

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 7 July 2022

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

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

The SPEAKER read prayers.

Parliamentary Committees

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY 2022-23

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (11:03): I move:

That the first report of the committee, entitled Emergency Services Levy 2022-23, be noted.

Under the Emergency Services Funding Act 1998, the Economic and Finance Committee has an annual statutory duty to inquire into, consider and report on the Treasurer's Determination regarding the emergency services levy. The committee must provide a report on the written determinations within 21 days after referral to the committee. This year, the committee received the Treasurer's statement on 28 May.

The Emergency Services Funding Act 1998 compels the Treasurer to include determinations regarding the funding targets required via the levy to deliver emergency services, the expenditure on specific kinds of emergency services and the benefits for South Australians across the state. The emergency services levy funds the following organisations to deliver vital emergency services across Adelaide and the regions:

- South Australian Country Fire Service;
- South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service;
- South Australian State Emergency Service;
- Surf Life Saving SA;
- Volunteer Marine Rescue organisations;
- South Australia Police;
- The Department for Environment and Water;
- SA Ambulance Service;
- State Rescue Helicopter; and
- Shark beach patrol.

On 10 June, the Economic Finance Committee held a public hearing with representatives from the Department of Treasury and Finance, the South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission, the MFS, the CFS and the SES. The witnesses outlined the funding targets, rate setting and expenditure for the proposed levy for the 2022-23 year. Commensurate with its 21-day obligation under the act, the committee considered the determinations and tabled its report on 16 June 2022.

Firstly, I want to thank the frontline responders, staff and volunteers who provide valuable and vital support to our communities in times of crisis. I would also like to take this opportunity to pay my respects and honour the work of the volunteer CFS firefighter who lost her life in the Coles fire earlier this year, as well as those suffering from cancer, exposure to chemicals or trauma from any of the incidents they have to attend.

Our emergency services are expending more resources attending to an increasing number of incidents. These include road crash incidents as well as those arising from extreme weather events such as fires, storms and floods. The SES provided data indicating an increasing trend of incident counts. In 2021-22, the SES recorded 10,305 incidents. This was a significant increase from 6,329 incidents in 2021 and 6,567 incidents in 2019-20. The number of major incidents and their average days of duration are steadily trending upwards. In 2021, there were 11 major incidents of three days' average duration. In just the first half of 2022, the SES has already experienced eight major incidents of an average seven days' duration.

Our emergency services overcame many challenges last year. Agencies responded to many large-scale events, including major structural fires, floods in the Far North and the West Coast and the Coles fire in the South-East. The CFS also attended approximately 3,000 road crash incidents. The COVID-19 pandemic has strained resources at all levels across all services. The committee commends staff and volunteers for the grit and resilience that they demonstrate every day.

I would also like to highlight the key elements of the 2022-23 emergency services levy and report the following as observed by the Economic and Finance Committee. Total expenditure on emergency services for 2021-22 is projected to reach \$351.6 million, a figure slightly less than the original projection of \$353,400,000. ESL receipts for 2021-22 are expected to be \$4.2 million above original expectations, due to the higher than expected remission payments and fixed property ESL revenue.

Cash balances in the Community Emergency Services Fund were forecast to be \$17.7 million on 30 June 2022. The total expenditure on emergency services for 2022-23 is projected to be \$365.1 million. This will be funded primarily by ESL payments from fixed property of \$310.5 million, and mobile property of \$51 million, in addition to minor revenues (\$0.5 million) and a run-down in cash in the Community Emergency Services Fund (\$3 million). For 2022-23, the government will pay \$139.1 million into the Community Emergency Services Fund. The total of remissions is fairly similar to previous years. The majority comprises remissions for private land at approximately \$131 million. The average residential ESL bill will receive a remission of \$175.85, equating to a more than 50 per cent reduction.

Emergency services levy bills are calculated by applying a prescribed rate on assessable property value in accordance with the property's purpose and location. In 2022-23, the committee can provide the following information: metropolitan residential households and commercial property owners should receive a 2 per cent increase in the emergency services levy. With calculations based on an average median house value of \$600,500, the average residential bill in metropolitan Adelaide should be \$144.35. This is \$2.75 more than last year.

For a median commercial property figure of \$1 million, the average bill for commercial property owners should be \$1,352.75. This is a \$26.25 increase on last year. Rates in major country towns were based on a median sales value of \$295,000. Residential ESL bills in these areas should be \$87.05, a decrease of approximately 2.2 per cent. For a \$750,000 industrial property in metropolitan Adelaide, emergency services levy bills will rise by approximately 4.4 per cent. Property owners should receive their bills from the beginning of August through to the end of September.

Given the increases in the cost of living, I would like to draw attention to flexible payment policies available to property owners. ESL bills can be paid in four monthly instalments or over an extended payment period upon contacting RevenueSA prior to a bill's due date. Revenue raised from the ESL strengthens the frontline and operational capacity of our emergency services. This year, expenditure will update and improve ICT, refurbish clubs and facilities and implement an innovative system to track real-time locations of firefighting and other emergency response vehicles during incidents.

The 2022-23 target expenditure of \$365.1 million is \$13.5 million more than the 2021-22 figure of \$351.6 million. This additional expenditure is required for:

- base funding for supplies and services (\$6.3 million);
- SAFECOM's emergency services sector ICT licensing, migration and security costs (\$1.8 million);

- carryover of expenditure from 2021-22 for the surf lifesaving club facilities redevelopment program (\$3.1 million);
- expenditure for the implementation of the automatic vehicle location system (\$0.5 million);
- bringing forward funding from the SES's building program (\$1 million); and
- reinstatement of MFS investing annual program (\$5.6 million).

The committee has fulfilled its obligations under the Emergency Services Funding Act 1998. I would like to thank the members of the Economic and Finance Committee, the representatives from the Department of Treasury and Finance, the Chief Executive of the South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission and the chief officers of the Metropolitan Fire Service, Country Fire Service and the State Emergency Service for their contribution and assistance. I would also like to thank the parliamentary officers who assisted.

Therefore, pursuant to section 6 of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Economic and Finance Committee recommends that parliament note this report.

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (11:14): I rise today to provide a contribution on the noting of this report of the Economic and Finance Committee in regard to the ESL report for the financial year 2022-23 and the determinations made by the Treasurer.

I, too, begin by thanking the departmental Treasury staff for their attendance at the public hearing that was held, as well as the heads of emergency services who provided their time and, in all good faith, answered questions provided to them by the committee. I also extend my respect to the family of the CFS firefighter who passed away in service earlier this year and my thanks, and the thanks of the house, for her service and dedication.

The emergency services levy, as you are well aware, sir, provides funding to all streams of the emergency services in this state. There are contributions made by the grant fund that is established and collects the ESL levies that are paid by South Australians and also remissions that are provided by the government. The payments are then made each year to the corresponding services.

This year, funding was provided to the CFS, the MFS, the State Emergency Services, Surf Life Saving SA, the Volunteer Marine Rescue organisations, South Australia Police, the Department for Environment and Water in their capacity of providing emergency services, the State Rescue Helicopter as well as the shark patrol plane, or the shark beach patrol plane as it is coined in the report.

Those of us on this side of the house are obviously very proud of the ESL and its current comparative rate settings. It is something that we were very keen to see changed in coming to government in 2018 after the former Labor government removed the remissions, effectively jacking up the price of the emergency services levy, adding to the cost-of-living pressures of families, businesses, as well as community and sporting organisations. I think that is one thing that many may not be aware of, that those organisations also pay the emergency services levy based on the facilities that they own or operate.

In coming to government, we returned the remission in the end, cutting emergency services levy bills by approximately \$184 for an average household, which is an approximate 50 per cent reduction. This investment of \$95½ million went back into the hip pockets of South Australians, and we were glad this financial year to see this approach continue.

One thing that we were keen to tease out and get a little more information on during the hearing this year was around the Keelty review, obviously undertaken by former Australian Federal Police Commissioner Mick Keelty in response to the 2019-20 bushfire season that saw multiple significant bushfire events across our state. On the back of that, a number of recommendations were made and projects commenced by a range of the emergency services to deliver improved communications and outcomes for both the community and the firefighting services in regard to the activities they undertake in major bushfire events.

We have obviously been very happy to see the automatic vehicle location system rolled out across the services, the burnover protection project, the development of new apps and the real-time vehicle location project—all these things on the back of what was an event that I think all South Australians will remember for quite some time. I cannot remember, certainly in my lifetime, a bushfire season when we had so many significant events so close together over that period. The impact of those events across multiple communities in South Australia will be felt for quite some time still.

One of the things that I wish to highlight from this report in particular was the carryover funds in regard to the surf lifesaving club redevelopment project. For those who are unaware, or new to this place perhaps, there is a fund and a funding arrangement that have been in place for quite some time that effectively funds a pipeline of redevelopment of the surf lifesaving clubs across South Australia.

There are significant carryover funds in this year's report, and there have been for a number of years with regard to one surf club, the West Beach Surf Life Saving Club. One of the reasons those funds have been continually carried over each and every year is that the surf lifesaving club sits on a beach that historically has been a beach, and then in the last 15 to 20 years it has started to erode—and there is no better way to describe it—and then to disappear.

Up until last summer, there was effectively no high-tide beach in front of the surf lifesaving club, which had made the activities of the club in regard to providing water cover and surf lifesaving activities near impossible in the current location. To access the beach to the south, the club had to go down to the Adelaide Sailing Club boat ramp and enter the beach from that direction, not being able to gain access directly in front of the club. To the north, depending on how high the tide was and the weather conditions on the day, they were not even able to have nippers access the beach from the ramp because the water level was above that.

As everyone in this chamber I think is aware, there was a significant contribution of funds allocated to a project to rebuild that beach. On the back of that project, and the commitment the former government made, the West Beach Surf Life Saving Club for the first time was confident enough to make an investment decision to rebuild that surf club in its current location. That was not an easy decision for them. They had been exploring other options, potentially, but the history of and the rightful place for that surf lifesaving club is on its current location.

They are currently financially viable based on the tourism opportunities that are available to them from patrons of the West Beach Caravan Park just down the road. The club does operate as the pub, for the lack of a better word, in the West Beach area, as there is no other facility of that type in the area. So that decision was made and these funds will be expended eventually out of the emergency services levy and the fund here to rebuild a beach. My only hope, and the hope of the West Beach community of course, is that there is a beach to patrol at West Beach into the future, because this investment could look very silly in a number of years' time if there is not a beach there to patrol.

Those decisions were made, as I said, based on the confidence provided to the surf lifesaving club on the back of the commitment the previous government made. I cannot fathom that the political party of the other persuasion was happy to provide funds from a federal perspective to rebuild the surf lifesaving club, which was different from most every other allocation of funding that we have had through the surf club redevelopment process, but I will put that aside. The key issue here is that this government has a responsibility to the people of West Beach.

This government has a responsibility to ensure that the investment made out of the emergency services levy into the redevelopment of that club is able to serve its community in the way that it should. Obviously, we have seen significant improvements and increased funds from the emergency services levy over the last number of years. There has been an increase this year in terms of the levy for the people of South Australia, and a modest one I might add.

In closing, can I please extend my thanks to all those people in the emergency services for their service and everything they do for our communities.

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (11:24): I rise to speak very briefly on the report of the committee. As a member of the Economic and Finance Committee, I appreciated the process to go through and the presenters who came from the representative bodies, and I thank them, as has been already

mentioned in this place. They include the CFS, the SES, the MFS, SAFECOM and the Department of Treasury and Finance. It was an incredibly important process to go through because of the importance of the need for appropriate expenditure of the funds raised by this levy.

In my electorate, there are many volunteers, especially in the CFS and SES. The moneys that are collected and expended from this fund are really important to ensure that people volunteering their services and their time during some of the most stressful times in our community are appropriately looked after with equipment and arrangements that are sustainable into the future. Can I just recognise those volunteers in particular who, as I said, work in the most stressful times for our communities. At times, when lives and properties are at risk, they are the ones who are willing to put their hands up. I encourage people across the state to consider volunteering with these organisations and doing their part for the safety and protection of our state in some incredibly challenging times.

Many of us have been touched very closely by some of the challenging fire times we have faced over the last couple of years, and I am one of them. I had a fire event that got to within a couple of hundred metres of my house. We evacuated my family and belongings. To know that there were volunteers, that were community members near us and doing their bit to protect not just my family but also the whole community, was really important, as it is to make sure they are properly equipped and able to do that job in a safe way.

I also acknowledge the important role volunteer farm firefighting units play in conjunction with the CFS to protect our communities. I am someone who is often on those volunteer farm fire units when our communities are at risk. They are an incredibly important part of the tapestry of emergency services and a vital tool that the CFS can use not just to defend properties but also, in the long time it has always had, to mop up after fire events.

I think there is a really important role for the CFS to play. I have always been one to encourage the CFS to continue to work collaboratively and constructively with these volunteers to ensure protections and structures are in place. I am encouraged, in the questioning through this committee process, to see that they are indeed involved in looking at making sure those arrangements are appropriate going into the future.

There was an aspect in the questioning of the committee that I was a bit concerned about. In the papers, there was a reduction of \$1 million towards the funds for the Department for Environment and Water to do some important fire load reduction burn-offs. Those of us who come from regional areas are very much aware of the importance of some of these back-burning and fire-load reduction aspects to try to reduce the risks that come with fires that continually go through national parks, or even SA Water land or the like, that can then intrude on private property.

There were questions around that at the committee level. I trust that the department is still well enough equipped to make sure that these works, which are necessary, are done appropriately. Through this process, it is important to ensure that our communities receive appropriate support and protection during some of those most vulnerable times. I certainly commend the committee report to the house and the process that was followed.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:28): I rise to speak briefly on this report by the Economic and Finance Committee into the emergency services levy. I, too, want to commend the many thousands of volunteers right across the state who literally put their lives on the line in the act of saving people's lives and property. I also want to thank the paid and retained staff—in the MFS there are paid staff and retained staff—and all the paid staff in senior roles right throughout emergency services. With the new build at SAFECOM we are getting everyone together in a state-of-the-art building, and it will assist with fighting calamities in the future because they will come; there is no doubt about it.

I note that this levy makes sure that we have state-of-the-art equipment delivered to our communities right across the board. It is not just the Metropolitan Fire Service and the Country Fire Service; it is also the surf lifesaving clubs, marine rescue and the State Emergency Service. I think it was late last year that Murray Bridge was delivered a new rescue boat, which will be put to good use on the River Murray.

Interestingly, the member for Flinders just touched on the issue of cold burns and back-burns. We do need to be in front of fires, including back-burning in the cold months to make sure we reduce fuel load. It is my belief that we should do a lot more of that in areas where it is safe to do so because, if you do not, you run the very real risk of having much bigger fires when they do come through. It does not matter where it is; it can be in the Adelaide Hills, the South-East, the Murray Mallee, the West Coast, the Upper North, the Mid-North or Yorke Peninsula.

I had a meeting this morning with someone from the South-East. When the action is on—and those of us in the CFS have all seen it in live firefighting activities—decisions to back-burn need to be made in a far more timely manner. At the end of the day, every time I have seen it stalled it has held up putting the fire out by up to several days or risked or burnt out many more acres or hectares—however you want to talk about it—of scrub and farmland. Those discussions need to be ongoing because sometimes, in an active fire situation, fighting fire with fire is one of the best tools you can have.

Alongside all those volunteers on the ground are the trucks or the farm fire units, a lot of which are ex-CFS units, and I have seen one or two ex-MFS units out in the country. They are very handy fire trucks, when you know some of your neighbours have these 3,000-litre trucks running around alongside the CFS trucks, which now run everything from quick attack vehicles through to 1,000-litre tankers up to the 4,000-litre trucks plus the backup tankers, some of which have 11,000 litres—and some have a lot more than that—to help keep the water up on the frontline. I want to commend all those people in the service.

I note there was an increase of about \$13 million, from what has been indicated by committee members today, of the ESL for functions of the emergency services. I also want to note that in my electorate the new SES building we began in our time in government is well underway at Strathalbyn. I commend all our services and commend that the funding be spent appropriately.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (11:33): I thank everyone for their contributions. I know, especially for those who come from country electorates, that the emergency services, the Country Fire Service and the State Emergency Service, play an important role. They also do so in the metropolitan area, but it is especially the case in country areas.

I think people will be grateful that the rise in the levy is on the rate of inflation, which is a positive in a time when a lot of people are feeling cost-of-living pressures on households. Once again, I would like to thank all the people who have contributed to the committee deliberations, as well as all those who clearly are not there, especially the volunteers who provide service day in and day out. We should be mindful of the stats provided by the SES and some of the other services about the trendline when it comes to the catastrophic events they are facing.

In my electorate were the floods and the consequences of them; there have been serious fires. We have seen what has happened interstate, so weather events are getting more intense. You just have to ask the people on the frontline, those deniers and those delayers when it comes to greenhouse gas emissions. We are on track for a world that our kids do not deserve to inherit in the form that we are going to give them if we do not take serious action.

We have to realise that a lot of the people who often put their lives on the line are volunteers, and with those trendlines are greater risks, but there is also that whole issue about drawing on volunteers to make themselves available when the intensity and the duration of events are increasing. We know that the fire season is globally increasing and that there is virtually an overlap now between the Northern Hemisphere and the Southern Hemisphere, so that is a lot of serious stuff to think about. Once again, I thank all who have made a contribution.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

The SPEAKER (11:36): Before I call the Clerk, I wish to make a brief statement in relation to the relevance of answers. During question time, points of order are frequently raised under standing order 98 concerning the relevance of answers by ministers. The rules requiring answers to be relevant—and the time available to answer—encourage more concise and direct answers to

questions without notice. The standing orders have required answers to be relevant since 1858 and time limits for answers were imposed in 2012.

What does relevance mean in the context of standing order 98? As members are aware, standing order 98 is broad and provides:

98 Rules applying to answers (125) Amended Nov. 2017

- (a) In answering a question, a Minister (sic) or other Member replies to the substance of the question and may not debate the matter to which the question refers.
- (b) During the period for asking Questions without Notice an answer to a question must not exceed four minutes. The Speaker has discretion to extend the time for a Minister or other Member's answer if the answer is interrupted.

Members will appreciate that whether a question is relevant turns on whether, in its proper context, a minister has replied to the substance of the question.

The *Practice of the House of Assembly*, often referred to as Blackmore's, follows very closely the practice in the House of Commons. Blackmore observes in relation to this matter:

An answer should be confined to the points of the Question, with only such explanation as is necessary to render the answers intelligible.

This is not, in my considered view, the practice that has now developed in the House of Assembly although, with great respect to Blackmore, it may be the practice in the Commons. I will return to this point.

First, I wish to record the practice as I understand it in other places, including the House of Representatives, the Parliament of New Zealand and the parliaments of certain other Australian states. House of Representatives standing order 104 concerns the form and content of answers and provides:

104 Answers

- a) An answer must be directly relevant to the question.
- b) A point of order regarding relevance may be taken only once in respect of each answer.
- c) The duration of each answer is limited to 3 minutes.

I understand that the words 'directly relevant' were introduced by amendment in 2010 and were likely intended to further narrow the scope of permissible answers. As well, answers are limited to three minutes, shorter than the four minutes contemplated by the standing orders in the House of Assembly. Whatever the proper construction to be given to words 'directly relevant', it is certainly a stricter formulation than mere substance, which is the touchstone in the House of Assembly. Additionally, the Clerk of the House of Representatives has observed:

The requirement for direct relevance has given Speakers greater authority in what has long been a difficult area. However, the vast majority of points of order raised during Question Time continue to be on relevance.

It is also true that the vast majority of points of order raised during question time in the House of Assembly continue to be relevance or, in the context of our House of Assembly standing orders, raise the question of whether the answer responds to the substance of the question.

The parliament of New Zealand has devised a test for relevance in relation to answers. Standing order 396 requires that answers or replies meet the following criteria:

396 Content of replies

- (1) An answer that seeks to address the question asked must be given if it can be given consistently with the public interest.
- (2) The reply to any question must be concise and confined to the subject matter of the question asked, and not contain—
 - (a) statements of fact and the names of any persons unless they are strictly necessary to answer the question, or
 - (b) arguments, inferences, imputations, epithets or ironical expressions, or

- (c) discreditable references to the House or any member of Parliament or any offensive or unparliamentary expression.

It goes on to provide:

- (3) Replies shall not refer to proceedings in committee at meetings closed to the public that have not yet been reported to the House or, subject to Standing Order 116, to a matter awaiting or under adjudication in, or suppressed by an order of, any New Zealand court.

Of course, there is an argument that an increase in the number of rules concerning the content of answers might produce an increase in the number of points of order, rather than improve relevancy.

In the Victorian Legislative Assembly, all answers to questions are required to be direct, factual and succinct and not introduce matter extraneous to the question. Moreover, answers must not debate the matter to which the question relates. However, the relevant standing order also provides that a minister shall have discretion to determine the content of any answer.

It is not unusual for apparently simple and direct questions to give rise to complex and multifaceted answers. In answering a question, the minister must consider what facts or background information are relevant and provide that information without entering into debate. How ministers go about answering questions is largely up to them, and members cannot stipulate how they must reply (for example, by insisting on a yes or a no answer), nor can the Speaker require a reply to be couched in one form rather than another.

I turn to the proper construction to be given to the term 'substance' under standing order 98 in the House of Assembly. At the outset, I observe that there is a difference between answering the substance of a question and the adequacy of the reply and that there is a tendency for points of order to be raised which concern the adequacy of the reply rather than the question of substance.

The role of the Speaker is to rule in accordance with the standing orders and precedence. If an answer does, in some way, go to the substance of the question, under the present standing orders, it is in order. What amounts to the substance of the question is a subjective judgement and without an amendment to the standing orders, will remain one. An answer will be more likely to engage with the substance of a question if it ventilates matters which lie close to the heart or the pith of the question. However, as McGee observes in *Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand*:

Questions often have more than one leg to them. If this is the case, members cannot demand that a reply addresses every leg of their question. The Minister has the latitude to address one or other of the legs of a question and ignore others.

In the House of Representatives, Speaker Smith has taken the approach in ruling that an answer that relates to one part of a question is directly relevant—an approach not dissimilar to other recent Speakers, such as Jenkins and Burke.

As well, it is the frequent practice of members to seek leave of the house to introduce further facts to explain their questions. Leave is most usually given so long as such additional content does not include argument or opinion which might be characterised as debate. Where extra content is included, it is not unreasonable to provide the minister with the opportunity to provide a fulsome answer to all or any part of the question and this would be well within the scope of standing order 98.

Finally, while it is the Speaker's role to ensure standing orders are adhered to, whether a reply answers the question satisfactorily, either in the questioner's view or even in any objective sense, is a matter for political discourse. Question time allows issues to be raised. It does not necessarily resolve them. The Speaker's interpretation of whether a minister is answering the substance of a question is based on the established practice of providing latitude to ministers in their answers and in accordance with the broad nature of standing order 98.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: CADELL TRAINING CENTRE (NEW DAIRY COMPLEX)

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:44): I move:

That the first report of the committee for the Fifty-Fifth Parliament, entitled Cadell Training Centre (New Dairy Complex), be noted.

The Cadell Training Centre (CTC) is a low-security prison farm situated on approximately 1,600 hectares of vineyards, olive groves and fruit trees in the Riverland. It is an open institution, with no perimeter fencing, where prisoners work together to budget, order food and prepare meals in cottage-style accommodation. This sense of normality promotes the trust, responsibility and accountability the prisoners need in preparation for a return to the community. Finding suitable employment after release is a crucial factor in reducing the rate of reoffending. The CTC prepares prisoners for release by providing job-ready skills training. It offers nationally recognised qualifications in various industries, such as citrus, olive and dairy production.

The proposed works will upgrade and expand the CTC's existing dairy complex, which forms an integral part of the rehabilitation process. The facility teaches prisoners transferable skills with a real-life application in several South Australian job sectors. Currently, it employs 25 prisoners to milk cows and package milk products. The prisoners tend to a herd of 100 milking cows that produce 2,200 litres of raw milk every day. The CTC supplies milk products to over 3,000 prisoners across the state. In addition, excess product and cream are sold to South Australian businesses for the manufacture of cheese.

As the complex was constructed in the 1960s, the infrastructure and equipment are badly in need of upgrading. Maintenance costs are substantial and sourcing parts has become very difficult. This project will allow the dairy to upgrade the infrastructure and expand its processing capacity, product line and customer base, while continuing to deliver quality milk products across the correctional system.

The dairy project presents a valuable opportunity for prisoners committed to rehabilitation. An expanded dairy means more prisoners can develop valuable skills and positive habits, along with a sense of purpose and pride. Prisoners are encouraged to arrive for shifts on time and have responsibilities that require ongoing attention, such as caring for the herd. The daily responsibilities, scheduled work hours and structured activities all contribute to the development of self-discipline and accountability.

Prisoners who might not be directly employed in the dairy may also benefit from this upgrade. Prisoner construction teams will work with the managing contractor and subcontractors to build works associated with the project, enabling prisoners to develop skills that will support them in achieving a Certificate II in Construction Pathways. Works are scheduled to begin in August 2022, with operational commissioning in November 2023.

The Public Works Committee has examined written and oral evidence in relation to the new dairy complex at the CTC, including receiving oral evidence from Mr Chris Sexton, the Executive Director of People and Business Services, Department for Correctional Services; Ryan Harber, the Executive Director of Community Corrections and Specialist Prisons for the Department for Correctional Services; and Mr Ben Hogarth, the Director of Building Projects for the Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

The Public Works Committee has examined the evidence and the committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and meets the criteria for examination of projects as set out in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Based upon the evidence considered pursuant to section 12(C) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:49): I want to thank the Public Works Committee for their speedy passage of the Cadell dairy upgrade. It was a pleasure to recently visit Cadell with the former Minister for Corrections, the member for Hartley. As the local member, I visited the corrections centre—I call it a transition centre—and with great pride. It is an establishment that has been there since 1960, and it gives the opportunity for those who have been in the corrections system to give themselves a level of upskill and transition away from the corrections system out into mainstream society.

Along the way, some of the people or inmates I have seen come away from Cadell have left in a pretty good place. It is there to be a firewall for those who are looking for a new career, new opportunities upon coming out, because we know that reoffending has been such a burden on the corrections system for a very long time.

Going back to the dairy upgrade, as we just heard from the Presiding Member of the committee, somewhere north of \$8 million is going to be invested into that upgrade. I have learnt over my time, as I am sure the member for Finniss would have learnt, that the level of commitment working in a dairy is profound: early hours, long hours. It is not just about milking cows but it is about preparation. It is about making sure you have feedstocks and making sure you have a rotation of milking cows to come in and go out.

We know that you cannot milk a cow 365 days of the year. There are times when cows go dry, or cows are put out in the paddock for a spell or to calve, and the Cadell Training Centre offers that opportunity. For those inmates who are currently working in that very old, antiquated dairy—I have watched it working and I have watched them do an outstanding job—I think the time has come to upgrade that dairy and give Cadell a sense of new ownership on a new bit of kit to produce more milk and to train more inmates, giving them a higher level of certification.

We know there are a number of areas of certification in food handling and food safety that currently exist, and I am sure that the upgrade will give them more of an opportunity to take away those certificates to then show a prospective employer when they are outside that virtual fence or virtual wall—because there are no fences and there are no walls. It is met with a sense of trust and a sense of optimism when inmates go to Cadell on that transition out into society.

I commend the upgrade and I commend the Cadell Training Centre. As I have said, 25 prisoners are now employed to milk cows. There are 232 cattle currently there, with 100 milkers producing about 2,200 litres of raw milk every day. Milk has been quite a valuable commodity of recent time, and we are seeing some of that milk go out into private value-adding businesses. Some of that product goes out into the prison system, and some of it is also distributed to local networks.

The upgrade of the dairy at Cadell is a great opportunity to further exemplify what Cadell can do and what it can give as an opportunity for those looking to transition from the corrections system out into mainstream society. As the local member, and as the shadow for corrections, I am buoyed by this investment into Cadell. It gives me great satisfaction to see that this project is getting closer to the pointy end. It ensures that it is of benefit not only to the corrections system but to those transitioning out of corrections into mainstream society.

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (11:54): I, too, rise to talk about the investment at the Cadell training facility. An amazing amount of effort has gone in to getting prisoners rehabilitated. I had the privilege of going out to Cadell in my role as Minister for Primary Industries about 12 months ago, and I saw the operation.

The interesting thing is how pristine and how well the dairy itself was operating. The reason I make that comment is that I had not seen a dairy of that type—a walk-through dairy—in operation for about 30 years. This is a piece of old technology. This is something that they have been working with since the 1960s when it was built. All other dairy farmers around South Australia have upgraded their facilities over that time. Unfortunately, Cadell has not had that opportunity. The prisoners had certainly taken care of this facility to keep it functioning. On reading the report, I understand that they are getting to the point of struggling to find parts to keep the existing machinery going, and I can imagine that being the case.

To see this upgrade is fantastic. It will make the prisoners who are operating in the dairy itself more relevant to the workforce. I asked prison officers there whether any dairy trainees had gone to work on dairy farms from the existing facility, and they said they did not think so. I can quite understand that, too, because what they are learning there is not necessarily transferable because of the age of the facility, whereas this new facility they are going to—again, it is not necessarily the most modern dairy out there as far as new technologies go—certainly has much closer links to the existing dairy industry and gives them the opportunity to get themselves some work in the dairy industry.

It is also the pride in the way that dairy is run. They may not have all the shiny new equipment as they are about to get, but they have certainly invested in the cows themselves. The genetics of the herd at Cadell are some of the highest I have seen. They have made sure they have bred cows there that are actually able to produce milk in the environment they operate in, and they have done a great job through the support of the prison officers as well as the prisoners working there. It is a

real credit to those people there. It is certainly helping this facility achieve its outcomes, and I think the investment in the new dairy is essential. I am pleased to see that investment. I believe it will create a greater tie between the dairy industry and Cadell going forward.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Finnis, and I appreciate your expertise in relation to dairying matters. I just remind the house that notice has been given to suspend standing orders at midday.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (11:57): I rise to also make a brief contribution in relation to this project. I reiterate the comments that have been made before the house thus far. I did do ag science in year 12 at Rostrevor College and I have learned a little bit about agriculture, tailing sheep, milking cows—

Mr Whetstone: Milking cows?

Mr TARZIA: —absolutely—and all kinds of things, like what to plant at what stage of the season throughout the year. I have had the great privilege of being able to build on that knowledge by visiting Cadell when I was corrections minister. Can I say that I absolutely commend the team in the Corrections department for what they do.

We all have a duty, if some of these offenders do come into our system, to do what we can to help improve their lives so that when they do leave prison they go out as better people with better skills. This particular project gives them an absolutely outstanding opportunity to learn some new skills that they can then take to the outside world when they are hopefully rehabilitated. It is an outstanding complex.

I thank Ryan, Chris, Mr Brown and the team. I am very happy to see this transition, this upgrade, and I am really looking forward to seeing what it delivers by way of rehabilitative outcomes for many offenders in the system. I thank the committee for its work and I commend the report.

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:59): I want to not only thank everyone for their contributions but also point out that the member for Chaffey did attend the committee meeting. Although he did not present evidence, he was kind enough to informally tell the members of his support for the project.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (11:59): I move:

That standing and sessional orders be so far suspended as to enable the Animal Welfare (Jumps Racing) Amendment Bill, set down on the *Notice Paper* as an Order of the Day, Private Members Business, Bills, for Wednesday 7 September, be taken into consideration during Government Business today.

Motion carried.

Bills

ANIMAL WELFARE (JUMPS RACING) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 July 2022.)

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (12:00): I rise to indicate that I am the lead speaker on behalf of the opposition on this bill. I rise to advise the house that the opposition will be opposing the bill but will support the amendments as introduced in the other place by the Hon. Ms Bonaros on behalf of the Hon. Frank Pangallo MLC.

We know that jumps racing has been a longstanding tradition in the thoroughbred industry for nearly 150 years in South Australia. Mr Speaker, I am sure that you are well aware of the long-

serving families involved in this sport, especially in your own electorate, sir; some of them may have also had law firms in your neck of the woods. We recognise that there is a debate around its continuation, particularly within the last 10 years.

I believe it is important to consider the history of this debate over the last decade for some context. A select committee was established in 2016 to review whether jumps racing ought to be banned. The current Minister for Racing was a member of that committee, which ultimately recommended against the ban. The committee instead recommended that the industry should in fact be given time to independently demonstrate improvements outlined in the recommendations. The industry did demonstrate some improvements for sure.

On this side of the house, we have no doubt that the industry participants take their responsibilities very seriously. They are deeply invested in the sport, and they care deeply for their horses as well. I have had the great privilege to be racing shadow minister for only a few months, and these trainers absolutely love their horses. It would be very unfair indeed to accuse trainers of being in any way dismissive, ignorant or cruel.

We understand that this debate is emotive, and the whole practice concerning jumps raising more broadly and whether it continues has been an emotive one. However, in this state a decision effectively has already been made. Racing SA announced in 2021 that jumps would no longer be scheduled in the South Australian racing calendar from 2022 onwards. A legislated ban is therefore, in our opinion, absolutely unnecessary.

Racing SA, as the peak industry body of racing in South Australia, has already effectively made a decision to end jumps racing across the state. This is on trend with the majority of states that have discontinued jumps racing in some form, and these states have often been used for the sake of contrast in the other place. The fact is that the only state ever to introduce a legislated ban on jumps racing is the state of New South Wales.

South Australia is in no sense being inconsistent with or contradicting the rest of Australia, as seems to be suggested in this chamber and in the other place. However, given that Racing South Australia is indeed the peak racing body in this state, it is entirely appropriate that it is the body that administrates jumps racing and not this house of parliament.

We say that government should not be unnecessarily interfering in the day-to-day administration of a sport. If the Labor Party wants to use its majority to start interfering in the administration of sport, the question is: where does it end? Where does it end and which sport does it extend to next? What sport will the Labor Party try to ban in this state? What sport will the Labor Party try to interfere with in its administration?

We are the party of choice, we are the party of small government and we do not believe in creating laws that simply do not need to be made when the peak body of a sport has already made the decision. We do not need this legislation.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (12:05): I rise to take this opportunity to endorse and very much commend the remarks the member for Hartley made just now in relation to this proposed legislation that has been brought to the house in something of a rush. I listened carefully to the Deputy Premier's contribution in her second reading speech yesterday and, subsequently, late morning yesterday and, subsequently, there was an indication from the government that this will be brought on for debate immediately.

My first question is: what is the rush? What is the rush about bringing this matter to the parliament, particularly in circumstances where this affects an industry that is regulated and highly engaged with the public process? It is the subject of ministerial responsibility in terms of the industry more broadly. The member for Hartley has certainly addressed remarks in the context of his responsibilities as shadow minister for racing.

What we see here is a provision that will affect the racing industry in a particular way, introduced via an amendment to the Animal Welfare Act 1985. I just want to make the observation that, as a matter of principle, we are considering here a proposal to amend part 3 of the Animal Welfare Act and to lump in those who have participated in something that enjoys a proud tradition over a long period of time, to lump in those who have participated in what certainly can be described

as an industry; it can also be described as a sport. It can also be described very thoroughly as a way of life for a large number of people not only in our state and not only in our nation but across the world

It lumps them in with a category of behaviour that is otherwise restricted to what we see as prohibited activities, including the organising of animal fights, the engaging in live baiting, the releasing of animals for captivity for supply to a person so that they may be subjected to deliberate forms of harm, and the like. Those prohibitive activities that are described in part 3 of the act are a category of behaviour that is rightly to be condemned in relation to the nature of the engagement with the animal.

My submission is that when we deal with racing, when we deal with in this case a particular category of horseracing, we should bear in mind that we are dealing with and looking to regulate the behaviour of care and sincerity of those who have engaged with animals over a long period of time and in a way that has enjoyed a proud heritage.

It is curious, in this regard, to compare what the direction of Olympic sport involving humans has been over the course of the last century. We saw steeplechasing introduced into the Olympics in 1920 in Antwerp, I think it was, for men running a steeplechase course over 3,000 metres. The Olympics proudly introduced the possibility of women participating in that event in Beijing in 2008 as an extension of the nature of athletic performance involving humans.

At the same time, the concept of steeplechasing where it involves horses is now to be condemned within part 3 of the act, and I think that is a shame. It is not my particular personal heritage or history. Steeplechasing originally emanated from the concept of racing from one steeple to another, from one town to another, from one church steeple to another, via all the walls and creeks and so on in between. It is a response to a spirit of competition, a tradition of community and a tradition of sport.

The member for Hartley referred to the only other place in which legislation of this kind has been passed by a state parliament. That was in New South Wales in 1997 in the very early days of the Carr Labor government at that time. It introduced what was, in that case, a very simple provision applying itself to the banning of steeplechasing and hurdling without reference to animals in particular. I note that at the time there was a tradition of involving the hurdling of greyhounds.

It otherwise was a piece of legislation that concerned a prohibition against the tethering of birds. It was a rather odd piece of legislating, if I may say so, and parts of it have since been repealed. However, it appears to be characterised by the same resort to a signal to those who might feel strongly about this sport. It is not the way to go about legislating in this area.

To make that point, and to put it on the record for those who would speak in terms of principle about this, in her contribution yesterday the Deputy Premier referred to the fact that, as we know, the racing industry in South Australia has determined, for the time being, that there will be no more jumps racing. One could say then that we are talking in moot terms here in the house now, and it is harmless to therefore put in some legislation that closes the door after the event.

The Deputy Premier referred to the fact that there may be trainers out there in the South-East, for example, who are involved in the training of horses for this purpose who might then take them over the border into Victoria so that they can participate in jumps events in Victoria—and that is okay, according to the Deputy Premier. So, far from providing some means by which there will be an end to the part 3 category of cruelty that this will now be categorised as, it is okay, according to the movers of this legislation, notwithstanding this being inserted, for people to keep on training their horses and then take them over the border to compete.

Far from this being an end to it, it is leaving open a possibility—just do not do it here. Further, and as I have indicated, for those who have been involved, and sincerely over a long period of time with this area of sporting life, it will consign them and their interest to an equating with part 3 of the Animal Welfare Act.

It is not the way to unite a community, it is not the way to bring people together and it is not an appropriate way to legislate in relation to this field of human endeavour—let alone, may I say, is it appropriate business to be bringing on so urgently in this place when other important legislation is

sitting waiting to be debated. So we should not be proceeding with this legislation and I urge all members of the house to think carefully on the matter.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:15): I was not going to speak on this particular bill. I am here as someone who is doing his chamber duty, but I thought I would get up and say something when we got that very odd comparison between human steeplechases and the horse steeplechase. I thought it was a very odd comparison, given the agency that a person has when it comes to steeplechasing. I was a steeplechaser. I used to do distance running—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HUGHES: No, a runner. I bet anything that I am the only one here in this chamber who has actually raced at Oakbank. I have raced at Oakbank in a 10-k cross-country championship. I tell you what: the horses have my sympathy. That was a sodden track with the jumps, and even worse for the human beings we had to go up the hill as well several times in that race. It was a hard slog, but it was a hard slog that I voluntarily entered into.

I sat on the select committee during the Weatherill government when this came up before and I have say that I was semi-agnostic. I listened to all the evidence, and at the end of the day it does come down to a pretty simple fact: more horses are seriously injured and are put to death when it comes to steeplechasing in comparison to those in flat racing. This is no slippy, thin end of the wedge to get rid of greyhound racing or flat racing.

Members interjecting:

Mr HUGHES: Well, the Greens might come, but I do not think they are going to get much support.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Giles has the floor.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can the members on my left get back in the saddle?

Mr HUGHES: At the end of the day, we have been talking about lots and lots of people involved in this. It is a minority sport, it is a very small minority sport, it is one that has diminished over the years. It is one that the industry itself, the wider horse racing industry itself, has some serious issues with. So I do not see any issue with legislating to ensure that, in this state, steeplechasing essentially comes to an end. As I said as to the comparison with human steeplechases—that great 3-k event, the steeplechase—it is voluntarily entered into. The horses are not given much choice. We know that horses do not naturally jump, they have to be trained. It is only in flight or in fear that horses in the wild clear hurdles. They have to be geared to go in that particular direction.

I say all of this coming from a family where my dad was right into horse racing. My mum lived and grew up in County Kildare next to the famous racehorse and horse stud in Ireland. I have family members in Ireland who are jockeys and quite famous jockeys, but they do not do jumps racing; they do flat racing. It is a diminishing sport and it has diminishing support, so let's just have some legislative clarity and see the end of it.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:19): I would like to make a small contribution to make it well known that I oppose this piece of legislation. As a former shadow racing minister, I saw firsthand what the jumps racing industry meant to South Australia and its racing history.

Yes, Racing SA have taken the jumps racing off their calendar. We understand that. While we have had contributions from this side of the chamber, I have watched the Deputy Premier squirming in glee with a KPI, that she is being part of putting an end to jumps racing and the proud history we have had here in South Australia for over 150 years.

What we need to understand is that those jumps horses were primarily once a flat-track racing horse. Contrary to what the member for Giles has said, whether you are racing uphill, over a steeple or over a jump, that is part of the discipline. Yes, the industry has modified the style of jumps that we have seen over a long period of time. Yes, we see much better and safer tracks in today's

racing society to prevent injury to animals, and that is a response to the call for the industry to do more to make sure racegoers are happy with what they see on the track.

I want to make it really clear that the trainers, the owners, the investors and the racegoers have all shown an incredible sense of care, not only with their animals but with the preparation of the tracks, in making sure that all conceivable barriers or issues in front of the industry are dealt with. I am quite saddened that we now have a government prepared to legislate an industry. The government should have no role—the industry should be self-regulating, and I think it is—but we continue to see what I consider to be a left ideology by the government, the minister and the Deputy Premier coming in here and making light of taking away the freedom that the industry has had for a very long time.

While we have the Deputy Premier in here introducing this legislation, where is the responsible racing minister? Why is she not in here representing her sector? Why is she not in here representing her portfolio? Whether she is speaking for it or against it, where is she? Tell me.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

Mr WHETSTONE: She is missing. We have a Deputy Premier—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can the member please resume his seat. I think there is a well-known parliamentary convention about the presence or non-presence of members in the chamber—in fact, it is a standing order, I am told. I would ask that the member for Chaffey abide by that standing order.

Mr TEAGUE: On the point of order that Mr Deputy Speaker has raised, and I do not demur at all, my understanding of the member for Chaffey's remarks was that he was referring to participation in the debate more broadly and not to the presence or otherwise of an individual member in the chamber at this time.

It may be that in the course of debate we see some participation from the Minister for Racing. We have not seen it to date. As I indicated in my remarks, this is properly introduced by the Minister for the Environment, the Deputy Premier; it is within the Deputy Premier's portfolio area for this legislation. The fact is that it impacts on the Minister for Racing, as has been adverted to in the course of the debate. As I say, it was my understanding that the member for Chaffey was referring to the course of the debate as opposed to anything that might transgress the standing orders.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thank you for your interpretation. I do not accept it and I am standing by my initial ruling. The member will continue his remarks, but I caution him and also caution him about making comments on the potential motives and behaviour of other members on my right as well. I let one go, but the member needs to understand that I will pull him up in future for those comments. You have the floor, member for Chaffey.

Mr WHETSTONE: I thank the member for Heysen for giving a clear explanation of my intent.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey, I just made my ruling. Your comments now are, in effect, a dissent from my ruling. Do you wish to dissent formally, or do I need to take other action?

Mr WHETSTONE: Thank you, Deputy Speaker, I will continue. As I have said, jumps racing has had a long history in South Australia. It has had a proud history and has responded to the calls for those who have had concerns with the impact on those animals, those horses that have traditionally raced on old sodden tracks with old technology as far as using jumps.

As I said, the industry have responded. They have modified their track conditions, they have modified the jumps, they have modified the length of the race and the height of the jumps. They have responded at every call, yet we are now seeing legislation introduced that is of great sadness not only to the industry but also to me personally. I am not an avid racegoer, but I do enjoy the competition on a racetrack. I do enjoy competition, first past the post, and that is by and large what the industry has shown over that 150 years.

As a member of the opposition, I will be vehemently opposing this legislation and, as has previously been said, if it is okay for the Queen, it is okay for jumps racing. The former Speaker in

this place, the Hon. Michael Atkinson, I am sure would be very concerned about what we are seeing today. I am sure he will be on social media at some point, if not already, venting his displeasure that the Deputy Premier is, I am sure, going against his wish. We know that he is a passionate racegoer. He has been a longstanding supporter of the racing industry, and I am sure today will be a day that he will see that very dark grey cloud coming across the parliament here in South Australia.

It is with great sadness that we are having to debate this today. I concur with the member for Heysen's comments. I thank the shadow minister for racing for his contribution, and I am somewhat concerned that we have not seen the Minister for Racing make a contribution.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (12:28): I will not speak for long. I think yesterday's speech and the contribution from the member for Giles adequately conveyed the reasons in favour of passing this piece of legislation. I will respond, I think, to the heart of the question from the opposition about this legislation, setting aside personal views about the rights and wrongs of jumps racing, the question of whether it is of merit to legislate to ban something that has already been ceased through voluntary action by an industry. It is a legitimate question.

The answer to that, in my view, has come in the numerous contacts I have had from people in the racing industry, including the board of Racing SA yesterday evening, going out of their way to thank me for creating certainty for the industry. By doing this, by backing in a decision already made by Racing SA, we are creating a certain environment for the flat racing community to continue to grow and prosper.

While there may be different views about the wisdom of that, the question is certainly not a moot one about whether there is merit in legislating. The feedback I have had is that, overwhelmingly, those who have made the decision inside the industry to cease the racing are grateful to have the legislative backing so that they can stop having the argument with the relatively few people who hope one day that this will be brought back. With that, I would like to thank all the contributors, and I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (12:30): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CHILD SEX OFFENCES) BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (12:31): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am pleased to introduce the Statutes Amendment (Child Sex Offences) Bill 2022. This significant and much-needed reform aims to protect the community from child sex offenders by increasing penalties on a range of child sex offences and ensuring that predators are not entitled to leniency because they were mistaken in their belief that their victim was a child. In so doing, this bill progresses two important election commitments made by the government to, first, increase penalties on a range of child sex offences and, second, strengthen Carly's Law so that police can hunt online predators with confidence.

This bill enacts these crucial Labor policies and goes even further to protect the children of South Australia with the inclusion of additional complementary reforms. The bill will substantially increase the maximum penalties for many child sex offences in the Criminal Consolidation Act 1935,

including offences involving direct sexual contact, as well as child exploitation material offences, child grooming offences and offences of using children in commercial sexual services.

For example, the maximum penalty for having sexual intercourse with a child aged under 17 is currently only 10 years. This is low compared with equivalent penalties in other Australian jurisdictions and is also low compared with the maximum life imprisonment imposed for sexual intercourse with a child under 14. Overall, the 10-year maximum does not reflect the seriousness of the conduct. The bill lifts this penalty to 15 years.

Similarly, indecent assault currently has an eight-year maximum penalty or 10 years for any aggravated indecent assault, which includes indecent assault on persons under 14. The bill creates specific higher penalties for indecent assaults against children: 10 years for children under 17 and 15 years for children under 14.

As well as raising the penalties on child exploitation material offences, the bill also removes the practice of classifying them into basic and aggravated classes. Typically, child exploitation material offences will be aggravated and have higher penalties if the defendant knew the child depicted in the material was under 14 years of age. The bill removes this distinction. Instead, these offences will have one significant maximum penalty that applies regardless of the age of the child. The new maximum penalties are set at a higher level than the existing aggravated penalties.

Removing age-based offence distinctions for this type of offending allows for more consistent and proportionate sentencing practices. Often authorities do not know the identity of the child victim depicted in the material and therefore cannot prove their exact age. They can gain a conviction but cannot attract the aggravated penalty, even if it is highly likely that the child is under 14. By applying a single penalty, regardless of the age of the child, this issue is removed. The age or apparent age of the child and the defendant's belief or knowledge of their age will of course still be relevant, as courts will be able to take it into account when selecting an appropriate penalty from within the range allowed.

This will also benefit law enforcement and prosecuting authorities. Due to the difficulties in determining the ages of children depicted in child exploitation material, authorities must spend more time looking at the material to classify charges, which has negative effects on their mental wellbeing. The bill also contains an important set of amendments in relation to policing using 'fictitious children'. These amendments have been included to strengthen existing law around charging online child predators where barriers have been experienced by police.

In a fictitious child scenario, an offender believes they are speaking to a real child, but in fact they are speaking to an undercover police officer or an artificial intelligence program. In many cases, a person can already be liable for criminal communications with a fictitious child. However, there are various gaps in current legislation that create the potential for leniency in this scenario, and the bill will address this. The bill applies the principle that these offenders should not be entitled to any leniency. They believed they were speaking to a real child and so should be treated as if they had been. They are still a danger to the community.

In particular, the bill will make it clear that the following offences can include communications with fictitious children:

1. Grooming offences under section 63B(3) of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 that are aggravated based on the knowledge that the victim was under 14 years old;
2. A registrable child sex offender failing to inform police of reportable contact with a child; and
3. Dishonest communication with children, better known as Carly's Law, which is pursuant to this Labor government's election commitment to strengthen Carly's Law so that police can hunt online predators with confidence.

The bill will also amend various sentencing provisions that reference the age of the victim to make it clear that, if the victim was fictitious, their age for the purposes of sentencing can be considered as the age the defendant believed them to be at the time of the offence.

Finally, the bill updates the list of registrable offences in the Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006. A registrable offence is one that will result in automatic mandatory registration as a child sex offender, except if one of the narrow exemptions apply. Keeping this list up to date ensures that the right people are captured on the register. A number of offences are added as registrable offences. The additional offences are mainly from the Commonwealth Criminal Code.

The act already includes some commonwealth child sex offences as registrable, but some were passed more recently by the commonwealth parliament. Some additional state child sex offences are also added as registrable offences, such as offences involving childlike sex dolls, Carly's Law and causing serious harm to a child if it arises from the same incident as a sexual offence. The bill also removes or narrows some registrable offences to ensure that the list focuses only on child sex offending.

A version of this bill passed the Legislative Council with unanimous support last year. It contained similar updates to the list of registrable offences, fictitious child amendments and some of the raised penalties included in this bill. However, just like many other crucial bills that went cold under the hand of the former government, this one did not pass the House of Assembly before sittings ended prior to the 2022 election.

What a shame that these absolutely necessary legislative reforms to protect South Australia's young people against some of society's most dangerous could not have been enacted sooner, so we are getting the job done as a priority. I look forward to seeing this bill progressing through the chamber and being enacted as soon as possible to ensure the children of our state are adequately protected from harm. I commend the bill to members and seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006

3—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This amendment is consequential.

4—Insertion of section 4A

This clause inserts a proposed section as follows:

4A—Meaning of reportable contact

Section 13(4), (5) and (6) of the Act currently define what reportable contact with a child constitutes for the purposes of the Act. This section proposes that the definition be enacted in amended form in this new section as it applies in several key sections throughout the Act. The definition is amended to provide that a reference to a child is to include—

- a person who the registrable offender believes, at the time the contact occurs, is under the age of 18 years; and
- a fictitious person represented to the registrable offender at the time the contact occurs as being a real person under the age of 18 years.

5—Amendment of section 13—Initial report by registrable offender of personal details

This clause deletes subsections (4),(5) and (6), the contents of which are proposed to be included in proposed section 4A as enacted by clause 4.

6—Amendment of Schedule 1—Class 1 and 2 offences

This clause updates several references to State and Commonwealth offences in the Schedule.

7—Transitional provisions

This clause contains transitional provisions consequent on the removal of certain offences by amendments in clause 6.

Part 3—Amendment of Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935

8—Amendment of section 5AA—Aggravated offences

This amendment substitutes subsection (1)(e) to—

- delete a reference to offences in Part 3 Division 11A consequential on the substitution of several existing penalties for aggravated child sex offences in that Division with a single higher penalty; and
- insert, in addition to the existing provisions in subsection (1)(e) regarding aggravated offences in respect of child sex offences where the victim is under the age of 12 years, a reference to an aggravated offence against section 63B(3) where the child is under the age of 14 years.

9—Amendment of section 49—Unlawful sexual intercourse

This amendment increases the maximum penalty of imprisonment applying for an offence against this section from 10 to 15 years.

10—Amendment of section 56—Indecent assault

Subclause (1) amends the penalty provision for the offence of indecent assault to provide for a penalty of imprisonment for 10 years if the victim of the offence was at the time of the offence under the age of 17 years and if the victim of the offence was at the time of the offence under the age of 14 years, 15 years. Subclause (2) deletes subsection 56(2) which is consequential on the amendment in subsection (1) to increase the penalty from that which would apply for an aggravated offence in accordance with section 5AA (which could still be charged under that section, see section 176 of the *Criminal Procedure Act 1921*).

11—Amendment of section 58—Acts of gross indecency

This clause increases the current penalty provision for the offence of gross indecency in subsection (1) (being imprisonment for a maximum of 3 years for a first offence and a maximum of 5 years for a subsequent offence) to a single maximum penalty of imprisonment for 15 years.

12—Amendment of section 63—Production or dissemination of child exploitation material

This amendment deletes the current maximum penalty (imprisonment for 10 years) and the aggravated penalty provision (imprisonment for 12 years) for an offence against the section and substitutes 1 higher maximum penalty for the offence (imprisonment for 15 years).

13—Amendment of section 63AA—Production or dissemination of child-like sex dolls

This amendment increases the maximum penalty of imprisonment applying for an offence against this section from 10 to 15 years.

14—Amendment of section 63A—Possession of child exploitation material

This clause deletes the current penalty provisions which vary according to whether an offence is a first or subsequent offence, or a basic or an aggravated offence, with the maximum possible term of imprisonment being 10 years for each offence. The proposed penalty provision provides for a maximum penalty of imprisonment for a first offence of 10 years and for a subsequent offence, 12 years.

15—Amendment of section 63AAB—Possession of child-like sex dolls

This amendment increases the maximum penalty of imprisonment applying for an offence against this section from 10 to 15 years.

16—Amendment of section 63B—Procuring child to commit indecent act etc

The amendments in subclauses (1) to (4) delete the current maximum penalties applying for a basic offence against subsections (1) and (3) (imprisonment for 10 years) and the current maximum penalties for an aggravated offence against those provisions (imprisonment for 12 years) with a higher maximum penalty of imprisonment for 12 years for a basic offence and imprisonment for 15 years for an aggravated offence.

The amendment in subclause (5) provides that for the purposes of the offence in subsection (3), it does not matter if the victim is a fictitious person represented to the defendant as a real person.

17—Amendment of section 68—Use of children in commercial sexual services

Subclause (1) increases the penalty for employing, engaging, causing or permitting a child to provide, or to continue to provide, commercial sexual services for a child over the age of 14 years from a maximum term of imprisonment of 9 years to 15 years.

Subclause (2) substitutes the existing lower penalties that apply in subsection (2) for the offence of asking a child to provide commercial sexual services with a single maximum penalty of imprisonment for 15 years.

Subclause (3) substitutes the existing lower penalties that apply in subsection (3) for the offences relating to receiving money or proceeds from children who provide commercial sexual services with a maximum penalty of imprisonment for 10 years if the child is under the age of 14 years and a maximum penalty of 4 years in any other case.

18—Amendment of section 139A—Dishonest communications with children

The offences in this section currently cover communications between a person of or over the age of 18 years and a child (defined as a person under the age of 17 years). The amendments proposed to the section substitutes the term *child* with the term *victim*, which is defined as—

- a person under the age of 17 years; or
- a person the offender believes is under the age of 17 years.

Part 4—Amendment of Sentencing Act 2017

19—Amendment of section 52—Interpretation

A serious sexual offence, for the purposes of Part 3 Division 4 of the Act (which deals with custodial sentences for serious repeat adult offenders and recidivist young offenders) is defined to include (among other offences) an offence under section 63B of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* where the victim was under the age of 14 years at the time of the offence. This clause makes an amendment to add to the definition in respect of an offence under section 63B(3) of that Act circumstances where the victim was a fictitious person represented to the defendant as a real person whom the defendant believed to be under the age of 14 years at the time of the offence.

20—Amendment of section 71—Home detention orders

This amendment provides for additional considerations for the court to take into account when considering the victim's age and the age difference between the defendant and the victim in circumstances where the victim of an offence committed under section 63B(3) of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* is a fictitious person represented to the defendant as a real person.

21—Amendment of section 96—Suspension of imprisonment on defendant entering into bond

This amendment provides for additional considerations for the court to take into account when considering the victim's age and the age difference between the defendant and the victim in circumstances where the victim of an offence committed under section 63B(3) of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* is a fictitious person represented to the defendant as a real person.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (12:39): I rise to support the passage of the bill, and I was about to say that I wholeheartedly endorse the contribution of the Deputy Premier in full—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, you are the lead speaker as well?

Mr TEAGUE: Yes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I just wanted to clarify that.

Mr TEAGUE: Yes, I am the lead speaker, and I was responsible for the bill in the period of the former government. It is regrettable that at the conclusion of those remarks—which rightly highlight the bipartisan, multipartisan, unanimous support of the progress of this legislation—we have remarks of that kind, particularly in circumstances where we saw the last bill jammed in ahead of this one on this very day. I will not dwell on such sentiments.

Indeed, this bill is important reform in this area. It reflects in substance the work that was done by the previous government, and it did enjoy support across the parliament in the last parliament. So much does it replicate the work undertaken by the previous government that I was able to follow along more or less word for word with the Deputy Premier's contribution just now. Again, I accord with those remarks.

The element that I will highlight, just for the benefit of those following the debate, is that the bill indeed specifically creates a remedy for those circumstances in which an offender finds themselves perceiving that they are communicating with a child, whereas in fact they are being monitored by the expert work of those undercover officers deploying methods with which to detect and discover this heinous behaviour. Those will be subject to the same liability for penalty, and I draw attention in particular to those amendments.

The offence provisions now in many respects consolidate what was previously a basic and an aggravated offence and in all respects increase maximum penalties associated with the relevant conduct. I have indicated that the contribution of the Deputy Premier draws in all respects from the

substance of that contribution presented to the parliament at the end of the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, and I advert also to the debate that took place in another place in May.

Finally, I want to take the chance to recognise and pay tribute in particular in this area to Sonya Ryan. Sonya is a constituent of mine, and I have happily had extensive engagement with Sonya Ryan over the years. She has achieved such an enormous amount in this most difficult area, bringing a positive and confident capacity for engagement online for children, recognising the sorts of terrible risks and terrible things that can happen when things go wrong online.

It happened so tragically to Sonya's daughter, Carly, when as a 15-year-old girl she was lured under false pretences to her death. In many cases, that sort of suffering I am sure would lead a mother to live a life of inconsolable grief. Sonya Ryan courageously and now consistently over the course of 15 or more years has dedicated herself to making sure that children and young people growing up in an online world are more confident, more able and more resilient to avoid what so tragically befell her dear daughter, Carly.

If this in another way is able by legislation to assist the work that Sonya does, then I thank Sonya in the same breath for the day-to-day practical work she does in the community. Long may legislation actively and practically assist work that is done by those involved in law enforcement and those involved in community work, including, in her leading way, Sonya Ryan. I commend the bill to the house.

Mrs PEARCE (King) (12:45): I rise to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Child Sex Offences) Bill. This is an important bill that follows through on the commitments we took to the last election. Simply, this bill will better protect children and empower the authorities to crack down on this abhorrent abuse. It seeks to increase the penalties for a range of child sex offences, amends section 139A of Carly's Law to ensure an offence to apply where there is unlawful communication with a fictitious child and it updates the list of registrable offences in the Child Sex Offender Registration Act.

This bill will mean tougher sentences for child sex offenders, and it will reduce the amount of leniency that can be provided to them, to keep our community safe. This bill is an amalgamation of many amendments that were put forward during the previous term of government but, unfortunately, did not pass. It also involves many new amendments to better protect our children.

We are serious about ensuring that there is justice for victims and survivors. We are serious about keeping our laws strong to ensure that people who exploit children are locked up so they cannot pose a threat to the community. We are sending a clear message to anyone even thinking about it that sexual exploitation of young people is unacceptable regardless of age. Our amendments to Carly's Law, a law that cracks down on offenders lying about their age to meet children, formed part of our commitment at the last election to strengthen it to further protect our community.

It will mean that charges can be laid against offenders when undercover police officers are posing as child victims, giving them greater confidence that they can intercept predators before they can harm vulnerable young people. For police, this will mean more options for charging unlawful communication with fictitious children, and the courts can then decide what age the offender believed the child to be, which will form sentencing provisions.

We are increasing the maximum penalty for gross indecency with or in the presence of a child, from five to 15 years; punishing those who seek to download, share or child abuse material; and removing age categories for image-based offending so that offenders can no longer get away with leniency when the age of the victim is unknown. Removing the age-based categories will also mean that we can decrease the amount of child exploitation material that justice system staff are exposed to, as the age of the child need not be determined to charge the basic or aggravated offence.

The bill also seeks to increase a list of registrable offences, incorporating recently passed offences by the commonwealth parliament as well as adding state child sex offences as registrable offences, such as offences involving childlike sex dolls, Carly's Law and causing serious harm to a child if it arises from the same incident as the sexual offence. While we are serious about ensuring that people who commit these abhorrent acts are punished for their actions, we also know that justice is about more than that.

Justice is also about ensuring that victims and survivors are at the centre of our response and provided the support they need. Whether that be when they are going through the courts to seek justice, we will provide them with information about their rights throughout that process. As well as providing support in their recovery as they process and recover from trauma, we want to help victims and survivors to ensure they are given true justice. That is why we have also committed \$2 million over four years to support services for victims.

These heinous acts have caused irreparable damage to victims and survivors in our community. I am proud to be standing alongside a government that is standing up to the challenge of taking it seriously and making sure that people who commit these abhorrent acts are put where they belong—away from the community.

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) (12:49): I also rise to speak in support of this really important bill and thank, firstly, the Attorney-General for his work to progress the bill in the other place and also the Deputy Premier for her work on this matter here. I particularly thank both of them for the sound amendments they have made to further strengthen this very important piece of legislation.

As has been said, this bill progresses two crucial commitments made by the government through our justice for victims policy. This policy made abundantly clear our commitment to tackle some of the most difficult issues our community confronts and, as part of that effort, to increase penalties on a range of child sex offences and to strengthen Carly's Law so that police can effectively pursue online predators with confidence.

Specifically in this bill, we are proposing to increase penalties on a number of child sex offences set out in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 and to amend section 139A of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, also known as Carly's Law, to ensure that the offence can apply where unlawful communication is made to a fictitious child. This bill is a combination of amendments that were put forward by the previous government but which did not pass—largely, it seems, due to a lack of urgency at that time in relation to them—and many additional amendments that are either new or make changes to the previous government's amendments.

The commitment we have to this law is situated amongst a suite of commitments to improve the safety of children and young people, to protect them from harm, including that caused by vile online predators, and to hold those perpetrators rightly to account. As I have said a number of times in this place now, our government intends to ensure that the most vulnerable children are at the centre of our decision-making and at the centre of our actions.

As minister, I am viscerally committed to keeping children in care, and indeed all children at risk, in my heart and in my mind as I undertake my responsibilities, responsibilities I am absolutely honoured to have. Every South Australian child should be safe, cared for, loved and nurtured, and it is everyone's responsibility to ensure that they are. As parliamentarians, we must do all that is within our power to progress this fundamental aim and to strengthen vulnerable families so that they have the best chance of succeeding safely together.

Outcomes for children in care and any child at risk must be improved. No matter their starting point, we want children to physically, mentally and emotionally thrive and, again, we want to align every effort to ensure that families have the support they need to safely stay together. We know that parental, other carer and general community concerns are rightly high regarding the vulnerability of all children and young people in an ever more complex and technology-driven world. As a parent, and as the Minister for Child Protection, I absolutely share these concerns and utterly condemn those who take advantage of children and young people.

We must continue to take whatever steps are necessary to keep children safe, including online. For children and young people in care, many of whom have already experienced significant trauma, we know this means regularly reviewing safety measures to provide protection from online predators. This is something I have had many conversations about with various department leaders and with the service providers that support children and young people in care.

I have also recently met with the national eSafety Commissioner and received a briefing, along with the Minister for Police, from SAPOL's Joint Anti Child Exploitation Task Force (JACET).

Can I take a moment to say that that group of police officers are extraordinary—absolutely extraordinary. Their utter commitment to holding perpetrators to account is extraordinary, and I thank them for their remarkable work.

We must deal strongly with perpetrators, as this bill does, and we must do all that we can to ensure the online environment is safe. This is complex work, but it is crucial work that must be undertaken. As all parents, caregivers and indeed most community members will attest, being online is now undeniably a central part of children's lives. It keeps kids connected, provides access to education and entertainment, and technology is increasingly integral to our children and young people's way of navigating their world.

Anybody who is a parent, a caregiver or an educator would have had multiple conversations with the children and young people in their lives about screen time, online safety, the need to get off of screens a bit more often, and more. Finding solutions and the right balance is a focus that many have. Recognising that no single strategy is 100 per cent effective at keeping young people safe online, we are working across a range of measures to protect those in care and to provide them with the skills to stay safe.

The tragic case of Carly Ryan, who was killed after being lured to a meeting by an adult who was posing as a young person, gives us no doubt in our minds that police should be able to proactively patrol the web to find these predators and stop them. There should never be any loophole for a person to claim they were just pretending. If people want to pretend, there are a million other ways to do it. You cannot ever stalk children online or lie about who you are, and that is why section 139A of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act amendments relating to fictitious children ensure that offenders can be charged with unlawful communications when an undercover SAPOL officer is posing as the child victim.

These amendments will see police have more charging options for unlawful communications with fictitious children, and sentencing courts can consider the age the offender believed the child to be when applying sentencing provisions. This legislation is further strengthened by amendments to home detention orders and suspension of imprisonment on a defendant entering into a bond respectively, which provide additional considerations for the court to take into account when considering the victim's age and the age difference between the defendant and the victim where the victim is a fictitious person pursuant to 63B of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

I also note that the increased penalties set out in the bill were informed by equivalent commonwealth and interstate offences and relevant to other offences within the act. As well as raising the penalties on child exploitation material offences, the bill makes changes to age distinction penalties, removing them only in relation to image-based offences, as the proposed maximum penalty is higher than the current aggravated penalty. It will be capable of covering offences in a wide range of circumstances.

This distinction removal is largely to decrease the exposure of justice system staff to child exploitation material as they will not need to determine the precise age of the child depicted in order to charge a basic or aggravated offence. It also sends a very strong message that any sexual exploitation of young people is utterly unacceptable regardless of age.

I also note that the added offences in this bill are mainly taken from the Commonwealth Criminal Code that were recently passed by the commonwealth parliament. Some additional state child sex offences are also added as registrable offences, as the member for King said, such as offences involving childlike sex dolls.

Our entire government and I are committed to working together and collaborating with all the stakeholders who have a role to play and to critically developing the solutions with the direct input of children and young people affected by them. Of course, these strategies must also be complemented by a legal framework that serves both to deter and to appropriately punish those who wish to harm children and young people.

Again, I commend the Attorney-General for these amendments, for adding another plank to our legislative approach and for his enduring commitment to keeping South Australian children and young people safe.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Regulation made under the following Act—
Bills of Sale—Fees Notice—Revocation

By the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water (Hon. S.E. Close)—

South Australian—Victoria Border Groundwaters Agreement Review Committee—Annual Report 2020-21

By the Minister for Child Protection (Hon. K.A. Hildyard)—

Children and Young People, Guardian for—Final Report of the South Australian Dual Involved Project: Children and young people in South Australia's child protection and youth justice systems—June 2022

By the Minister for Education, Training and Skills (Hon. B.I. Boyer)—

Education, Department for—Annual Report 2021

By the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services (Hon. J.K. Szakacs)—

Correctional Services, Department for—Report on actions taken following the Coronial Inquest into the death in custody of Anthony Lanzafame—April 2022

Ministerial Statement

EASTERN STATES DEPLOYMENT, EMERGENCY STORM RESPONSE

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (14:03): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: The people of New South Wales have been impacted in an unprecedented way by a widespread and intense rainfall throughout 2022. On multiple occasions, with some of the most heartbreaking of outcomes, New South Wales has been hit by extensive and disastrous flooding, affecting numerous communities.

Approximately 30,000 people across the north, south and west of Sydney, as well as the Hunter region, are subject to either evacuation orders or evacuation warnings. For many of these communities, this is the fourth flood they have experienced in less than 18 months. The impact on these communities is confronting and profound and I want every individual affected to know that they are in South Australia's thoughts.

Due to the overwhelming nature of this situation and the volume of assistance required for the state of New South Wales, the New South Wales SES has called upon other jurisdictions, including South Australia and the commonwealth, to assist. Today is day five of this event. We are seeing heavier rains than forecast and higher rivers than predicted. This is causing significant access and egress issues and infrastructure damage, including to bridges and roads.

Once again, the South Australian SES is stepping up to the task and today has deployed 26 volunteers and staff to New South Wales. This includes commanders, a deputy incident controller, storm crew, a swift-water team and administrative support officers. These deployed staff and

volunteers join emergency services members from Queensland, the ACT and Victoria, as well as the Australian Defence Force.

I acknowledge not just the commitment of the South Australian SES members who dedicate extensive time and effort to ensure that they are some of the most highly skilled and highly capable emergency services personnel in the nation. I also commend their bravery in responding every day across South Australia to emergencies, including marine and swift-water rescue, road crash rescue and ever-increasing extreme weather events, including floods, storms and heatwaves.

On behalf of the government of South Australia, I commit not just our words but our collective actions in support of fellow Australians who are currently in need.

Question Time

COVID-19 VACCINATION CLINICS

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:05): My question is to the Premier. Will the government reactivate vaccination hubs to ensure that South Australians have rapid, safe access to the fourth COVID-19 vaccination dose? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The fourth COVID vaccine is now available to people in response to the expected spike of COVID-19 cases.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:05): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for this important question. I believe that about two hours ago there was an announcement from the federal health minister to increase eligibility in relation to fourth dose vaccines for people under the age of 65, which we absolutely welcome. It is something that we were certainly encouraging would take place to deal with what we were seeing in terms of an increasing rate of COVID in South Australia, particularly in relation to the new variants of BA.4 and BA.5.

We are also in a situation where many people have had their third dose over six months ago now, so clearly there is an issue of waning immunity that is taking place. I am very pleased that a significant number of South Australians who are eligible for the fourth dose have come forward. The statistics that were presented to health ministers around the country on Friday when we met in Canberra actually showed that South Australia was the second highest state or territory in the country for people over the age of 65 coming forward for their fourth dose, which is certainly fantastic and great to see.

Now we see an eligibility increase, which has just been announced a few hours ago and which is now recommended for people over the age of 50 to get access to their fourth dose, and it will also be available for people over the age of 30. It will be people such as me, or the Premier, or the Leader of the Opposition who will be in that category and hopefully will come forward and say, 'We will be interested in getting our vaccine,' and certainly I will be keen to do that.

There will be other people, like the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, who will be in that category and who will be absolutely recommended to get that vaccine. I am sure that he will do that at his first availability. We need to make sure that we are doing everything between now and Monday, when this becomes available, to make sure that we are geared up to have that availability.

We have obviously been in a stage where the number of people coming forward to our vaccination hubs have been quite minimal, and we have been in a position where it didn't make sense to continue to have a whole lot of health staff who could have otherwise been deployed in our health system—which is obviously under significant pressure at the moment—not there providing services because the number of people was so low.

We are now doing a very rapid piece of work to make sure that we have the capability, but I do stress that there is a huge amount of capability outside the Health SA networks, which wasn't the case in the early phases of the vaccination programs. There are over 600 different avenues, through GPs and pharmacies, where people can get access to vaccination at the moment. We know that

there is a plentiful supply of the vaccine, and obviously we need to work with our GPs, pharmacies and health clinics through SA Health to make sure that they are available.

Even despite the changes that we made recently in terms of our vaccination rollout program, we still made it clear that there was going to be availability of SA Health clinics into the future as well. For instance, with respect to the Noarlunga mass vaccination site a deal was able to be struck in terms of a lease of that site, so that was remaining within the network in any case. There is a central clinic that's available on King William Street in North Adelaide. There is also going to be a clinic in the northern suburbs. There are also mobile clinics that visit across suburbs and regions, and there is also a network of regional clinics that will remain open as well.

But now, with this increased demand that we are going to be seeing, we need to make sure that there will be the availability, so we need to make sure we are doing that rapid work over the next couple of days to ensure that the vaccine is as available as possible because we want as many people as possible who are eligible to come forward to protect themselves, to protect their community and ultimately make sure that we can reduce as much as possible the incidence of COVID-19 in South Australia.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Ms PRATT (Frome) (14:10): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. What is the minister doing to assist people who are struggling to secure or retain rental housing? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms PRATT: CoreLogic reported on Tuesday that Adelaide has slipped down the rental affordability rankings, with a typical property rent increasing by 4.9 per cent for the quarter to \$492 per week. Further, it was reported yesterday that more than 1,100 homes in South Australia have been removed from the National Rental Affordability Scheme.

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (14:10): It's almost like a government question again really, isn't it? I am really happy to address a few things in this area. The South Australian Housing Authority provides rental assistance to access some rent in advance as well as bond for people who need it when trying to access private rental properties, as well as people in Housing SA actually providing real support for people who need assistance to access private rental tenancies.

In relation to the national figures that came out, the number of private houses in South Australia that are empty is around 84,000—I think was the figure—representing around about 10 per cent of properties in South Australia that are empty. The government's responsibility in terms of maintaining public housing is to turn over public housing for rental as quickly as it possibly can. At any given time, we know there are a small number of public houses that will need to be vacant in order to have maintenance done in between tenancies. Currently, there are 400 fewer of those empty properties than there were earlier this year.

The performance in terms of turning over properties has actually improved quite significantly. That's really pleasing because, given the current crisis with people who are struggling to access and maintain properties in terms of accommodation, I think that is what we need to see. This performance has improved significantly. We will continue to monitor that, indeed, providing support for people with private rental property.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Ms PRATT (Frome) (14:13): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. Will the minister commit to retaining the affordable homes program? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms PRATT: The affordable homes program provides vital assistance to South Australians to have the opportunity to own their own home, with exclusive access to properties at a fixed price. However, neither of Labor's election documents, 'first homes for the future,' or its public housing plan make any mention of the affordable homes program.

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (14:13): Thanks for giving me another opportunity to speak regarding the work that we are doing. Just to provide you with some further information, I think I forgot to answer the part where you talked about NRAS.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. N.F. COOK: The National Rental Affordability Scheme (NRAS)—I forgot to say that that was an excellent scheme under federal Labor that provides supplemented rental for people in private properties purchased and built and done under arrangement. Up until 2014, that was growing and in place. This provides—

The SPEAKER: Minister, there is a point of order, which—

The Hon. N.F. COOK: I know it is hard to hear the—

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, please be seated. I will hear the point of order under 134, member for Morialta.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Standing order 98: I thank you for your further advice this morning. You made it very clear about the importance of the substance of the question. The minister's response now, I think, is debate and it is also debate in relation to the previous question. There is a very specific question here about the affordable homes scheme, and we seek your support in having the minister answer that question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Morialta. Order, member for Florey! My statement this morning was not intended to enlarge or alter the test in relation to standing order 98, but rather to provide a comprehensive statement that might assist members. I will listen carefully.

The Hon. N.F. COOK: This is about affordable housing. I was asked about affordable housing, and this is particularly about affordable housing. The NRAS scheme was halted by I think it was the Abbott government at that time, in 2014. In spite of issues being raised over the past four years in respect to NRAS—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. N.F. COOK: —we saw no action at all. There was no commitment to restart that scheme. There are thousands of NRAS properties disappearing out of the market because of just Liberal policy basically.

Mrs Hurn: What are you doing?

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

The Hon. N.F. COOK: The NRAS program provides affordable rental so that people are paying 75 per cent of market rent and the other portion is paid in so that these become essentially affordable rental properties. That is one part of rental affordability that started to end when they cut it in 2014, but now we will see it end by 2025. I think it's about 3,000 properties to disappear out of that scheme, with probably most of those people selling them, which is pretty unfortunate.

In terms of the state government plan currently, we have taken to the election a very clear commitment to build public housing, so we are building 400 public homes. That will happen across a range of locations in South Australia, with 150 of them committed to the regions. A few weeks ago, we announced that the tender would be released for the first 10 of those in Mount Gambier, specifically targeting local builders in Mount Gambier to help with jobs as well as provision of housing. There will be more to add later this year and beyond in terms of those.

Mr Cowdrey: What about the affordable homes program?

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Colton!

The Hon. N.F. COOK: There are also 350 properties owned currently by the Housing Authority—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Taylor! Member for Schubert!

The Hon. N.F. COOK: —that will be upgraded, with investment of between \$50,000 and \$100,000, to bring those back online, with many of those empty for the whole time of the previous government. There is also a stimulation maintenance program of 3,000 homes, which will have up to around \$10,000 spent on each of those. That will help to make those homes much more livable and prolong the life of them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. N.F. COOK: There is a piece of work going on at the moment as to how we improve the access and the amenity of public housing. In relation to the previous government's 1,000 affordable homes, which is due to end in 2025, over the past two years less than 60 have been sold. So, unless my math is completely out, that is a very slow output, very low yield result for public housing and other housing tenants.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the next question, I recognise the presence in the gallery of Peter Treloar—a very warm welcome—a former Deputy Speaker and a former member for Flinders. I also recognise the presence in the gallery of Mr Andrew Collett AM, a guest of the member for Heysen.

Question Time

BUSINESS CONFIDENCE

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (14:19): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer update the house about business confidence in South Australia and how it compares to levels recorded over previous months?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (14:19): I thank the member for Light for his important question because, as we know, business confidence is a good indicator of sentiment within the community and is important for gauging economic trends, particularly in these turbulent times. Mr Speaker, you would recall that shortly after the election there was a release about business confidence from NAB showing a remarkable turnaround in business confidence levels since the March 2022 election.

Mr Whetstone: Overnight.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Although we have become accustomed to being a little sceptical of the interjections from the member for Chaffey, he is right: it did happen overnight, and I can tell you the night that it changed—it was 19 March.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Don't we love his interjections in this place. There has been a remarkable turnaround in business confidence since the state election, an extraordinary increase to levels that are the highest in the nation. That is the information that I released. I was somewhat bemused last sitting week when the member for Colton took umbrage with these figures and made a contribution to this place saying that somehow we were fudging the numbers, that we were using trend terms rather than seasonally adjustable monthly terms and that we were artificially inflating these business confidence figures

I thought, 'Well, that's an interesting contribution.' Some members had approached me about it and said, 'Treasurer, could that possibly be true?' It was such a compelling contribution from the member for Colton for those who saw it. Some people referred to it as Churchillian, such was the gravity of the contribution made by the member for Colton, so I thought I would go back and have a look at the figures and I would update them for the house. So let's have a look at how the non-trend indicators of business confidence look on the same measure.

In October 2021, business confidence was at an indicator level of positive 14, so not too bad. But you will remember, sir, that shortly after that the member for Dunstan stood up at a press conference and said, 'Don't worry. We've got this. It's all going to go well throwing open the borders.' That's when it all went awry.

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: In November—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —it fell by 10 points to only four, and in December—

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —it fell to negative 11. That's the level of confidence that the South Australian business community had—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —in the leadership of the former Liberal government. That was the level of business confidence and, as the member for Chaffey quickly drew our attention to, it did quickly turn around: it turned around virtually overnight. Well, in fact, not overnight—it was over the course of a Saturday that it turned around. That's when it turned around and got into roundly positive territory.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: They were very helpful interjections this time around from the member for Chaffey. So business confidence was looking good, but it didn't stop there.

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: We have also had Roy Morgan Research, which tracks government confidence—

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —as part of their regular national political polling, and it has shown—

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —a marked increase in government confidence in South Australia since the Malinauskas Labor government came to power. As of June, the latest public release by Roy Morgan, their confidence index, it is at the highest level in the nation—120.5 points, well above the national average of 105. So I hope the member for Colton can take some confidence in those figures, just like the business community does.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Ms PRATT (Frome) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. Is the minister aware of the case of Natasha, reported in the media today? What measures has the minister taken to assist her family? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms PRATT: It was reported in the ABC today that Natasha, a single mother with eight children, is 'worried that we're going to end up on the street and have nowhere to go'. Natasha has applied for 46 rentals in the past four months but was rejected for each one.

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (14:23): It's a sad fact that for every one Natasha there are many more people who are seriously in trouble in relation to housing rental affordability. The simple fact, as well, is that there are nowhere near enough houses that are of the size that is required for larger families.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N.F. COOK: It's really boring, isn't it?

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Schubert is called to order and the member for Frome is called to order. The minister has the call.

The Hon. N.F. COOK: Every day when issues like Natasha's are raised, including Natasha's, we discuss them within our team and we check to see if people have reached out for assistance and, if any of them have reached out for assistance at all through the Housing Authority or through any of the processes, our staff will then reach out and make sure that everything possible is being done. I have just signed 20—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley!

The Hon. N.F. COOK: —letters getting really good results for people in terms of housing transfers, getting made category 1 when they weren't, getting given really great attention by our office every day, so they will reach out to Natasha if they have her contact information, and they will make sure that she is getting all the support she can.

The only way we are going to help to remedy problems such as this, including Natasha's, is by increasing the supply of affordable housing into the market. We are working very hard to make sure that the policies that are in place now are suitable, that we are able to grow and improve the offering for people who need public, social, and private rentals. Depending on where they live, the demand for housing in some areas is enormous.

It is a sad fact that as there were many celebrating the increase in population, there was nothing being done to actually address what was going to happen with the ending of NRAS, the reduction in people's affordability to be able to access rentals and the hundreds and hundreds of homes that sat empty on the public housing list. All of these things have improved, and they will improve further by the injection of \$177½ million into the public housing budget over the next four years to build hundreds and hundreds of homes.

This is the first time that new money has gone into public housing for many years. The last government brought \$600 million or thereabouts forward from the forward estimates to sit in the

account and not do anything. We have only seen 60 of the affordable houses go out for sale from the government in four years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

The Hon. N.F. COOK: What we need to do is grow—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hartley!

The Hon. N.F. COOK: —and build on the affordable homes program as it was started by Labor in 2007. We are seeing some good parts of that retained.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. N.F. COOK: We are building public housing, and every day we are getting—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley! Member for Morialta!

The Hon. N.F. COOK: —results. You are very agitated.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta knows better and is warned. The member for Chaffey is warned. The minister has the call.

The Hon. N.F. COOK: The previous Treasurer, Lob—sorry, that was a Freudian slip—Rob Lucas sold the most public houses out of anyone we know.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta, order! The Treasurer, order!

KEOLIS DOWNER

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (14:28): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister advise whether he has received advice from any agency about break costs associated with the public transport contract with Keolis Downer, and, if so, will the minister release this advice?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:28): Given the former government wrote the contract, and the member was a cabinet minister, I am sure that they have seen the contracts. I am sure that they are also well aware that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —all these contractual obligations are commercial-in-confidence, but if the shadow minister is asking me to release the contract—

Mr Tarzia: No, I didn't ask that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As I have said, the department is now tasked with going through the contract, and Crown law will be looking at the contract. If there are any unusual break clauses put in there by public officers that are not natural or normal to other public sector contracts, those public officers, whoever they are and wherever they sit—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It's true, that's just the way—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hartley!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —integrity works. If there have been any extraordinary clauses put into these contracts, I can assure the house I will be making those people famous.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: They might already be famous, true. They might already be household names; I don't know, but we will find out.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

COST OF LIVING CONCESSION

Mr BROWN (Florey) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. Can the minister inform the house of any recent government initiatives to assist South Australian renters facing cost-of-living pressures?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (14:29): It really gives me great pleasure to talk about this, and I thank the member for Florey for the question. I have previously spoken in this place about the Malinauskas Labor government doubling the Cost of Living Concession. That is to happen over this financial year and provides an extra \$39.3 million to around 200,000 households.

We were set to deliver this policy under the existing arrangements, where owner-occupiers would get paid in August and tenants would get paid next March. However, on the day before the budget I received an email sent by Lyndal, a renter from the western suburbs.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned.

The Hon. N.F. COOK: Lyndal wrote:

Why do tenants have to wait nearly a year to get it, while homeowners get it this year in August? Our cost of living is high and probably will not change in the next 10 months. This seems very unfair to me as a tenant.

Last night, my office was thrilled to call Lyndal and let her know that she would not have to wait, neither would the tens of thousands of renters who also qualify for the Cost of Living Concession. Lyndal was generous enough to join the Premier and I, along with SACOSS, at Parliament House this morning to announce the change.

We are overdelivering on this election commitment with the help of constituents like Lyndal. Not only will people in need get double the amount of money but tens of thousands will now get their money earlier. By paying all the concessions together in August, more than \$78 million will go directly into the pockets of those who need it most. We are also giving people plenty of time to access this critical support.

Anyone who submits an eligible application by 31 December this year who is not already receiving the Cost of Living Concession will be paid their double concession. Our range of government concessions helps hundreds of thousands of South Australians every year and total more than \$213 million. Concessions include free public transport for seniors, another election commitment that started on 1 July. Yes, renters are doing it really tough, and our government, the Malinauskas Labor government, is helping.

South Australia has about 47,000 social housing properties, where tenants pay about \$200 million less cumulatively than market rent. We may have had many more of these homes if 12,000 public homes didn't vanish under the Liberals in just eight years, from 1994 to 2002. We also help more than 10,000 private renters every year, saving them thousands in up-front costs. As has been said before, we assist with the bond and the rent in advance. We have committed \$177 million dollars in new money to the trust to build those new homes and repair others.

The Minister for Consumer and Business Services is leading a review of the Residential Tenancies Act. I have ordered a review of the Supported Residential Facilities Act with the aim of improving residential arrangements for people with disability. Yesterday, I received the first draft of a report I ordered on modular homes that can be delivered faster and at lower cost than traditional builds. I have also ordered a review of the emergency accommodation program, which currently costs \$11 million to keep people in unsuitable motels compared with \$4 million a year when the Liberals took government. We will improve life for people renting.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT INQUIRY

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (14:33): My question is again to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister advise on what date it was decided to cancel the commission of inquiry into public transport?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:34): That was a decision of the cabinet, and cabinet decisions, under the great tradition set by the Marshall government, are cabinet-in-confidence.

KEOLIS DOWNER

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (14:34): My question is to the same minister. Has the minister been advised by Keolis Downer that they will not be seeking compensation for the termination of their contract?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:34): I have made it very, very clear from the very beginning. In fact, we made it clear when the former government broke their promise about not having a privatisation agenda. When the previous government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —went out to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —announce—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections across the chamber are unwelcome. The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: When the previous government announced—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —that they were privatising our trains and trams without having a mandate from the public, the Leader of the Opposition—in fact, they had a mandate to do the opposite—then wrote to all the participants in the tender process advising them that in South

Australia there are fixed terms, and there are fixed-term elections, and 'participate in this tender at your risk' because if Labor is elected we will be undoing this contract.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: All the participants were fairly warned; they were told. This is not like the previous government—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is on three warnings. The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We made it very clear to all participants that we would be bringing this contract back in. When we were elected, one of the first meetings the Premier and I had was with Keolis Downer, and Keolis Downer accepted the mandate of the South Australian public that these contracts would be returned to public hands, and they will. If the opposition still think that's a bad idea, they should say so.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It's important to remember that when you make an election commitment to keep your word, and keeping your word means something to some people. It means a lot to the Premier, it means a lot to the people of South Australia, and our job as ministers and a government is to make sure that our election commitments are fulfilled. The commission of inquiry, as an election commitment, is not the sole commitment. The commitment is to return our trains and trams into public hands; that is the aim.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

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

Mr Patterson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morphett!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Keolis Downer—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley can depart under 137A for the remainder of question time, and I observe that the member for Florey is now two warnings.

The honourable member for Hartley having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He wants to be so much like me, sir; I am very proud. The commitment that we have made is to bring our trains and trams back into public hands and to do an assessment about whether it's feasible to bring our buses back into public hands. That is the commitment that we will be keeping. We will be doing that assessment, we will be bringing our trains and trams back into public hands, and the reason we want to do that is that public transport is an essential service. Every time a South Australian catches a bus, train or a tram, we all save.

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Flinders!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The former government embarked on a series of intersection upgrades. Portrush Road, for example, is a good example.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order, minister, which I will hear under 134.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Sir, standing order 98: the minister is now debating. Also, he is straying from the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Morialta. There is some force in what the member says. I will listen closely to the minister. The minister is late in the answer, and I am particularly alive to the standing order at this point in the answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir, but the point I was trying to make to the house is about the massive amount of money we have to spend on infrastructure, because public transport options are being governed by private profits rather than public interest. So our view is, if you have the public transport system operating in the public interest rather than in the interests of shareholders who are offshore, we can get better outcomes. The Treasurer can save those precious dollars that we dole out over and over again to build infrastructure to meet peak demand when still encouraging public transport use.

We have seen a dramatic increase in public transport use over the last month or so. We want that to increase, but we are still 25 per cent below where we were before the COVID pandemic, so there is more scope for us to grow, and bringing our trains and trams back into public hands will help.

ROAD UPGRADES

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Local Government, Regional Roads and Veterans Affairs. Will the government upgrade the Murray Bridge to Mannum road? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PEDERICK: The new Thomas Foods International facility at Murray Bridge is due to open later this year, which will result in a dramatic increase in road freight to the facility.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart—Minister for Local Government, Minister for Regional Roads, Minister for Veterans Affairs) (14:39): Thank you to the member for Hammond. Certainly I understand the issue. I have great faith in the Minister for Infrastructure. I will get an answer for the member for Hammond and come back to him as soon as I can. Can I also reinforce the importance and the degree of appreciation I have for Thomas Foods International and the work they do. I will get a definite answer and a time frame for the member for Hammond on what is happening in the area.

ABERFOYLE PARK HIGH SCHOOL

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. Can the minister update the house on the recent capital works upgrades at Aberfoyle Park High School?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:40): I thank the member for Davenport for this important question. It was fantastic to be joined this morning by the member for Davenport at Aberfoyle Park High School, which is one of our fantastic high schools in the south. It has about 1,150 students and is doing some really impressive things. It was a pleasure today to join with the member and get a tour of the recently completed \$14 million upgrade for that school.

Aberfoyle Park High School, like quite a lot of our public education stock, was built in the 1980s. I think it's probably fair to say that there isn't a great deal from that period of architecture that has found its way onto any heritage register in this state. For that reason, there's a lot of work that we need to do to refresh and update some of our schools and the general learning areas at places like Aberfoyle Park High School, which were built almost 40 years ago.

That is what is being done, and it was fantastic to have a look today at what has been completed at the school. The member and I were fortunate enough to have a tour with the principal of Aberfoyle Park High School, Marion Coady, who will be known to many people in this chamber because she has given many years of service to public education in this state. I know the shadow minister would agree with me that there aren't many fiercer advocates for their school or school communities than Marion Coady. I think that's probably putting it politely.

To be honest, she is the kind of principal every school deserves. She fought very strongly for this upgrade to make sure that what is delivered as part of the \$14 million envelope is what the community wants now and what the community needs now and also what that community needs

going forward into the future. I must say that it wasn't all smooth sailing; the project did hit a few snags along the way.

I was fortunate enough last year, when I was the shadow minister, to have a tour of the work that was underway. Marion informed me that the bedrock had been hit very close to the surface. There were going to be additional earthworks and footings needed to complete the build. These are the kinds of complications that often happen and result in more funding being needed to finish the project. Sometimes that can jeopardise what is actually completed in the end.

Fortunately, some fantastic work has been done here by the builders, by the architects, by the agency and also, thanks to Marion's fantastic leadership, to make sure that what the school first envisaged back in 2017, when the now Deputy Premier, then Minister for Education, announced a \$10 million grant to the school, is actually what is delivered and what will be available for future generations of Aberfoyle Park High School students.

The highlight no doubt today was the opportunity to see the years 10 and 11 band play a performance of the Beach Boys' classic *Kokomo*. *Kokomo* is my second-favourite karaoke song behind—

The Hon. N.F. Cook: Did you get there fast? Did you take it slow?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I got there fast and took it slow, as the member for Hurtle Vale tells me. My first favourite song, though, is *Raspberry Beret* by Prince, which I'm sure many people will agree is a fantastic karaoke song. It was very special to see these young people perform such an incredible piece of music under the tutelage of their music teacher, Steve Kammerman.

The school is quite a large school, with 1,150 students, and they have a music program with 180 students. It is an incredible program. The quality of the performances produced there is quite breathtaking. As part of this \$14 million build, there is a brand-new 250-seat theatre, where the students were performing today and where they will put on performances for their student colleagues and for the broader community into the future. It is a fantastic result. I thank the member for Davenport for all her work. I look forward to getting back there and seeing a lot of performances in the future from these talented students.

ROADS OF STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Local Government, Regional Roads and Veterans Affairs. When will the Eyre Peninsula road network under the Roads of Strategic Importance program be fully completed? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PEDERICK: An amount of \$32 million combined state and federal funding has been allocated to Eyre Peninsula to compensate for rail closure. So far we have seen shoulder sealing, overtaking lanes, widening, an intersection upgrade and guardrails, but since the election there has been little transparency as to what this money has been spent on.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond, you are warned.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: You are warned for a second time, and a further interjection will see you leave the chamber. The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:45): The ROSI program, the Roads of Strategic Importance, is a joint initiative of the Australian and South Australian governments. It is an 80:20 program.

It is always very enjoyable when the commonwealth government are able to partner with the South Australian government to make sure that we can extract as much as we possibly can to improve freight movements, support regional economic growth and connectivity to improve safety for all road users.

The proposed rural corridor upgrades within this program include several projects. There is the \$87.5 million upgrade of the Sturt Highway between Renmark and Gawler. There is the \$62.5 million upgrade of the Barrier Highway between Cockburn and Burra. There is the \$93.75 million Eyre Highway upgrade between Port Augusta and Border Village, and of course the \$51.25 million for the Eyre Peninsula road upgrades for sections of the Tod, Birdseye and Lincoln highways and Western Approach Road. Now—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In terms of the Eyre Peninsula roads that the member raised, the program focuses on sections of the Tod, Birdseye, Flinders and Lincoln highways and Western Approach Road. Works commenced in April 2020 with all works anticipated to be completed by late 2023 under the time frame, I understand, set by the previous government.

With respect to pavement rehabilitation works, I understand that the Port Lincoln intersection design and shoulder sealing are completed. There are junction upgrades on the Lincoln Highway, the Flinders Highway and the Tod Highway, as well as overtaking lanes between the Flinders and Tod highways. I understand also that the Western Approach Road on the Lincoln Highway will have some new design work done on them as well.

We are committed to the ROSI program. It is a good program. I am not sure why the member thinks some of these programs are on hold. We are working to the same time frame—

Mr Pederick: I'm just asking what you're doing with them.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sorry, I thought you said in your question that these programs with on hold.

Mr Pederick: I don't know why your relevant minister isn't answering it, but anyway.

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond, you can leave the chamber under 137A for the remainder of question time.

The honourable member for Hammond having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The ROSI program is something that I think was a good initiative of the previous government. It was an initiative that was able to extract a larger proportion of funding from the commonwealth government giving a smaller proportion from the state government as an 80:20 program.

These regional communities need these upgrades, and they need these upgrades desperately. They are important pieces of infrastructure, and this government is committed to making sure that we can complete these programs. I want to thank the regional communities that want to work with us collaboratively to make sure that we deliver these projects.

There is no issue here in pointscoreing. The issue here is: can we complete the roads? Can we get more funding from the commonwealth government? That is the important part. I have to say that I would have thought these programs would be above politics given that most of these programs are in electorates that aren't held by the Australian Labor Party. However, we are committed to delivering them.

I think they are good programs. We did not criticise them in opposition. In fact, we applauded them. We have not criticised them now. We have not sought to undo them. These are programs that we think have value. I hope that the opposition, if they are interested in finding out the progress of these, would perhaps seek a briefing from the government. As far as I know, I have not received any request for a briefing from members about the program.

Mr Telfer: We did.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You sent me a letter?

Mr TELFER: Yes.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will go check. You sent me a letter about the ROSI program?

Mr Telfer: Yes.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Okay, I will go back to it. I am sure my staff, as we speak, are listening and are checking our systems, and I am sure you're in better company than the member you're sitting next to.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

PW2PA ALLIANCE

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:49): Supplementary question: has the minister got full confidence in the capacity of the PW2PA Alliance to deliver these projects in a cost-effective and efficient manner?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:49): I rely on advice from the Department for Infrastructure and Transport, and they are the experts in road building. What I will not do is substitute my own opinion on any supplier; in fact, it would be entirely inappropriate for me to do so, to be involved in tender processes or the allocation of contracts. That would be corruption or maladministration or misconduct.

The idea is: do I have confidence in Jon Whelan? I absolutely do. Do I have confidence in Wayne Buckerfield? I absolutely do. Do I have confidence in all my executive directors, even the ones who used to work for the Liberal government and were appointed without a competitive process to be an executive director, whether it was the Department for Infrastructure and Transport? I have complete confidence in them, too, because the public sector is above politics, and they serve and work for us well.

In terms of who has confidence in these alliances, that is the job of our chief executive. It is their job to have confidence, and if they lose confidence in any alliance or any tenderer or anyone doing any scope of work, then they report that to the elected government and they give us a course of action to follow. But the idea that I would substitute my judgement for theirs—we decide priorities, they do delivery. That is the difference. I've got to say that these types of questions concern me because the truth is this: politicians should not be—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —deciding who wins contracts and who gets the alliance contracts, and if that was the practice of the previous government, I would like to know because that would be deeply inappropriate. You have to have confidence in the people you appoint to do this work. That is why the Public Sector Act gives the Premier the ability to appoint chief executives of the department and no further—because we want the Public Service to be independent.

What we don't want is people, through maybe an unsolicited bid process, getting large-scale government contracts, who have deep personal relationships with ministers. That would be deeply inappropriate—deeply inappropriate. There have been a number of contracts let over the last four years where that accusation could be made.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Standing order 98: the question was reasonably specific. The minister is debating and straying from the substance.

The SPEAKER: There is some merit in the matter that has been raised with me. I will listen carefully, but I do ask that the minister return to the substance of the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: From memory, I have received no concerns about the alliance, but I will check with Mr Whelan at the conclusion of question time to see if there are any concerns with the alliance. If the member has an accusation to make or has information, here's the forum. If you have an accusation, make it. Make the accusation, and I will go away and I will check the validity of that accusation to see if it's accurate. That would be the fair thing to do.

BUCKLAND PARK INTERSECTION

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:53): I have a question for the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Will the minister commit to bringing forward the construction of a grade separation at the Buckland Park intersection? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain just a little bit further.

Leave granted.

Mr ELLIS: In 2010, when the Riverlea development was approved, the requirement was that at the point at which they reach the sale of 3,400 allotments a developer might then be compelled to upgrade that intersection to provide for an overpass rather than signals, which provides tremendous inconvenience to the people in my electorate.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:53): Yes, it does provide a lot of inconvenience for the member's electorate; I accept that. Why the former government approved that, I suppose is a question they may need to consider.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer is called to order. The exchange between the Treasurer and the member for Chaffey will cease. The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am just waiting for an interjection. There is none coming? That's a shame. I understand your concerns. Given the work we have done to create this nonstop corridor and the work that the former government started by duplicating the Augusta Highway as well—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —it does look ridiculous to have a set of traffic lights on that section of road. I think the member raises a very good point.

Currently, there is an interim signalised at-grade intersection at the Port Wakefield and Angle Vale Road intersection, which was funded by the developer and which I am advised was approved by former Minister Knoll. I am advised that an upgrade signalised at-grade intersection is the next step in this development, which is required to be funded again by the developer, and I understand that that is anticipated to occur within the next five years.

The question that the member is asking on behalf of his community is will there be a grade separation and nonstop work done there. That is a very expensive solution and that is something that we are looking at. We will be closely monitoring traffic volumes. I don't think it's probably an ideal outcome, but it is very difficult to try and fix all the problems left to us.

I do think that the member's advocacy will have some weight in this and I encourage him to keep up that advocacy, through local federal members of parliament as well, because this is an issue that is important for our freight industry and the local community. That section of road, both

governments—Labor and Liberal—have long-term committed to try to duplicate and make nonstop: the Northern Connector, the north-south, the South Road Superway, the Port River Expressway. All the work we have done through the Northern Expressway is all about non-stop freight to our ports and into Adelaide, and that is very important.

This does look like an anomaly and so it is definitely on our radar and something that we are looking at, but I can't give the member the commitment he wants here and now because the government does have a lot of priorities, especially health, education and job creation. It is important that we prioritise this appropriately, but I can reassure the member and his constituents that we are looking at it. Perhaps he could ask the previous government why they thought a set of traffic lights on a non-stop corridor was a good idea.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. How is the government recognising the outstanding achievements of children and young people, carers, volunteers, staff and organisations from across the child protection sector?

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) (14:57): I very much thank the member for her question and for her deep interest in this issue. As minister, as I have stated to this house on a number of occasions, I am deeply committed to keeping children and young people in care in my mind and in my heart as I undertake my responsibilities, responsibilities that I am absolutely honoured to have.

Every South Australian child deserves to be safe, nurtured, cared for and loved and empowered to physically, mentally and emotionally thrive. Ensuring this is so is not something one person or, indeed, one department or organisation can do on its own. It is everyone's responsibility to ensure that children are safe, feel nurtured and are free from abuse or neglect. It is everyone's responsibility to grapple with the complex and often interconnected issues that families confront: poverty, domestic violence, mental ill-health, substance misuse and intergenerational trauma and what these mean for children's lives and now need to support and strengthen families.

There are a number of wonderful people across our community who take on those responsibilities in remarkable ways. That is why it is so incredibly important that we take this opportunity, in the lead-up to National Child Protection Week in September, to recognise the extraordinary and generous efforts of those who work tirelessly in the community to protect, nurture or support children, and children and young people themselves.

I am delighted that nominations are now open for the 2022 SA Child Protection Awards. These awards focus on celebrating the outstanding achievements of carers, volunteers, staff and organisations encasing child protection, strengthening families and community wellbeing. They focus on recognising the extraordinary children and young people who with courage, often in the face of adversity, take remarkable steps forward toward their own achievements and in sharing their voice and experience.

If you know one of these young people or someone who works tirelessly in the community to protect, nurture and/or support children, I encourage everyone in this house to please consider nominating them in recognition of that generous effort and focus on improving outcomes for children so that they can live their best possible lives.

The award categories include Outstanding achievement of a child or young person who has had a care experience; the Voice of children and young people in care award; the Active Efforts Award; the Positive Impact Award; and Outstanding Service Awards in the following categories: Non-government organisations, Across Government, Department for Child Protection, and regional organisations. Award categories also include South Australian Foster Carer of the Year, South Australian Kinship Carer of the Year, and Volunteer of the Year.

The event last year attracted more than 200 nominations from individuals, teams and organisations. I hope this year's awards will attract even more interest. Again, I urge everyone in this place to consider nominating someone in your community in one or more of these categories. Nominations, as I said, are open now and close on 1 August.

I acknowledge that these awards are delivered as a partnership between the Department for Child Protection and the National Association for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect. I thank all involved for their commitment and efforts in promoting the incredible work of South Australians who play their part in creating the safe and supportive environments that every child and young person needs.

MEADOWS INTERSECTION

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Will the minister release the traffic modelling in relation to the Meadows intersection redevelopment? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TEAGUE: The intersection upgrade at Mawson/Battunga/Nottage roads at Meadows has been a long-awaited project. I note that Mawson and Battunga roads are arterial roads under the care and control of the Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

Council has advised me that it has approached DIT now on a number of occasions and requested that traffic modelling analysis be re-evaluated with current survey data to determine if the projected growth forecasts may still be accommodated by the proposed upgrade, the community view being that a roundabout is warranted at that location. To date, DIT has indicated that a roundabout is not required at the intersection.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:02): I don't have that detail at hand. I am happy to take that on notice and have a look, but it must be something that the four years the former government had in office wasn't enough to fix. I will go back and check to see why the department say a roundabout at that intersection is not justified. If it's appropriate to release the modelling, I will. There might be some contractual obligations about why we don't. I have not heard that we wouldn't release traffic modelling, so I will go back and check that for the member.

If the question from the council is that they are somehow unsatisfied with the methodology behind the traffic modelling, which I assume is where they are coming from, perhaps there are some assumptions the modelling had made that may have made the roundabout unfeasible. I will check that out—I more than happy to.

It is fair to say that there are sections of our road network that have been long overlooked. There are a number that need looking at, whether they be in the northern suburbs, whether they be in the Adelaide Hills, whether they be in suburban Adelaide, whether they be in the outer south or in regional South Australia. We have one of the largest road networks in the world. It is a very large and difficult job, and a very expensive one, and we have a relatively small population base and small tax base on which to maintain these roads.

We are reliant on the commonwealth government and our partners in councils to try to maintain and fix these roads. I know that often many councils attempt to try to push that responsibility onto the state, the state tries to push that responsibility onto the commonwealth government and the commonwealth government just say no to everyone. But, if we can work collaboratively with the council to come to a solution, I am up for the debate and up for the discussion. I will go away and check that for the member. Hopefully, before we return after the winter recess, between sittings I can give the member either a written or verbal response to his question.

MEADOWS INTERSECTION

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:04): In light of that answer, will the minister indicate whether the traffic modelling for the Meadows intersection redevelopment takes into account significant increases in traffic that occur at that location on major holidays and school holiday periods?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:04): This is another wicked problem all governments have—building to peak demand. That is a very, very big problem. When I was a young lad a long, long, long time ago, the question was who would get to school early enough to get a bike

rack position because everyone rode their bikes to school and there were no kiss and drop areas. No-one got dropped off to school. Things have changed dramatically.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Was there a smoking area behind the bike rack?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes. That was part of my finest political moment, when I campaigned to become a prefect at Adelaide High School to put ashtrays in the toilets.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, I did. I topped the poll, but you need a teacher to vote for you, and I didn't get the vote of the teachers. Anyway, back to the point.

We are more and more building to the peak, and when you build to the peak you do get suboptimal outcomes. I was trying to talk about this earlier, about the Portrush Road and Magill Road intersection, where we spent nearly 90 per cent of the money on that entire project on home acquisitions. A small slip lane might sound like an easy solution, but when you are buying numerous properties and businesses it can get into the tens of millions of dollars to do these upgrades and you're not actually dealing with the core problem, which is that our network fundamentally isn't working.

I am reluctant to go to the Treasurer more and more often to build to peak demand because it doesn't serve the purpose. What we need to do is structurally fix our road network, which is why that is a much cleverer way, and public transport is a big part of that. I will get the details of the peak modelling for public holidays and, I assume, other important days around public holidays, and it might also be morning traffic and evening traffic as well. I will get all those for the member if it is appropriate to hand over.

Ministerial Statement

BIOSECURITY RESPONSE TO VARROA DESTRUCTOR

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (15:07): I table a copy of a ministerial statement given in the other place by the Hon. Clare Scriven.

Grievance Debate

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Ms PRATT (Frome) (15:07): It is clear that the rental market has become increasingly tight nationally, with Adelaide and regional SA being no exception. We have soaring rental prices and plummeting vacancy rates resulting in some households from being able to remain in the private rental market and some falling into homelessness.

We have the South Australian Women's Legal Service warning of a threefold increase in the number of domestic violence victims forced to remain living with their abusive partners. A study released by AnglicareSA in April examined 1,125 rental properties, finding just two were 'affordable and appropriate' for a single person working on a minimum wage. Further, no rentals were affordable for a single person on JobSeeker, youth allowance or the age pension, while just four properties were affordable for a couple on JobSeeker with two children.

The most recent figures from the Real Estate Institute of Australia show that Adelaide has the least accessible rental market of any Australian capital city, with just 0.6 per cent of dwellings vacant. It does not stop there. We have the media continuing to draw attention to this important issue, and the average rent per week is continuing to increase. In CoreLogic's quarterly rental review from April to June 2022, a median property rent for Melbourne was \$480 per week compared with \$492 per week in Adelaide, leaving Adelaide now more expensive than Melbourne for rentals.

Further to this, new figures show that as many as 2,513 properties will be cut from the National Rental Affordability Scheme (NRAS). The scheme enables landlords to charge 20 per cent below market value for affordable housing for up to 10 years. The 2,513 properties comprise 386 this year, 806 in 2023, 1,079 in 2024, 240 in 2025, and two in 2026. This will add even more pressure onto the South Australian housing market.

It is no surprise that the vulnerable are becoming even more marginalised as we see the number of South Australians resorting to living in tents and caravan parks, couch surfing and staying in abusive relationships for shelter made worse during this harsh winter. This morning, we saw the Premier and Minister for Human Services announce that the Cost of Living Concession will be brought forward from March next year to this August. Whilst we support any assistance that can be provided to South Australians in this difficult time, more needs to be done to ease rental pressures and prevent homelessness.

The Malinauskas Labor government and responsible ministers, including the Minister for Human Services, need to step up and provide faster and more effective solutions to the urgent housing crisis that South Australians are currently faced with. It is not enough to bring forward a date for concessions when our most vulnerable would already have been expecting and budgeting for this measure. The crisis is much bigger than this. Urgent assistance and reforms are required to resolve this ongoing issue.

NAIDOC WEEK

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:10): NAIDOC Week is a time when our governments, local councils, schools and community organisations explore and revel in the wonders of our First Nations culture and distinct history. Raising awareness and understanding of our First Nations' culture and an ongoing fight for a stronger voice in the community is at its heart.

NAIDOC Week encompasses an annual theme chosen to reflect a way forward to champion institutional, structural and cooperative reforms, whilst acknowledging and celebrating the achievements of those who led change in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities over generations. This was highlighted on Monday evening, when I attended Tandanya National Aboriginal Cultural Institute and heard about their future plans.

The first tranche of the 2021 Census data has recently been released, and it reveals a telling story of a changing Australia. More and more Australians are identifying as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander, an increase of over 25 per cent. With such a massive jump in numbers, there will no doubt be some speculation as to why. Of course, the politics of identity is always at play, and there will be commentary around targeting the way in which skin tone and colour play a role.

Those thoughtless and worn-out arguments, however, fail to take into consideration how much colonial practices, such as those that led to the Stolen Generations, directly targeted people with lighter skin tones and mixed heritage and how those policies and the trauma associated with that practice have impacted on the decision for people over the years to officially want to record their ethnicity. That is why the Census figures are revealing about changing attitudes in Australia. That is, in part, why NAIDOC Week is important and has proved to be a pivotal face of change.

There is a proud history of getting up, standing up and showing up, the theme of this year's week of Indigenous pride, and the momentum for change is now. I was proud to be a member of the Rudd Labor government that delivered an apology to the Stolen Generations, and I stand here today proud to be a member of the Malinauskas Labor government that appointed the first First Nations Attorney-General, who is already getting on with work on a comprehensive state government approach to telling Truth and a Treaty and building on the Uluru Statement from the Heart.

Just last week, Kurna Narungga Ngadjuri Ngarrindjeri elder Dale Agius was appointed as our inaugural Commissioner for First Nations Voice. His role is to lead consultation with Aboriginal groups to lay the foundations for a state-based implementation of the Uluru Statement from the Heart, to make sure we move beyond words, promises, acknowledgements and good intentions. The relationship between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and non-indigenous Australians needs to be based on justice, equity and the proper recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people's rights.

This week, in my electorate of Torrens our schools are immersed in NAIDOC Week activities. On Monday, I presented a new Aboriginal flag to Wandana Primary School, which is celebrating the week with a First Nations artist in residence, a special assembly led by student leaders explaining the themes of the week, a boomerang and Pitjantjatjara language workshop, weaving and Dreamtime story activities, and there will be a surprise flash mob Aboriginal dance performance.

I also visited Avenues College where I met with some of our First Nations students, and together we replaced the Aboriginal, Torres Strait Islander and Australian flags. By the end of the week, classes will have been engaged in numerous activities including designing their own interpretation flags, participating in a yarning circle and some senior students having joined Auntie Brenda in the preschool to create a cultural mural and Auntie Lisa in reception class to participate in music workshops.

It was wonderful to see Avenues College student Peyton Aspel, a year 12 student, awarded the 2022 Dr Alice Rigney Prize—a prize awarded to a student who embodies all that Dr Rigney stood for and promoted. I recall visiting the school and interviewing Dr Rigney and one of the teachers for a story in *The Advertiser* many years ago. Peyton is a very worthy recipient and active participant in cultural programs at Avenues College, a talented sportswoman and part of the South Australian Aboriginal Secondary Training Academy elite netball academy. I look forward to following where her journey takes her.

At Hillcrest Primary School, NAIDOC Week is being celebrated with students designing special poster boards including language, Indigenous legends, Eddie Mabo, Indigenous storyboards, and classes are participating in Wingaru digital quizzes.

COASTAL MANAGEMENT

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:16): I rise today to speak about an issue of growing concern to my community—the condition of our local beaches and coastline. Prior to the 2018 election, I spoke on numerous occasions about the need for a long-term solution for the issue of longshore drift on our northern beaches. From government, we tasked the environment department with development of this plan. I stress that the Liberal Party did not put forward the solution. Independent experts in the department did. We funded the solution, a three-part approach: mass replenishment at West Beach, a pipeline to recycle sand that has moved north and is accumulating, and a package of activities to plant out and care for the newly rebuilt dunes.

We knew that this issue needed to have immediate action, as erosion was moving northwards from West Beach. We needed to provide an ability to get sand to beaches that are not easily accessible by truck—for example, Henley South and Henley—as the degradation that was seen at West Beach was moving northwards quickly. Sadly, despite installing a similar pipeline on the southern section of beaches between Glenelg and Kingston Park themselves roughly eight years ago to deal with this northward movement of sand, the Labor Party actively campaigned against a long-term solution to this issue.

The Liberal Party did not come to government with a predetermined idea of what the solution needed to be. As I said, the experts did the work, and significant consultation was undertaken. Planning permissions were sought, and construction and operation contracts had been signed. The rebuild and nourishment of West Beach had begun. For those who live at or visited West Beach this summer, for the first time in nearly 20 years there was a high tide dry beach in front of the surf club.

Then the election happened—a Labor government, and what has happened since? Large-scale fill into West Beach stopped. The pipeline that had sand discharge points into Henley had its construction contract torn up. Instead, we have a minister who has had to declare a conflict of interest, who has had to step away from decision-making on the issue, who did not answer any questions in estimates but was happy to speak on ABC radio.

We now have another review. Multiple reviews have already been conducted on this issue over the past 30 years, and now nearly four months into the life of this government it has not even started. We do not know what the review will be considering, if any new options are even being proposed or even the time frame of when the government plans to do anything above a level of yearly nourishment. We found out today in the other place that the new minister tasked with the responsibility for the coastline has not even met with the department.

Before the election, my community had certainty. They had a long-term solution and a fix was literally underway. Instead, now we have delay and no action. On the back of another storm, we have West Beach and now Henley South and Henley Beach under threat, with multiple beach access points having to be closed last week, old infrastructure exposed and the whole dune system through Henley South virtually gone.

Our community is not going to stand by and let the Labor Party delay, to sit and watch our beaches disappear—you can be very sure of that. Every bit of science clearly shows that sand from West Beach, from Henley South, from Henley and from Grange moves north. You only have to look at a picture of the Semaphore jetty from 30 years ago versus today to draw that conclusion for yourself.

Minister, be sensible. We do not mind how it comes back—in fact, we are completely agnostic on that. But if the southern beaches can have a permanent solution, why not the northern section of beaches? Something must be done by this government now before our beaches literally disappear. It needs to be a priority and one thing is very clear: this is not a priority for this Labor government.

HYDROGEN POWER PLANT

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:20): I rise today to speak yet again about hydrogen, given its importance to my community. As a bit of a drop-off point, I want to return to estimates, given I did not get an opportunity to make some speeches about estimates. I want to commend all the people involved in committee B: the ministers, the shadow ministers and the other members and the way that was conducted. I hope it was useful to all concerned.

Time and time again, people raise the issue about the need to reform estimates and make it, if you like, a more efficient process. It is done in different ways in different states and at a federal level and I would add my voice to say that we do need to have a look at it to see if we can do it better. I will say that having estimates, having a parliamentary process, having an open and democratic society in this day and age, given the growing threats around the world, is something that we all, across the chamber, need to spruik and need to defend.

In Estimates Committee A, a subject dear to my heart came up. The member for Morphett was asking a range of questions about the hydrogen plant. I accept his words that he does not want it to fail. I think it is entirely reasonable that major projects like that undergo scrutiny. I would just voice a note of caution, and that is that we do not get into the position that happened when the Weatherill government announced the big battery and when Musk and others came onto the scene and the disparaging comments in relation to the big battery, something that has exceeded expectations and is now becoming commonplace around the world. At the time, it was the world's largest utility-scale battery.

Just as that was an example of innovation, the commitment to building a hydrogen plant just outside Whyalla is also a real positive. I think it is important that we are willing to try to capture first-mover advantage. For my community, there are a range of benefits. It is a community that has called out for economic diversification for many years. Economic diversification is just one element; obviously there are jobs, it is good for the environment and it will form part of a bigger jigsaw because it will give the impetus to other developments.

One of the exciting things about the power plant is the 250-megawatts worth of electrolyzers. I am hoping that it will be built to the north of the steelworks with the potential, at least in a small way initially, to complement the steelworks in Whyalla. Of course, hydrogen replaces coking coal as a reductant in the iron-making process. I know what it will replace.

When you look at coking coal and coke ovens, they are probably one of the dirtiest and dangerous parts of the steelmaking enterprise. My mum used to be a cleaner at the coke ovens in Whyalla. She would often come home black, but she worked around the periphery of the coke ovens. With respect to the people who worked at the actual coke ovens, from an occupational health and safety perspective it was probably one of the most risky places to work in the steelworks given the production of benzene and other carcinogens.

If we can move to hydrogen in Whyalla in the steel industry, it will be a real plus. It is the sort of thing that will enable us to produce steel for generations to come. In a way, the hydrogen power plant that we are committing to, the publicly owned hydrogen power plant, will put downward pressure on prices and will give us a greater degree of energy security, which is a real plus and it is a real plus in many, many ways.

Time expired.

SCHUBERT ELECTORATE

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:25): I rise today to speak on several issues in relation to my local community, particularly regional roads. We have an enormous road network across South Australia. Locals in the regions tend to know their network like the back of their hand, so when they raise an issue with you about road safety you listen. I would like to recognise and commend in particular the persistence, the passion and the patience shown by two proud locals, Ron and Vivien Tomlinson of Humbug Scrub.

Like many locals who live along Humbug Scrub Road, they have been fighting tirelessly over a long period of time to see their road-safety concerns addressed. After countless letters, emails and meetings they have finally received confirmation that they have been waiting for: a change in the speed limit in a bid to reduce and improve road safety. I have to say that, as the Liberal candidate, I invited the former Minister for Transport, Corey Wingard, to visit and to see the condition of this road firsthand. On the back of that, we made a commitment to see this road improved, to see it resolved.

It is safe to say that locals along this particular stretch of Humbug Scrub Road were playing Russian roulette with their lives every single time they left their driveway. Locals were scared to put their bins out. They were scared to leave their driveway with kids or grandkids in their back seat as motorists screamed past their driveways doing 100 clicks an hour, not to mention the terrible vision. They could not see cars coming from either side.

They received confirmation of this decision yesterday from the department, and to say that they are ecstatic is a complete understatement. I would also like to acknowledge councillor David Kerrison from the Playford city council for his work and his advocacy when it comes to seeing the speed limit reduced along this stretch. He and I have been working very closely together, and it is so pleasing that we have got a result for the locals there.

I think it is important to reflect on the enormous progress that the former Marshall Liberal government made when it came to regional roads. We forged ahead with road maintenance as a result of the significant backlog that the Labor Party left behind. We upgraded roads right across South Australia, including in my electorate of Schubert, and there is still more work to be done, which is why it is all the more disappointing that funding for regional roads in the Labor government's first budget has fallen so spectacularly short.

Of the \$7.83 billion budgeted for roads over the next four years, just \$467.4 million is going towards roads in the regions. That is just 6 per cent allocated to our regional roads, but I will keep fighting for my community. There is road surfacing to be done in main streets right across my electorate, including in Mount Pleasant, in Birdwood and not to mention in Gumeracha.

Last year, I fought to receive a commitment from the former government to resurface Albert Street, which is the main street in Gumeracha. I was so pleased to hear from Gumeracha's very own lead lingerer in Libby Barber that progress is already being made. This is an important project for infrastructure investment in Gumeracha for the locals, for the businesses, and I am so pleased to see it progressing.

Another concern within my electorate is the T-junction of Gorge Road and Redden Drive in Cudlee Creek near the fantastic Cudlee Creek Tavern. This junction is notoriously difficult to navigate. There is low visibility, and vision is so impaired that people are coming out into the middle of the road just to make a run for their lives. Traffic in this area is, pleasingly, increasing as business opportunities expand—likewise for Gorge Road and Tippett Road in Cudlee Creek, which needs to be addressed. I have written to the minister. I look forward to his response.

I could go on, Mr Speaker. There is Linke's Corner in Nuri that needs to be fixed. There is tree trimming that needs to be done from Mount Pleasant to Angaston along critical livestock routes. There is Torrens Valley Road that needs to be dealt with. I am so committed to working with locals and businesses alike to ensure we get our fair share in the regions and our fair share in Schubert.

PLAYFORD ELECTORATE

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (15:30): I hope my constituents will overlook that this is not a bread-and-butter issue, but, before any good show begins, it is appropriate to start with some housekeeping. With the utmost respect to the Playford family and those who revere the name, myself

included, I rise to speak regarding the ongoing use of the Playford name for the electorate that I represent in this house. I have recently written to the Electoral Commissioner to outline my concerns, and I know there are significant numbers of people connected to my electorate who will agree with me.

During the state election campaign, it became clear the naming of Playford to an electorate located outside the boundaries of the City of Playford created widespread confusion amongst voters. It must be pointed out that my seat lies entirely within the City of Salisbury and that, at their closest points, there is still 3½ kilometres of road separating their boundaries. Roughly speaking, if you draw a line from the southern tip of the electorate I represent in Mawson Lakes to the southern boundary of the City of Playford, the distance is almost eight kilometres.

The Playford name is historic and should be preserved, but I do believe it needs to be applied to an area with a stronger historical link to the name. Created in 1970, the boundaries of this seat have jumped around. While it predates the naming of the City of Playford in 1997, I argue the latter has greater public recognition and is more appropriately placed based on our former Premier's work in establishing what was then our satellite city.

I found during the election that when introducing myself or showing constituents campaign materials, they would often remark that they lived within the City of Salisbury and that I was campaigning in the wrong part of town. With the election over, I am continually contacted by constituents living within the City of Playford who mistakenly believe that I am their local member of parliament. Given the confusion, I have suggested to the commissioner that consideration be given to the renaming of the electorate ahead of the 2026 state election.

I do not feel the local member should have any more say over an alternative name than the next person, but if it helps for me to come up with a starting point I favour a practical approach, maybe a little bit boring; however, there is nothing boring about the name of Parafield Gardens, which is a fine suburb that I am very proud to represent. As I said, as a starting point, that is where I think we should go with the naming of the seat.

This is by far and away the largest suburb within the electorate and also one of the largest suburbs within Adelaide. It is my view that familiarity with a geographical name, akin to seats like Port Adelaide, Adelaide, Mount Gambier, Elizabeth, creates the least confusion for constituents in identifying the electorate they live in. Notwithstanding this, I appreciate this could be an opportunity to adopt an Indigenous name for the seat. That said, this box in many ways is ticked, noting my understanding that 'para' is the Kurna word for river or stream.

In making the suggestion, I am of the view that the Playford name is significant and should not be abandoned. Sir Thomas Playford was a big thinker who did many wonderful things, such as nationalising our electricity supply and growing our industrial base. I want to reiterate that my suggestion is not an attack on his legacy but more an argument about bringing the name home to a more appropriate place.

In the same way the seat of Dunstan is based around the former electorate of Norwood, I believe the Playford name should be applied to an electorate within the City of Playford or perhaps in the Adelaide Hills to acknowledge the area once represented by Sir Thomas Playford. I have deliberately raised this matter early in the political term in the hope that this can be given respectful discussion amongst stakeholders, especially members of the Playford family.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (15:35): I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 6 September 2022 at 11am.

Motion carried.

*Bills***STATUTES AMENDMENT (CHILD SEX OFFENCES) BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr BROWN (Florey) (15:35): There are not too many things that this house does and this house debates that have more importance than protecting the innocent members of our society. That is why issues regarding child sex offenders is something I take extremely seriously, as I know everyone in this house does, and should be something that should be above politics and the ordinary rancour of many things we discuss in this house.

I am very pleased that the government has brought forward this particular bill, implementing, as it does, not only a few things that were put forward by the previous government that unfortunately were not able to be done before the election but also a few of the election commitments that the government took to the recent state election.

For example, two of the important election commitments this bill seeks to accomplish are the increase in penalties for a range of child sex offenders in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and it amends section 139A of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, colloquially known as Carly's Law, to ensure that the offence can apply where the unlawful communication is made to a fictitious child. It also updates the list of registrable offences in the Child Sex Offender Registration Act 2006. It is also, as I said before, largely a combination of initiatives by the previous government and also ones that this government took to the recent election.

I will turn briefly to the particulars of the bill before I expand on particular sections of it. Firstly, I will talk about the increased penalties for child sex offences. The increased penalties were informed by the equivalent commonwealth and interstate offences and are relative to other offences within the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. This is important, as it is important not to create discrepancies between sentencing provisions in our state law and also that of the commonwealth because that can often lead to perverse outcomes, where decisions are made to prosecute offences under particular jurisdictions just because of the penalties that are involved, rather than because of the nature of the offences that have been committed.

Not only does this particular bill raise penalties on child exploitation material offences but it also makes changes to the age distinction penalties—for example, the existing law says that they are aggravated for children of 14 and under—and removes them for image-based offences. That way, because the new proposed maximum penalty is higher than the current aggravated penalty, it will be capable of covering offences in a wide range of circumstances, including different age children.

This is largely because the way the act is currently structured requires personnel involved in law enforcement to be exposed to child exploitation material, colloquially known as child pornography, which creates an undue burden on those investigators; not only that, but it can also hold up investigations. What the bill proposes to do, by increasing those maximum penalties, is effectively increase the ceiling so much that aggravation is no longer really a factor so that we can make sure that people are properly prosecuted, and indeed properly convicted and punished, at a higher level and to make that distinction no longer necessary.

One of the other things the bill does that is particularly important in my view—and I will expand on this later—is the amendments to section 139A of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act again, colloquially known as Carly's Law. This relates to the fictitious children provision, so it will now be legal for law enforcement personnel to effectively impersonate children and make sure that offenders are convicted on the basis that they provided a fake age to a law enforcement officer, even though they purported to be a child who was under age.

I understand that this has come about because there were some difficulties in the law and that the result of that might be that prosecutions might necessarily fail. These amendments will see police have more charging options for unlawful communications with fictitious children, and sentencing courts can then consider the age the offender believed the child to be when applying sentencing provisions. I would like to expand on that in a moment.

The bill also amends the list of registrable offences. The added offences are mainly taken from the Commonwealth Criminal Code and have recently been passed by the commonwealth parliament, as I understand, sometime during the last year. There have also been some additional state offences, such as offences involving childlike sex dolls, indeed Carly's Law itself and causing serious harm to a child if it arises from the same incident as a sexual offence.

In clauses 20 and 21, this bill makes amendments to home detention orders and suspension of imprisonment on a defendant entering into a bond respectively. These provide additional considerations for the court to take into account when considering the victim's age and the age difference between the defendant and the victim, where the victim is a fictitious person pursuant to section 63B(3) of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

Again, this is all about providing tools for the armoury of our law enforcement personnel to make sure that people who are engaged in this sort of behaviour are properly punished. On those lines, I would like to provide some information to the house about something known as Sweetie 2.0, which is a project introduced by a not-for-profit organisation in the Netherlands. I am very grateful to the parliamentary library for preparing some information for me on this particular topic. The information provided on this program states:

Webcam sex tourism, the act of engaging children in webcam prostitution, is a growing international problem. Not only does webcam sex tourism provide easy access to child abuse and child abuse images for child abusers, it is also a crime that has a comparatively low risk for the offenders. Live webcam performances leave few traces and little evidence that law enforcement can use. Further difficulties arise from the fact that webcam sex tourism often has a cross-border character, which causes jurisdictional conflicts and makes it more difficult to obtain evidence or even launch an investigation...

The Dutch children's rights organization Terre des Hommes (TdH) was the first NGO to actively tackle webcam child sex tourism by using a virtual character called 'Sweetie' to identify offenders in chat rooms and online forums. Since then, sweetie has been further developed into a chatbot, called Sweetie 2.0, to automate interaction with offenders...

In 2013, using the virtual girl Sweetie, Terre des Hommes researchers identified more than 1,000 individuals seeking to attract children via webcam for sexual purposes. Their report then served as an international wake-up call and the UN put it on its agenda. In the Philippines, websites that sexually exploited children have been shut down and predators prosecuted with the results of such research handed over to law enforcement authorities. However, many predators were able to remain in the shadows...

To stop this phenomenon, Terre des Hommes has gone one step further: Sweetie 2.0 is a program development by a team of experts from the universities of Tilburg and Leiden. This program, which detects, identifies and deters millions of potential predators around the world, will be harmonized with national and international systems of investigation and prosecution.

Unfortunately, there are legal issues about the use of fictitious children, as this particular study informs us:

Using artificial intelligence raises serious legal questions. Sweetie as an investigative tool is so innovative, that it is unclear whether its use is actually covered by existing rules of criminal procedure. However, the question of criminal procedural legality of Sweetie is preceded by a prior substantive criminal law question: is interacting with Sweetie in a sexually charged way a criminal offence in the first place, given that Sweetie is not a person, but a virtual avatar? An answer to this question is important, because if webcam sex tourism with a virtual avatar is not considered criminal, it will be much harder to make the case that Sweetie is an acceptable investigative method.

This particular program has already delivered some results in a related field, and I would like to inform the house of an article from the *Courier Mail* from October 2014, which is headlined "'Sweetie' sting nabs Brisbane sex offender Scott Robert Hansen'. The article goes on to say:

A registered sex offender and serial flasher from Brisbane is believed to be the first child sex predator caught by an undercover online sting targeting pedophiles with a virtual fake child nicknamed Sweetie.

The program sees charity workers pose as Sweetie—the computer-generated animation of a 10-year-old Filipina girl. They target pedophiles, who would ask Sweetie to perform sex acts in front of a webcam for cash.

Set up by Dutch Children's rights group Terre des Hommes Netherlands, Sweetie managed to lure more than 1000 adults around the world, including 46 Australians, providing their details to Interpol.

The first to have been convicted in the online sex tourism sting is a Brisbane man, registered sex offender Scott Robert Hansen.

Australian Federal Police officers executed a search of Hansen's home in February after he was referred to police by Terre des Hommes following a web chat with Sweetie.

The 37-year-old is a known serial-flasher who was first convicted for wilful exposure in 1995 for repeatedly flashing young girls on a school bus by standing naked in front windows outside.

In 1999 he was again convicted for repeatedly flashing girls aged 11 to 13, and in 2009 was given 18 months jail time for flashing and attempting to abduct an eight-year-old girl on her way home from school in his home suburb of Kallangur on Brisbane's northside.

The Brisbane District Court heard at the time that particular offence was committed while Hansen was on bail for child pornography offences after being found with more than 20,000 explicit images and films on his computer in 2008.

In 2011 while appearing on charges for approaching three young siblings while naked, and attempting to abduct an eight-year-old girl, grabbing her leg and cupping her mouth, a prosecutor told the Brisbane District Court Hansen's offending towards young children was 'escalating' and 'as time goes by is getting more serious'.

Hansen was last jailed in 2012 for nine months, after the 10th time he was found to have exposed himself to young girls.

During an earlier sentencing hearing, prosecutor Rob Glenday told Brisbane District Court Hansen's act of flashing were 'an impulse he couldn't control and when he did it he felt good for the rest of the day'.

Hansen has pleaded guilty to three child sex charges in the Brisbane District Court—admitting to sending obscene pictures of himself to Sweetie, having images of child sex abuse in his computer, and failing to comply with a sex offenders order.

I note that engaging with a child, because she was an virtual avatar, was not a specific offence in Queensland. The article goes on to say:

He is believed to have chatted with the girl, believing she was nine-years old, and performed a sex act in front of the webcam broadcasting it directly to the child, transcripts obtained by the BBC reveal.

They say the chat logs of Hansen's conversations show him to be directly targeting what he thought was a child.

The very first thing he typed in was:

'hi, u really 9yo'. The operator posing as Sweetie replied 'Yes'.

Hansen then wrote things along the lines—I will not get into too much detail—of 'wanna chat or cam with older man?' and, 'I like asian chicks.' Becoming more explicit, he then told Sweetie that he was naked and asked her to perform sex acts.

Hansen has been sentenced to two years in prison but is unlikely to serve the full term of his sentence as he has already served eight months in detention. He will have to serve an intensive correction order for 12 months.

Details of 1,000 men who contacted Sweetie and offered to pay for lewd services have been sent to police in 71 countries around the world, including 46 offenders from Australia, the operation revealed last year. An operator who posed as Sweetie and was incredibly disturbed said that the conversations had literally given her nightmares and told the ABC that Hansen was 'not even amongst the most serious people'. The quote about Hansen is:

He was very direct, at one point he asked us to get our fictional eight-year-old sister involved. It was very difficult to go to sleep at night after interacting with someone like Hansen—

the anonymous man said—

He was probably not the most serious, not even among the most serious.

Investigations into Sweetie's other predators continue but no other arrests are known.

I would just like to provide an update to the house from Terre des Hommes on how this particular operation is going in 2022:

For many years, cyber related and undercover research have been central to Terre des Hommes' Sweetie and Watch programmes. After thorough analysis, we have come to the conclusion that this type of activity does not align with [their] mission—

because of consideration of legal issues and others. They have decided to hand their research over to other organisations because of the legal issues in particular.

We are aware that such things are underway. There are such opportunities that exist for law enforcement, but unfortunately the laws of our land have not kept up and provided that assistance. The laws that we have either prevent these operations from taking place or prevent the proper prosecution of those people who seek to prey on our children.

These people are the most evil of the evil, and we need to do everything we can in this parliament to make sure that they are properly brought to justice, and so I absolutely commend the government for doing everything that it can to change the law to make sure that these tools are provided to law enforcement. I commend the bill to the house.

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (15:49): I rise today in support of this bill. One of the most crucial roles of government is to ensure the safety of its people, and special attention must be paid to the safety of the most vulnerable people in our community. We must care for and protect older people, we must care for and protect people living with disability, and we must care for and protect children.

This topic of child sex offences is difficult to even think about let alone speak about, but we must because we need to do everything we can to keep children safe and supported. During the election campaign Labor committed to taking the toughest action in the country against those who exploit children. We also committed to putting the victim at the centre of how we respond in this area, doing what we can to begin the process of repairing the damage that has been caused.

Central to this is an investment of an additional \$2 million to help victims as they go through court processes, provide better education about their rights and support their recovery from trauma. Our government is also committed to passing laws for the indefinite detention for serious child sex offenders, who will need to convince the Supreme Court and two medical professionals, both appointed by the court, that they should be released. We will also require lifetime electronic monitoring when serious child sex offenders re-enter the community, and we will create our state's first child sex offender register.

Today's bill honours two important election commitments made by our government in this space. The bill will increase penalties on a range of child sex offences in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935; in particular, it makes changes to the age distinction around penalties. For example, currently an image-based offence is considered aggravated only for children aged 14 and under. It is often difficult to prove the child in an image is 14 or under and involves police or others in the justice system at times having to extensively trawl through content to determine the exact age of a child.

I cannot begin to imagine how horrifying this work must be for those workers. This bill removes that age requirement for image-based offences, thereby removing that role from workers and also making it very clear that the sexual exploitation of children at any age is unacceptable. The bill before us also amends section 139A of Carly's Law to ensure that the offence can apply where the unlawful communication is made to a fictitious child. So, when an undercover police officer is posing as a child victim, offenders can still be charged with unlawful communications.

These amendments will see police have more charging options for unlawful communications with fictitious children, and sentencing courts will be able to consider the age the offender thought the child was when applying sentencing provisions.

I want to thank the Attorney-General, his staff and department for their work on this bill. I also want to take this opportunity to thank the people who work so hard in this area to keep children safe and supported: our police officers, detectives, victim support services, lawyers and anyone else working in this area. Thank you for working in an incredibly difficult field of work, because you choose to put children first.

I extend my support to victims of these heinous acts. I stand with you. This bill is the first of a couple we will be introducing on these matters and is step 1 in our tough on child sex offenders approach. I commend the bill to the house.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (15:53): I rise to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Child Sex Offences) Bill 2022. This bill progresses two important election policies made by this government to increase penalties on a range of child sex offences in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 and amends section 139A of the CLCA, Carly's Law, to ensure that the offence can apply where the

unlawful communication is made to a fictitious child. It also updates the list of registrable offences in the Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006.

The bill is a combination of amendments that were put forward by the previous government that were unfortunately not progressed and aims to protect the community from sex offenders by increasing penalties. We are enacting our Labor policies and commitments, and these penalties are increased for consistency across the commonwealth and properly recognise the severity of the offences.

As well as raising the penalties on child exploitation material offences, the bill makes changes to age distinction penalties, removing them only in relation to image-based offences. As the proposed maximum penalty is higher than the current aggravated penalty, it will be capable of covering offences in a wide range of circumstances including different age children.

This distinction removal is largely to decrease the exposure of justice system staff to child exploitation material, as they will no longer need to determine the precise age of the child depicted in order to charge a basic or aggravated offence, and it sends a strong message that sexual exploitation of young people is unacceptable, regardless of age. Importantly, too, we are improving protections for our police officers and committing towards their work health and safety obligations to keep the workers as safe as possible.

This bill addresses gaps in the current legislation, and we are working hard to protect young children from harm. Whilst parents, carers, teachers and so many in our community do everything we can to protect our children and protect vulnerable people from harm, we cannot be everywhere at all times and observing everything our children do, so this piece of legislation is one that will help to keep our children safe. I am pleased that it will also enable police officers to have the support they need so that they can pursue these matters with confidence. I commend this bill to the house.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (15:56): I rise to make a very brief contribution to this very important bill, which reflects some very important election commitments made by the Malinauskas government whilst in opposition and which also, to be fair to the current opposition, builds on some work that was already underway during the previous term of government. We have taken that ball and run with it, and I extend my thanks and appreciation to the current Attorney-General, the Hon. Kyam Maher in the other place, and also to the Premier and the Deputy Premier for leading the policy process while we were in opposition, facilitating the development of these very important policies.

I want to touch only very briefly on three aspects of it; first of all, the increased penalties. It is very important that, from time to time, we review penalties for all offences, but it is most important that we review penalties for the most serious of those offences. We have heard from other contributors of the inadequacy often of some of our laws in relation to child exploitation offences. This has been recognised for some time, and it was certainly recognised by the government while in opposition, and this bill gives expression to those concerns.

It is not only bringing the laws into line with commonwealth laws, for the reasons already expressed by other speakers, but also bringing them in line with other comparable offences within the CLCA. To my mind, that is not just child exploitation offences. Newer members may not have noticed, but often we come into this place and we change laws in response to public demand and public expression of concern and often after a while, once we review the CLCA in totality, we come across anomalies where some offences are punished at a much higher level than other offences that should necessarily be punished at a very high level. It is very important that we review laws from time to time. We make sure that there are none of these anomalies and that the penalties for offences for the commission of offences adequately reflects the seriousness of those offences.

Other speakers have touched on the age distinction penalties in relation to the image-based offences. This is very important, in essence doing away with an aggravation of those offences, and making the penalty for a basic and/or aggravated offence the same and much more serious. As other speakers have reflected on, this lessens the burden on those workers, whether they are within the court system or indeed within the police, who have to view these images in order to mount a prosecution in order to conduct a prosecution.

I have had long conversations with police officers who have to do this awful work. It is fair to say that they suffer significant trauma, and it is heartbreaking for those people who have to do this

work, but of course it is necessary work and it has to be done in order to combat these evil crimes. Anything we can do to lessen the burden on those workers is commendable, and I commend that part of the bill in particular.

Finally, I want to reflect on the amendments relating to fictitious children. It is hugely important that offenders are punished not simply for their actions but for their intended actions. There are offenders who conduct conversations or try to groom children online, and in their mind those children are children, whether or not they are police officers. At the moment, it is very difficult to mount a prosecution case. The amendments in this bill will give the police many more options in order to charge offenders who seek out material, seek out children to groom to ultimately abuse or exploit in whatever way, and I absolutely welcome those new provisions.

As previous speakers have said, we must do everything we can to protect our children. We also have in train another very important policy in terms of South Australia's first child sex offender register. I look forward to that legislation being brought into this place. I thoroughly commend this bill to the house.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (16:01): I will speak just a few words to thank the contributors, to thank the people from the other side, including the person leading for the opposition, the member for Heysen, and to also give acknowledgement and credit to the Hon. Kyam Maher for having taken this piece of legislation through the upper house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 9 passed.

Clause 10.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I move:

Amendment No 1 [DeputyPremier-1]—

Page 6, after line 33—Insert:

- (a1) Section 56(1), penalty provision, (b)—after 'offence' insert:
(other than an offence of a kind described in paragraph (c) or (d))

The government has filed this amendment to clarify the operation of the amended indecent assault penalties. The bill adds new penalty levels for indecent assault that apply when the victim is a child. This is in addition to the existing penalties for basic and aggravated offences. The effect of the amendment is to make it clear that when the victim is a child the higher child-specific penalties will apply, even if the circumstances mean it could also be charged as an aggravated offence. This was always the intended operation of the new penalties; however, the clarifying words are inserted to avoid doubt in response to concerns raised by the Director of Public Prosecutions.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (11 to 21) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (16:05): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MOTOR SPORT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

No. 1. Clause 6, page 4, line 4 [heading to clause 6]—Delete 'Insertion of sections 4 to 9B' and substitute:

Substitution of section 10

No. 2. Clause 6, page 4, line 5—Delete 'Before section 10 insert:' and substitute:

Section 10—delete section 10 and substitute:

No. 3. New clause, page 13, after line 2—Insert:

19A—Insertion of Part 3B

After section 27C insert:

Part 3B—Reporting

27D—Board to report on ticket sales etc for motor sport events

- (1) The Board must, in relation to each motor sport event promoted by the Board, or in relation to which the Board performs functions under this Act, prepare and provide to the Minister a report setting out—
 - (a) the total attendance at the motor sport event; and
 - (b) any other information required by the regulations.
- (2) The report must be completed and provided to the Minister within 3 months after the completion of the motor sport event.
- (3) The Minister must cause a copy of the report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament within 6 sitting days after receiving the report.

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I would like to speak in favour of this because this is an event that has been longed for by many people in South Australia. I am not a motorsport enthusiast, and it will probably surprise no-one that I have revealed myself that way. However, I did a lot of doorknocking in the marginal seats in the north-east in particular, and I was interested to find how many people really have a fondness for the Adelaide 500 and are very keen to see it back. In some ways, that might be unsurprising to people.

When I was surprised was in the Coorong and Lower Lakes area, meeting with people who are deeply concerned about the state of the River Murray and talking about the Murray-Darling Basin Action Plan and what we can be doing, the basin authority and what needed to be done to also help the Coorong, particularly the southern lagoon and the works the department was contemplating doing.

One gentleman came up to me at the very small public meeting we held and said that he was something like a fourth generation member of the Liberal Party, that we was an agriculturalist and regarded himself as a blue blood. However, he said that there was one thing that was going to change his vote to Labor—and I naturally assumed it was something to do with the 450 gigalitres we had been trying to get down the river—and he startled me by saying, 'No, it's the Adelaide 500.'

This was an issue that I think the previous government simply miscalculated. They did not appreciate the feeling that so many people in South Australia have towards a race event that gave an occasion on which to come into the city, spend time with friends and family and enjoy the event itself and all the surrounding entertainment.

It is therefore with considerable delight that I have watched—again at a slight distance; I am not paying close attention, not being an earnest fan myself—the way in which the Premier in particular has led, ensuring that this race happens quickly, that it happens in December, that it is

done well and that it is prepared to be a project that will last for many years and an event that will come back for many years. I know from personal experience it is something that means a huge amount to South Australians and for which they are very grateful.

Mr TARZIA: The amendments are eminently sensible. We have made it very clear that, whilst we have applied much scrutiny, we certainly are not in the way of the Motorsport Board returning. We commend the bill to the house.

Motion carried.

CROSS BORDER COMMISSIONER BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

SUPERANNUATION FUNDS MANAGEMENT CORPORATION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (INVESTMENT IN RUSSIAN ASSETS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 May 2022.)

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (16:10): For over 130 days, South Australians and the broader local community have watched in horror as Russia invades Ukraine. Our televisions and mobile phones have been covered with images and footage of conflict and destruction we are unable to explain to our children or even understand ourselves. The unjustifiable aggression shown by Russian forces over these four months has drawn strong condemnation from the global community, and rightfully so.

Over 4½ thousand innocent Ukrainian civilians have had their lives stolen from them by the hands of a violent authoritarian regime. It has been reported that many deaths have come at close quarters by Russian armed forces. As of 26 June, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights verified that 330 children have been killed since the invasion began. Three hundred and thirty future teachers, nurses, cleaners, coaches, thinkers and world changers have been taken from the Ukrainian people far too soon.

This barbaric crusade of violence and suffering has created a humanitarian crisis, as Ukrainians look to their neighbours in their time of need. The United Nations has suggested that as many as 12 million people have fled their homes since the invasion began, with more than five million seeking refuge in neighbouring countries. As we watch the resilience and bravery of the Ukrainian people in the face of such evil, I am filled with hope as a young nation led by their president fights for their sovereignty and their freedom.

Democracies such as ours must do everything they can to ensure the prosperity of our global community. As the people of Ukraine are showing the world, injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. I was proud to stand as a candidate with the Malinauskas Labor team, who committed to amending the Superannuation Funds Management Corporation of South Australia Act 1995 to enable ministerial direction to enable the removal of state government funds from Russian assets. I maintain that pride as I stand here today as a member of this place.

This bill will divest \$60 million worth of Australian workers' super held in Russian assets by Funds SA. By amending the act, we will effectively end state government funds and the superannuation of the state's public sector workers being invested in Russian assets. I am pleased that, in addition to this bill, our government has shown support to the Ukrainian people in other ways. Some time ago, the government received a request from the Australian Federation of Ukrainian Organisations, who reached out seeking a donation of medical supplies to assist communities in Ukraine. I am so pleased this substantial medical assistance was provided.

The Malinauskas government has provided over 20,000 items of medical equipment. Included in the shipments are items that can be used in their hospitals to support injured civilians or soldiers, including masks for adults and children, first aid and wound dressings, pulse oximeters,

emergency medical kits, nasogastric tubes, hypodermic syringes and many more items. These pallets of medical devices and materials were dispatched in early April and arrived in Ukraine some weeks ago.

They are now being used in hospitals across Ukraine by doctors, nurses and other clinical staff. Thank you to SA Health, the Minister for Health and the Premier for helping to make this happen. This equipment is supporting innocent people who are suffering because of this invasion. More life-saving medical equipment will also soon be on its way to Ukraine to support local hospitals and healthcare workers, with 70 defibrillators, which have previously been used by our ambos to save South Australian lives, being flown to Ukraine over the coming weeks to save Ukrainian lives.

There is something extra special about these defibrillators: the children of South Australia's Ukrainian communities have drawn handwritten messages of support on them. This important donation was organised by the SA Ambulance Service and the Australian Defence Force will deliver each box of urgent aid amid a desperate need in Ukraine for medical equipment during the conflict.

The defibrillators will be deployed to field hospitals, enabling health workers to deliver a shock to patients experiencing cardiac arrest to induce a normal heart rhythm and potentially save hundreds of lives through this conflict. The dual heart monitoring devices will be shipped to Ukraine in batches, along with rechargeable batteries. I would also like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the support provided to Ukraine by a company in my electorate of Elder, Micro-X, located in Tonsley.

The Tonsley precinct is such an incredible hub of innovation and Micro-X is no exception, with their innovative medical and defence products using world-leading technology. I was able to see some of these products during my visit a couple of weeks ago, including their bedside X-ray units, their Rovers. The Rover, designed and manufactured in South Australia, began by supporting trauma imaging in military medical facilities.

Its lightweight and rugged construction means the medical staff can use the imaging machines in emergency settings, particularly in deployed and temporary hospital environments. The Micro-X Rover is six times lighter than conventional mobile X-ray machines and its design means that it can easily go where it is most needed. Micro-X partnered with four US-based non-government organisations, who purchased the Rovers at a discount and arranged their transport to Ukraine.

There are currently 11 of the South Australian made Rovers over there and, knowing the make-up of some of that workforce at Micro-X, it is highly likely that former Holdens' workers played a part in their manufacturing. These Rovers are located primarily in Central Ukraine, in cities that have been exposed to fighting including Kyiv. Since their delivery, Micro-X has been in contact with the NGOs who have reported that the Rovers have been life saving, as it means people can get X-rays when they arrive at a hospital and be diagnosed more quickly, instead of waiting to be taken to an imaging room.

It is really heartening to hear and know that a South Australian product is making such a difference overseas. Our government's donation of defibrillators, the previous donation of medical equipment and this bill show that our government's stands with the people of Ukraine, and I commend the bill to the house.

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (16:17): I rise today to speak to the Superannuation Funds Management Corporation of South Australia (Investment in Russian Assets) Amendment Bill 2022. I stand to indicate the opposition's support for the bill and, most certainly, the intent of the bill. The opposition joins the government, and we stand side by side and hand in hand in expressing our horror in regard to the continued events that are transpiring in Ukraine.

The opposition likewise believes that it is our obligation, this parliament's joint obligation, to ensure the principles of our democratic freedoms and our democratic beliefs are defended and promoted. We join the government in expressing that the actions and aggression being displayed by Vladimir Putin and Russia cannot be tolerated. When Russia invaded Ukraine, international financial sanctions were imposed on Russia in response to its ongoing threat to the soft entry and territorial integrity of Ukraine.

This bill seeks to provide a mechanism for the minister for Funds SA to provide a direction for the divestment of Russian assets held by Funds SA on behalf of Super SA members. In its latest update of the situation, Funds SA has advised on its website, dated 7 March 2022, that majority divestment has already been achieved and that the original exposure to Russia of approximately \$60 million has been reduced to \$9 million or 0.02 per cent of the total investment portfolio held by Funds SA.

It does appear that the remainder of the funds will be difficult to divest while strict international trade and economic sanctions exist. Despite this, Funds SA has been actively engaged with its external investment managers regarding exposure to Russian securities and has been implementing sanctions imposed by the Australian government. It is expected that this amount may have changed marginally since 7 March 2022 when this media release was made public.

Funds SA further advises that it will continue to seek divestment across the portfolio from its investment managers, but notes that trading restrictions in key markets make this difficult at the current time. I add this to give context to the level of investment that currently stands in Russia prior to the moving of this bill. I again confirm that the opposition will be supporting this bill but that we do reserve our right to move amendments in the other place.

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (16:20): From the comfort and safety of these green benches, I rise in support of this bill. I can only imagine the contrast between our lives in Adelaide and the unnecessary suffering inflicted on a proud and decent people on the other side of the world. We are all very lucky to be away from this bloodshed but, as global citizens who enjoy this peace, we are obligated to speak out when this is threatened and to act whenever possible.

While we are dealing with the tip of the iceberg and a problem that is inflicting immeasurable misery, this bill is the right thing to do. There are so many things we can do in support of the Ukrainian people, and this should be seen as just one of them. In doing so, this is a line in the sand that must be drawn. Beyond the intent to pull South Australian investment out of Russia, it should also be seen as a wake-up call to any other tyrant believing their behaviour will go unnoticed. We live in a global village and we must make it clear that there are rules and standards we must all abide by.

As investors through our superannuation, we are also realising the power we have in saying where our money should be going. I know that I am not alone in my view that South Australian funds should do good in the world rather than prop up acts of evil. Because of this, it is perfectly reasonable for the minister to require Funds SA to divest its remaining Russian assets. While our parliament can produce motions in condemnation of the Russian invasion of Ukraine, I believe actions speak much louder than words.

Through this bill, we are not only making a symbolic gesture in opposition but also helping to weaken a war against the innocent. Some may question the point of doing this, given the low levels of investment in Russia, but I believe otherwise. We may only deliver a scratch, but every journey begins with a single step. We are not the only jurisdiction to condemn this barbarity, and we are also not the only jurisdiction to have the legislative levers to control where our hard-earned money goes. While this may scratch the Russian war effort, if other jurisdictions follow we can turn a scratch into a bruise and then, over time, into a dent.

In delivery of these words, I want to make it very clear that the Russian people are not our enemies. Just as we have grown up happily with Ukrainians around us, we are also enriched by many Russian families who call South Australia home. The beauty of our state is that we are mature enough to draw the distinction between the Russian people and the tyranny of Russia's leadership. They are not one and the same, and Russians living here should continue to uphold and be proud of who they are.

Just as I said to a gathering of African refugees in Salisbury last week, the Malinauskas government is proud of and will continue to support you. We will not allow you to stop celebrating who you are. In upholding this sentiment, I also want to acknowledge and give praise to the many Russians in South Australia who have stood shoulder to shoulder with the Ukrainian community in condemnation of the war. We know this is happening, and we will not allow you to be tarred by the same brush.

I note there is a clause within this bill for an annual review of the circumstances. This is also the right path to take. I hope there will come a time in the not too distant future when we can lift the restrictions that we are debating today. A Russia removed of the shackles of tyranny is in everybody's interest. The moment that day arrives, we must be there to support this new beginning. In the meantime, we must stay focused on doing what we can in support of the people of Ukraine.

I was moved by a quote from a Welsh logistics manager, Shaun Hopkins. Mr Hopkins discovered charities were having trouble getting supplies into war-torn Ukraine, so he took it upon himself—despite using crutches and a wheelchair—to drive to the war-ravaged country and deliver them. In context to his efforts, which have to date led to 19 convoys from Wales joining the effort, he said, 'We want more people to come forward and channel that energy into action rather than empathy.'

While empathy for this terrible situation is important, it is vital that we follow the lead of Mr Hopkins and go beyond sympathising to take whatever action we can. It is easy to suggest that as a small state half the world away we cannot make any impact, but just imagine if every other state in the country followed. I know from the words of our Prime Minister that beyond NATO Australia is making the world's biggest contribution in the aid of Ukraine.

With this in mind we need to accept that, if we stand in condemnation of the invasion, as a global community in which South Australia is a responsible participant, there is going to be a lot more to do. While we stand to stop the flow of money from Funds SA today, we must be prepared to act fast and be willing to make changes on other fronts in support of the Ukrainian people.

My mum is regularly in contact with her brother in neighbouring Poland. On top of grappling with an influx that has so far seen 4.3 million refugees into Poland, we hear of her homeland living on the edge as well. The industrial parts of the south of Poland produce a vast array of armaments. Each day, low-flying fighter jets fly over her home town in surveillance and concern that local factories could become targets.

The heightened fear and suffering this conflict is causing is spreading by the day. On figures from May this year, neighbouring countries of Ukraine have so far received 12 million refugees. We need to be mindful of this, and also offer them support, knowing the difficult circumstances that they also face. This unnecessary war does not stop at any particular border, but instead sends shockwaves across the world.

The notion of this bill was in its early stages just a few months ago, when it was first raised by the Premier prior to the election. To be on the verge of enshrining it into legislation in just over 100 days since taking office reflects a lot of hard work and the will to make it happen. I want to pass on my thanks to all those behind the scenes who have helped bring this bill before us today. My words have been chosen very carefully as the mere thought of sounding jubilant while a crisis is happening on the other side of the world fills me with dread. In respect of the unnecessary bloodshed caused through this conflict, I solemnly commend this bill to the house.

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (16:28): I could never have imagined that in 2022 we would be in a situation where war is raging in Europe and a whole country is being decimated. Surely as a world we should have moved on from this course of action. For Russia to display such aggression with no care for human sacrifice is devastating.

With 7.1 million people internally displaced and five million fleeing to neighbouring countries, it is a humanitarian crisis of epic proportions. The pictures coming out of the media show the complete decimation of towns: there is literally nothing left. These Ukrainians have no home to go back to, yet they show up bravely trying to defend their country, with farmers using every tool and tractor they own to try to withstand the assault.

Ukraine is a country of fighters and they are not giving up under any circumstances. We need to support them as much as we possibly can. They are protecting their right to democracy, and that is something that we need to throw ourselves behind. The world has moved to impose economic sanctions on Russia in response to this aggression, such as banning new investments in Russia, freezing the assets of Russian banks, and sanctioning their financial institutions.

The Australian federal government has moved to prohibit imports of energy products as well as prohibit the supply, sale or transfer of certain luxury goods. We as a state government have been supporting the humanitarian crisis, providing medical equipment and safe passage to refugees, but we need to be able to do more in regard to our response to the Russian aggression.

A few weeks back I joined my community in a fundraising event in Blackwood hosted by the Blackwood Action Group. It was a fashion parade that brought our community together to show our support for the Ukrainian people, a parade with heart. After the parade, we heard about what Ukraine is like in more peaceful times and watched a video in which there was a heartfelt plea from Ukrainians for peace. Over \$6,700 was raised to go directly to Ukrainian refugees who now call South Australia home.

These people are fleeing their homes with barely a bag of clothes, sometimes less, and I am glad our government has opened its doors to these refugees. Providing support to displaced Ukrainians is important, but we also need to address the Russian aggression. The Premier was clear prior to the election that as a government we would move swiftly to direct Funds SA to divest Russian investments. In order to do that, the act needs to change. It currently does not have a mechanism by which the funds can be directed by government.

Removing state government funds from Russian investments is an important step, and I know I will feel better knowing that my superannuation is not aiding the Russian assault. I am sure many in the public sector feel the same. The amendments contained in this bill will enable a direction by the minister for the divestment of Russian assets to occur in a sensible way that will target Russian-held investments. Workers' superannuation needs to be protected to avoid significant loss.

Funds SA has already started this process, already divesting a significant volume of Russian funds, but in the interests of fund members in South Australia it is appropriate to ensure the divestment occurs responsibly. This may take some time, but it is clear we need to ensure the minister has the ability to direct Funds SA to divest the remaining Russian assets. These amendments are the right thing to do, they are what our community expects us to do and I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (16:31): It gives me great pleasure to rise to make a contribution on the Superannuation Funds Management Corporation of South Australia (Investment in Russian Assets) Amendment Bill.

This is an unusual bill, and it comes from a time when, as other members have articulated to this place, almost unthinkable circumstances are occurring over in eastern Europe as we speak. I think this is the first time since the Second World War that there has been an invasion of one European country by another, a situation we thought we were well past, particularly given the developments of the late 20th century. Alas, we are not.

This particular change comes about as a result of a public discussion that occurred in the lead-up to the recent March election when, at the very beginning of the Russian invasion of Ukraine, the state's then political leaders, the member for Dunstan and the now Premier, the member for Croydon, were hosted by *The Advertiser* in a debate-type forum. The question was raised about whether the state, directly or indirectly, held any investments in Russian assets and, if so, what would be done about it.

The then Premier, the member for Dunstan, responded that we did; in fact, I think the then Treasurer had previously indicated publicly that there was a level of assets held which, in isolation, seems an extensive amount, an amount of some \$60-odd million in the value of investments. As the member for Colton has pointed out, in the context of the overall amount of funds under management by Funds SA, that is only a very small portion; nonetheless, \$60 million is no small beer.

As to what would be done about it, the response from the member for Dunstan, while technically correct, was disappointing, I think, at the time. It was, 'Well, nothing, because we have a regime in South Australia where we do not want ministers of the day or politicians directing an independent board superintending the independent management structure of Funds SA about where they should or should not invest their money.'

I do not say that to criticise the member for Dunstan; as I said, technically he is right. It is really important that we have that separation between the government of the day and the minister responsible for that agency and the investment decisions that that agency is taking on behalf of those entities and South Australians who have funds under investment with Funds SA. That is a very appropriate approach. The last thing we would want to see is a minister making decisions, considered or knee-jerk, about how these funds are invested.

Certainly, considering the events of the last two or three months—just as we saw the events of 2008 after Lehman Brothers fell over and the global share markets, including the Australian share market, started their considerable declines—the last thing we want is an elected official, a minister of the day, having to make judgement calls about the best investments to make and the timing of those investments. That is a recipe for disaster.

But the member for Croydon, the now Premier, in recognising that also recognised that this is an extraordinary situation that gives rise to the necessity for elected members, the government of the day and for a minister, in a very small and tightly constrained way, to have the capacity to reflect the community's expectations in how those investment decisions are made, so this is the purpose of this bill.

There is an overwhelming community sentiment at the moment that no-one—in South Australia, and I believe Australia and most parts of the Western world—wants to be party to supporting investments domiciled in a country that may have some direct or indirect effect on the Russian war effort. If that means investments that are held in Russian assets or Russian companies or Russian entities are somehow directly or indirectly involved in the Russian defence materiel effort or in some other way that is helping the Russian war effort, then that needs to be if not minimised then exited completely.

It has been quite the task to come up with a bill that balances the position that the member for Dunstan articulated—absolutely correct and sound in principle—with the position that the Malinauskas Labor government took to the election, and that is an attempt as far as possible to respect that principle but importantly to take action here. That is what we do with this bill. It ensures that we are very constrained in how we take action in this way.

As we know, the amount the previous government reported publicly that is under investment or is the value of those investments in Russian assets has declined considerably since the time it was outlined as being \$60 million for a couple of reasons. One is that there have been some opportunities to divest those assets, but more importantly and more honestly, I think, we should recognise that those assets that are still being held, as the member for Colton said, are simply unable to be divested. There are very stringent sanctions on Russia and that is making it extremely difficult for governments and government agencies, including Funds SA and the fund managers they engage, to divest of assets that are domiciled in Russia or are otherwise considered to be Russian assets.

Because it is so difficult to transact in those assets, it means that the value of those assets has reduced very considerably. The overall value of the investments now held has declined considerably, and I fully expect that the opposition will want to know from the government what is the most recent value that we can attribute to those. We will invite the chief executive from Funds SA to provide advice during the course of the committee stage so that we can provide the most up-to-date advice to the chamber. But, suffice to say, it is significantly less than that \$60 million we started out at.

It is important to recognise that some of the investments are extremely difficult to exit from. It might be, for example, that the state has a position in some sort of pooled fund, holding units in that pooled fund, and some of the investments held in that fund may be considered to be Russian assets, so not a direct asset holding but an indirect asset holding. There is likely to be a contractual obligation for the state to maintain its presence or its holding of units within that pooled fund that cannot simply be exited from in short order.

That is constraining the state to be able to immediately exit from those asset holdings. To do so would risk the state being in breach of the arrangements that were entered into when those units were undertaken and potentially risk incurring very significant losses. These are some of the concerns that the chair of the Funds SA board and the Chief Executive of Funds SA made absolutely

clear to me when we were coming up with the best way to give effect to the government's election commitment for this bill.

We wanted not only to exit the ownership of these assets, directly or indirectly, as quickly as possible but at the same time we wanted to protect the value overall of the government's remaining assets to the greatest extent possible. You could imagine that the very strong appetite I alluded to before from the community to making sure that the government held no asset positions with Russian investments might perhaps wane considerably if it became clear that in order to exit from those investments it might incur losses in the tens or hundreds of millions of dollars, losses potentially considerably higher than the initial value of the investments when the information was first reported to the media by the former Treasurer.

In short, it is not simply done. I am extremely grateful, I have to say, to the Chief Executive Officer of Funds SA and also the board chair and, by extension, the board for their very collaborative, thorough and nuanced approach to making sure that we get this solution right. It also comes at a time when boards of companies, let alone companies responsible for the investment of funds, are actively considering their responsibilities under the developing ESG principles making themselves apparent across financial markets globally.

This is something the state government is turning its mind to, that is, that companies realise that they have a responsibility to their shareholders and to their employees that they must be good corporate citizens, that they have to act and be seen to act responsibly in the current global environment, and that making sure that there is a program of setting and sticking to a set of ESG principles is absolutely essential for organisations in this day and age.

It would have been an option, for example, for us merely to bring that work forward and impose it in legislation now, that Funds SA could simply meet the government's election commitment by adopting to and, for example, reporting on ESG principles. However, being frank, that perhaps would not have satisfied the community's desire to see in black and white that the government was giving effect to the commitment to divest itself as quickly as possible specifically of those Russian investments, and that is why we have arrived here.

You will see in the way in which the bill has been drafted that the action that the corporation takes to divest itself of these assets has to be taken prudently—and importantly consistently—with the corporation's pre-existing and overall objectives, and that is for the benefit of those organisations that place their funds under their investment. That makes it clear that the bill empowers only the corporation to take action in a way which does not otherwise place remaining investment funds at great risk.

That is absolutely essential not only for the comfort of the board and management, who have very strict fiduciary obligations, but also for the organisations that have placed their funds in trust with Funds SA for investment. It is also important that there is a responsibility for the corporation and for the government to be held accountable for how this bill is given effect, and that we report on a periodic basis as to how these changes have been given effect and to what extent investment activities have been changed or altered in order to divest these assets.

For example, and again foreshadowing, perhaps, one of the questions that may arise during the committee stage of this debate: what are the assets that still remain? What is the value of those assets, and if those assets are still being held what is the plan to divest of them, or is it in some cases simply impossible to divest? I gave an example of that pooled fund arrangement before, and so on.

I think that in the annual review of the effect of this bill, placing it in the annual report, which is required to be provided not only to the minister but also to the parliament, gives the parliament some satisfaction as to how the requirements of this bill are given effect. It is, of course, the parliament's prerogative to empower the corporation to take these actions, and so it is up to the parliament to be assured that the actions are being undertaken as prudently as possible. In that respect, it is a relatively brief but an important bill.

I just want to stress again, as I conclude my remarks, that we have tried as hard as we possibly can to put very narrow parentheses around the operation of this direction for investment activity. The last thing I think the parliament would want to see, or that I would want to see as the

current Treasurer, or a government would want to see is a growing or expanding capacity for elected members or ministers of the day to direct investments that Funds SA may or may not make.

If the parliament can be assured that there is very little room for that to occur, that it can only occur under very tight strictures and cannot expand out from those very tight parentheses, then I think we give confidence to all those entities that have invested funds with Funds SA that no harm should be coming to their investments as a result of these sorts of changes. For example, that is a consideration that all of us would have along with another 200,000-plus South Australians who have their superannuation funds invested with Funds SA.

Merely by providing this change, we do not unnecessarily put at risk those important funds as well as other funds around government that are invested through Funds SA. With my customary brief remarks, I conclude my contribution.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (16:51): I also rise to speak in support of this bill, which I think is a testament to the Treasurer and the Premier in taking leadership in this government on this particular issue. Although the former government declared it was too difficult to remove state government funds from Russian assets, our leadership team, the Treasurer and the Premier acted on this issue as a matter of urgency after this parliament was formed.

The commonwealth has already prohibited the import of oil, refined petroleum products, natural gas, coal and other energy products from Russia, and has also prohibited the supply, sale and transfer of certain luxury goods. I am very proud that South Australia is committing to joining with other states and nations in imposing economic sanctions on Russia in response to their acts of aggression against Ukraine.

In the face of international condemnation and tough economic restrictions, Russia continues to pursue its acts of aggression against Ukrainians, ignoring the pleas of the international community, and that is heartbreaking to still see on our TV screens. The resulting deaths of thousands of civilians and millions of people being displaced from their home is a tragedy for the entire globe at this point in time. We are seeing impacts here, obviously, in our energy prices and petrol prices. Beyond that, the humanitarian implications are horrific.

We probably feel a little bit distant here from what is going on over there. We do see it on our TV screens and probably think it is a bit of a movie, but many of us here—and I am looking at the Minister for Police, with his family background, and the Premier, with his family background—know the horrors of being refugees and having our homes invaded. In my own electorate of Enfield there is a significant Afghan population who fled their homes and landed on the safe shores of Australia through, in many cases, refugee camps in Pakistan and detention centres, horrifically, here in Australia as well.

My own story is that I was not born in Adelaide. I was born in London. On the way through, my family were displaced from their own home in a village called Eptakomi in Cyprus. In two weeks, we will be commemorating the 48th anniversary of the invasion of Cyprus by Turkey. That is a moment of great sadness for my family and for more than 30,000 Cypriots who call Australia home. On 20 July 1974, the Turkish military invaded Cyprus and displaced more than 150,000 Greek Cypriots, including my family.

We were forced to jump in the car with my young brothers, Tony and Michael, who were six and eight at the time, in the middle of the night with nothing but the clothes they were wearing, driving across the island to escape gunfire and tanks and the terror of that invasion by Turkish soldiers. As a result of what happened in 1974, one in three Cypriots became refugees, displaced from their homes, forced to relocate in many parts of the world.

I still remember the stories of my brothers at that time. My brother Michael was crying because he lost his little red car. Actually, I think he was so psychologically scarred that the first car he bought was a little red Nissan Xer. I do not know if he realises it was a little bit of scarring that caused him to go that full circle. My eldest brother Tony was crying night after night because he left his pillow at home and said he could not sleep without his pillow.

My mum has told me stories of being pregnant with me during that pretty awful time. My father had to stay behind in Cyprus. With Tony and Michael, she went on a ship to Greece and then caught a plane over to the UK, where my uncles had already moved some years earlier. I am pretty sure that doing that on your own with two little kids and being pregnant was pretty horrific for her as well. I was not born in Eptakomi; I was born in London only a matter of months after that pretty horrific thing happened to my family.

During the course of the invasion and subsequent occupation, many Greek Cypriots lost their lives—in fact, thousands. More than 2,000 Greek Cypriots were shipped off to Turkey as prisoners of war and almost none of them were ever released. There are still 1,500 Greek Cypriots who remain missing. That is 1,500 families who do not know where their loved ones are, who are facing grief day after day, 48 years later, because they do not know where their sons or daughters, or brothers or sisters are buried.

We are hoping against hope that that is resolved in some way, shape or form, but people are losing hope. For the sake of all those Ukrainians who are going through this, I hope they are not living this story 48 years later, that they have not been able to find their loved ones or move back home. Cyprus today does still remain divided between north and south. The European Court of Human Rights has found against the Turkish government for abuses of human rights in the course of its occupation.

The United Nations Security Council, through Resolution 367, universally condemned the Turkish government's declaration of the occupied territory as a federated Turkish state, and I wholeheartedly support that condemnation of my family's island. In its occupation of Cyprus, the Turkish military has sought to ethnically cleanse the occupied territory through the violent expulsion of Greek Cypriots from their homes. They have resettled more than 120,000 mainland Turks onto the northern part of Cyprus—similar to those things we are seeing now with the Russians going into Ukraine. The Turkish government needs to remove its military from Northern Cyprus. There is no other answer to that situation. There is no other answer than for Russia to get out of Ukraine.

My family, along with many other South Australian Cypriot families, had their lives destroyed and we have deep, deep empathy for the Ukrainians who are facing a very similar situation. As it happens, for the first time in 19 years I am going back to Cyprus in only a matter of days. My children are going to Cyprus for the very first time. We are going to attempt to cross the UN Green Line and go and see the village and a very special church to my mother. She is 80 this year, and the reason we are doing it is to make sure that mum knows I have gone and had a look before she passes.

This is a horrific situation that Ukraine is going through. We need to do more to help these people. We need to make sure that if they are coming to Australia they are coming here safely and that they are protected and welcomed here. With this particular bill, it is expressing our views on what is happening over there, and I wholeheartedly support that. I am very proud of our Premier and the Treasurer for taking this forward, and I commend this bill to the house.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (17:00): I rise in support of this bill. In doing so, can I first acknowledge and thank the Minister for Small and Family Business for her words, her contribution and for sharing her lived experience. Her life has been shaped in a huge way by an experience of dislocation, an experience of war and an experience of aggression. The minister has spoken at length in this place before on her experience, as has the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, as have I, about what it is to live and breathe a refugee story. I thank the minister for her words today.

This is a bill that is clearly about a series of key pillars. Most importantly, this is an expression of political leadership on behalf of this government, on behalf of the Treasurer and, most importantly, an expression of political leadership on behalf of our Premier. It is an expression of political leadership, not just in government but in the months leading up to our being fortunate enough to form government. In fact, it was an expression of political leadership in mere days after the invasion of Ukraine by Russian aggressors.

I stood proudly next to the Premier on a number of occasions as a member of this place with eastern European heritage, which I will speak to in a moment. There are few times I have been prouder to be a member of the great Australian Labor Party than seeing the political leadership

firsthand of the Premier in respect of his undying, unquestionable and unabridged support for the people of Ukraine through words and actions.

I do note in respect of words of support and actions of support that very much largely the support for the people of Ukraine is entirely bipartisan in this state. I note the support for Ukrainian people, and the strong stance against the Russian invasion has come universally from right across the political spectrum, although not entirely. There have been parts of our mainstream political discourse that have been less than supportive to all initiatives being put forth by governments of the commonwealth and of states, but the suite of responses immediately as a result of the heartbreaking reality of Ukraine were very clear to see.

I congratulate the former Premier, the member for Dunstan, on his efforts in that regard and, as I said, the Premier (member for Croydon) for his immediate political leadership. This is something that has very much formed part of the Premier's leadership when it comes to this state, our political party, and our government's response about refugees, about displaced persons, about those people who would seek to give everything up to simply find safety, to simply find refuge, to simply be able to wake up in the morning without the fear of war or invasion.

The Premier's ongoing support for a more compassionate response from a government perspective to those people seeking refuge in our country is very clear for all to see. The Premier has put his money where his mouth is, and this state, under his leadership, has advocated in our short period of government for a significantly larger humanitarian intake of migration into this country.

The fact is we are a country that is richer for migration, and we are a country that is stronger because of refugees—refugees just like the Minister for Small and Family Business's parents, refugees just like the Hon. Tung Ngo in the other place, refugees just like my father—who gave everything, and continue to give everything of themselves, to make our state, and our country, a fairer and more just place to live.

The Premier's leadership in this regard is worth those comments because in politics leadership matters. Frankly, the only thing worse in politics than standing for something is standing for nothing, and that is not something that the Premier will be accused of doing. In standing in support of this bill, I also do so as someone who has traditionally and fundamentally not been a supporter of divestment when it comes to funds under management or superannuation. I will discuss fundamentally why, in supporting this bill, I think there is a huge difference between the way that this bill is crafted, and of course divestment as a blunt instrument.

The Treasurer spoke in his contribution about the pros and cons, the risks and opportunities of us as a state, and Funds SA as the investor of these funds, taking a stance through our existing ESG framework. Now ESG is something that I have been a very firm advocate for in my time before entering this place. I have been very fortunate to have contributed to both national and international bodies of work in respect of workers' capital, superannuation investment, retirement savings, and the need, the importance, and in fact the duty of investors to consider the environmental, social and governance framework of investing workers' capital, workers' money.

This is workers' money. Superannuation is deferred workers' earnings, and the ESG principles around those are incredibly important. They have been and continue to be part of a significant degree of international work being undertaken by institutional investors, led very proudly by a number of Australian industry superannuation funds; a great partnership of business and trade unions, capital and workers. That ESG work that is being undertaken will lead to better outcomes for business. It will lead to better outcomes for workers who invest their money on trust in these funds.

Most importantly, it will lead to better returns, to better retirement savings, because when we are investing in junk assets, when we are investing in assets with diminishing returns or increasing risk or, for that matter, investing in Russian assets which are, frankly, the combination of all those categories, we compromise the retirement savings of working people and we compromise the ability to have adequate retirement income for working people who have deferred their earnings into superannuation.

Traditionally, I would argue and have argued that divestment is a blunt instrument that does not adequately deal with the systemic issues it seeks to address and that ESG and the collaboration and work around ESG is a better approach. However, when it comes to matters of extraordinary

principle, when it comes to matters like the first postwar invasion of a sovereign nation, a liberal democracy, as we are currently seeing in Ukraine by Putin aggression, we need to make account of that.

In supporting this bill, I commend the drafting, the consultation, the work and the leadership shown by Funds SA, by both its executive leadership and the chair of its board, for the pragmatic manner that will absolutely guarantee its sole purpose—that is, the retirement savings of its members. This will guarantee that. I commend Funds SA chief executive, Jo Townsend, and chair of the board, Paul Laband. I have previously worked on a board with Paul Laband and commend his appointment by the former government and his exemplary leadership both in governance and in a technical and strategic approach to investments that very few people have.

I support this bill as someone who has not traditionally supported and who will not continue to support a blunt approach to divestment. The importance of this bill is not to be understated, and it goes to the contemporary understanding of the response. As I said in my opening remarks, the heartfelt support for the Ukrainian people shown by both sides of politics and by South Australians has been profound.

Australian government—the former Morrison government and the current Albanese government, as well as the Marshall Liberal government and the Malinauskas Labor government—has provided support, particularly in the provision of capital and asset support, whether that be Bushmasters repurposed for the resistance of the Ukrainian people or the support recently provided by SA Health and SA Ambulance through the ongoing supply and provision of medical equipment to the civilians of Ukraine as they continue to struggle against the aggression. All these things matter.

They matter because not only do they provide material support for the Ukrainian resistance but they are also a sign of extreme support and extreme solidarity with Ukrainians who live in this country and who live here in South Australia. I want to especially acknowledge and thank the Ukrainian community here in South Australia for their advocacy for the Ukrainian struggle and also for their friendship. I am one of a number of people in this house and this parliament who are fortunate enough to call the Ukrainian community friends, and I am fortunate enough as an Australian man of Hungarian descent to be literally across the border from Ukraine.

At various times in the last century there have been quite enormous boundary changes, as has often happened throughout Europe, and at various times the sovereign territory of Ukraine has been part of the Hungarian border and vice versa. Growing up with the Ukrainian community, none of that mattered. The friendship between the Ukrainian community and the Hungarian community, the Ukrainian community and the Polish community, and the Ukrainian community and the Baltic or Slavic communities was extraordinary.

Ukraine has been at the epicentre of geopolitical struggle for generations. As the borders change and as the aggression from Germany or Russia tends to congregate within the sovereign lands of Ukraine, it continues to strike me and remind me about the resilience of the Ukrainian people—the bravery and also the kindness of the Ukrainian people. It is that kindness and the generosity of the Ukrainian people that I have known growing up in Royal Park next door to Ukrainians, across the road from Ukrainians, two doors down from Ukrainians.

But it is the kindness that we now see in the way that the South Australian Ukrainian community, largely led by the Association of Ukrainians in South Australia and President Frank Fursenko, have generously welcomed Ukrainian displaced people into their homes and our community and how they have supported them in an entirely unabridged manner.

That support has not just been about the expression of the kindness of the Ukrainian community but it has also assisted government, because it is quite a difficult process for governments to support people leaving war-torn countries like Ukraine, in the manner that mostly women and children have, in a culturally appropriate way, and that would not have occurred if it were not for the support and ongoing leadership of the Ukrainian community here in South Australia.

I have spent many hours at the Kozak Bar at the Ukrainian association since being elected to this place. In fact, an event every year which I refuse to miss is Malanka, which in the Ukrainian Julian calendar is the new year celebration. As I have spent time there since the invasion of Ukraine,

I have definitely noticed a different feel and a different atmosphere at the Ukrainian association, at the Ukrainian hall and in the Kozak Bar, and that is because it is busy and bustling and full of energy.

As you walk through to the rear of the hall, there is a makeshift clothing and accessory boutique, as it was described to me—all donated goods and all staffed on a volunteer basis—where Ukrainian displaced people can attend and feel as though they are able to continue to support themselves and their families in a manner that recognises their resilience.

But it also acknowledges that most Ukrainians do not consider their current stay here in South Australia as permanent, because the bravery and the resilience of the Ukrainian people continue to dictate and convince me that in the conflict in Ukraine the Ukrainian people will prevail. They will prevail and they will do so with the support of most of the Western world, of liberal democracies, and with South Australia and Australia being able to hold their heads high as global citizens supporting those most in need at the time of their greatest struggle.

I finish on this point because it is the most important and perhaps the most driving factor in my public life, and that is that support in the most important time of need, at the most profound of times, was exactly what welcomed my father here to Australia as a refugee in 1957. As he picked up arms and fled Hungary as part of the Hungarian revolution, the same aggression, the same methodology and the same ideology that he fought, the Ukrainian people now fight as well. That drives me in politics and it commits me to public life in his memory. He passed away in January this year and I know that he would be proud that this parliament is considering every bit of action that it can in standing up to the aggression of Russia.

While I understand and recognise that debate in this house must be in English, as I said on the night after the invasion of Ukraine at the Ukrainian association, I also say this evening: Slava Ukraini.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (17:21): I rise to support the Superannuation Funds Management Corporation of South Australia (Investment in Russian Assets) Amendment Bill 2022. This is an important piece of legislation and, importantly, one of the first pieces of legislation that we, as a new government, have brought before this parliament. Firstly, this is something that our new Premier is very passionate about, that we should be doing everything possible that we can as a state to support the people of Ukraine in their struggle against Russian invasion that they are facing at the moment.

I think this is a dangerous time for both democracy and for the peace of our world as we have known it for a long time in terms of the dangers we are currently facing. It is important that we do not allow such an invasion and such aggression to go unresponded to by the international community. In doing so, we all have to play our part in making sure that this has the appropriate response. One of the easiest ways that we can do that is by making sure that the funds we hold as a government, in particular superannuation assets held on behalf of public servants in South Australia and other funds that are held by Funds SA, are not invested in Russian assets.

That is a clear and simple proposition, a proposition that was made clear by the former federal Liberal Treasurer, Josh Frydenberg, who called on state governments to take this exact action. It is disappointing that this action was not taken by the previous government, but we are now righting that wrong and making sure that this is action that will be in our statute book to make sure that we are no longer investing in Russian assets.

As other speakers have said, this becomes a difficult area in terms of where you draw the line in relation to what areas should be invested in or not by our funding bodies in South Australia. I would argue that we should not go too far in trying to draw too much of a moral compass over investments that should be made, but there should be some things that are absolute in terms of making clear that our funds should not be invested in particular assets.

One of those, I understand, was a decision made a long time ago in relation to investment in tobacco companies. This is something that has been raised across governments around the country—commonwealth, state and territory—over the previous 10 years, and this is an area of policy I have long had interest in. This is obviously of key importance in the health portfolio, that we should be doing nothing that should be in any way supporting companies whose whole reason for being is

to create products that ultimately kill people and cause significant disease and impacts upon our health and hospital systems.

That is very clear, and I think that there is wide support in the community, that we should not be involved in any way as a government in terms of investments, and similarly here. When it comes to Russian investments, I think there is vast, broad community support that we should be taking all action to make sure that we are no longer investing in Russian assets, given the impact we have seen on the Ukrainian people. This is not where our involvement as a state government ends, however.

We have been doing everything possible to make sure that we can provide assistance to the people of Ukraine, whether it is through people who have come here to South Australia or will in the future, or whether it is about supporting and providing goods or assistance to people on the ground in Ukraine. I had the pleasure this week of visiting the Ukrainian association in Hindmarsh in South Australia. We had an excellent project, led by the SA Ambulance Service, to provide 70 of our defibrillators and heart monitoring devices. They are now on their way to Ukraine in a staged way to make sure that we can provide additional support for health services on the ground.

It is an awful thing to say, but it is true, that there has been a huge destruction of hospitals and health facilities in Ukraine by the Russian invasion. The health services available there are very thin on the ground, and devices like those we are donating are very high-tech, in that they not only provide defibrillation that can be used by anybody but they also provide a high level of support for our intensive care paramedics in the work they do in monitoring people's hearts on a day-to-day basis in South Australia.

That is the sort of use that will be useful in a hospital-like situation. The vast majority of these devices we will be sending over will not be used necessarily in ambulances, as they have been in South Australia, but they will be used in hospitals, given the high functionality of these devices. They provide ECG services, they provide blood oxygen level readings, they provide carbon dioxide readings, they provide a whole range of different forms of monitoring that intensive care paramedics can use, and they will be very well used when they are received in Ukraine. It was great to be there the other day when a number of the children from the school and the community had written messages on the boxes that will be sent over.

This is not the first support that SA Health has provided to Ukraine. This comes after five pallet loads of medical devices, equipment and supplies have already been sent over to support as well. We are actively exploring all opportunities of how we can help people on the ground. Of course, that is not where our government involvement ends. As a government, we have made significant donations to the cause. We have also made our commitments in terms of making sure that we can help with resettling people here in South Australia.

It was great to visit and to see the facilities that are being used by the Ukrainian association to help schoolchildren who are now here in Adelaide and who are receiving assistance from the association. I want to thank everybody there for the incredible work they have been doing to provide assistance to families. I also visited to see the sheds they have at the back of the association, where many people have come to donate items of clothing and other key household items that can be used by family members, and that has provided a huge level of support from our community.

We have also heard directly, as a cabinet, from the Ukrainian Ambassador to Australia. The Premier invited him to meet with our cabinet—I believe it was the first state cabinet he has been able to address—to hear directly of the issues being faced on the ground and to hear how welcome the South Australian government's support has been for the fight they are engaged in. We cannot allow this type of aggression, this type of invasion, to go unchecked.

I think it is also very welcome that Australian governments—both the former Morrison government and now the new Albanese government—have also been providing significant assistance. Additional assistance was announced just this week by the Prime Minister upon his visit to Ukraine to see firsthand and to meet with the President of Ukraine and offer Australia's full support for their efforts.

Clearly, we cannot allow this to stand. This bill has an important function of providing that. I thank the Treasurer and the Premier for bringing it to this parliament to make sure that we can give our full support to Ukraine and our full denunciation of the actions of Russia and all its entities in terms of the outrageous attack on democracy and innocent people and, unfortunately, the death of many, many thousands of civilians that we have seen in eastern Europe over the past few months.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

At 17:31 the house adjourned until Tuesday 6 September 2022 at 11:00.