

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 30 November 2022

The SPEAKER (Hon. D.R. Cregan) took the chair at 10:31.

The SPEAKER: Honourable members, we acknowledge Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the traditional owners of this country throughout Australia and their connection to land and community. We pay our respects to them and their cultures and to elders both past and present.

The SPEAKER read prayers.

Bills

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY COMMISSIONER BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (10:32): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to establish the Office of the Construction Industry Commissioner, to provide for the powers and functions of the commissioner and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (10:33): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the Construction Industry Commissioner Bill 2022. This bill provides essential and urgent protection for South Australia's construction industry, which has come under concerted and coordinated attack from militant unions supported by this Labor government. That this bill is required at all is a sad indictment on the failure of our Premier to stand up and protect our construction industry and South Australian jobs.

At a time when they most need our support, the Premier is instead cosying up to John Setka's militant CFMEU. He has welcomed John Setka's CFMEU to South Australia with open arms, putting South Australian jobs and families at risk in the process. That is why the opposition has been forced to step in and to stand up to the CFMEU's bad behaviour, aiming to protect our construction industry by introducing a bill to establish a South Australian construction industry watchdog.

This bill provides for a construction industry commissioner who will promote the rights of building and construction industry participants, respect for the rule of law and work health and safety. The commissioner will facilitate and encourage the fair treatment of building and construction industry participants in their commercial dealings with each other or in relation to any other matters generally relating to their workplaces.

The commissioner will be a one-stop shop for our building and construction industry to register any concerns relating to safety, industrial action, allegations of coercion, and threatening behaviour. The commissioner will also facilitate the resolution of complaints through measures such as mediation and making representations on behalf of notifiers and complainants in accordance with relevant legislation, such as the Building and Construction Industry Security of Payment Act 2009 and the Work Health and Safety Act 2012.

In terms of ministerial accountability, the bill provides that the commissioner will monitor and advise the minister about practices that may adversely affect building and construction industry participants within the industry. The commissioner must put forward to the minister a report on the commissioner's operations each year, setting out any complaints made and any practices or conditions that adversely affect builders and contractors within the industry.

The commissioner has the power to compel individuals to provide information that the commissioner requires to undertake the commissioner's functions under the act, and the maximum penalty for failing to comply is \$20,000. The commissioner has the power to suspend work health

and safety entry permits if the commissioner is satisfied that a work health and safety entry permit has contravened the Work Health and Safety Act 2012.

The commissioner also has the power to direct matters to appropriate investigative agencies, including SAPOL, the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, the Commonwealth Ombudsman and the Fair Work Ombudsman. To protect individuals when giving a notification or making a complaint to the commissioner, the bill provides penalties of \$10,000 for individuals and \$50,000 for a body corporate should threats, coercion or intimidation occur in the course of the performance of functions under the act.

Industrial relations powers have for some time been a commonwealth responsibility, with relevant acts including the Independent Contractors Act 2006, the Fair Work Act 2009 and the building and construction act 2016. Up until earlier this year, the Australian Building and Construction Commission, established by the former federal Liberal government, has covered issues and matters such as wages and entitlements, unprotected industrial action, freedom of association, coercion, discrimination, sham arrangements, unlawful pickets and right of entry, yet the federal Labor Party has shamefully gutted the Australian Building and Construction Commission, leaving South Australian businesses unprotected from union thugs.

In South Australia, we have seen this play out firsthand. It started with the election of the Malinauskas Labor government in March, with \$125,000 worth of support from the CFMEU. In return for this payment, the Premier has rolled out the red carpet for John Setka to take over the South Australian branch of the CFMEU. Since that moment, we have slowly but surely seen the CFMEU infiltrate our local construction industry, putting jobs at risk.

It started with intimidatory behaviour towards the Master Builders Association, including the alleged damage of cars, and has progressed to threatening local businesses if they do not sign up to union deals. Many impacted businesses have been too afraid to speak up, but last week I was proud to stand shoulder to shoulder with John Nicholls from the family-run Crane Services at Wingfield. They are being held to ransom by John Setka and his cronies, who have rejected a 16 per cent pay rise offer and are now undertaking rolling strikes. This is crippling the business, and Mr Nicholls may be forced to restructure, which will cost people their jobs and livelihoods.

The Premier has repeatedly said that if he was made aware of bullying and intimidation he would stand up to it. Unfortunately for South Australian businesses, there has been silence and inaction. In fact, the CFMEU is so emboldened by the Premier's failure to stand up to them that they have undertaken an advertising blitz, including on the government's own tram network.

The Premier should be ashamed of himself for standing by as these militant union tactics are used against local South Australian businesses. Where the Premier has failed to fill the void left by the abolition of the federal building and construction industry watchdog, the opposition is today standing up for local construction businesses and workers right across our state.

The CFMEU must not be allowed to run roughshod over our local construction industry. The Premier must call out this behaviour instead of condoning it. The opposition has done the work for the government; now the government needs to support this bill and stand up to union thugs once and for all. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

CLIMATE CHANGE AND GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS REDUCTION (TARGETS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 November 2022.)

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:42): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes24
 Noes.....16
 Majority8

AYES

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

NOES

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

PAIRS

Boyer, B.I.	Marshall, S.S.	Szakacs, J.K.
Cowdrey, M.J.		

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

ELECTORAL (TELEPHONE VOTING) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 November 2022.)

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:47): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes24
 Noes.....16
 Majority8

AYES

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

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
Ellis, F.J.
McBride, P.N.
Pisoni, D.G.
Tarzia, V.A.
Whetstone, T.J.

Batty, J.A.
Gardner, J.A.W. (teller)
Patterson, S.J.R.
Pratt, P.K.
Teague, J.B.

Bell, T.S.
Hurn, A.M.
Pederick, A.S.
Speirs, D.J.
Telfer, S.J.

PAIRS

Boyer, B.I.
Marshall, S.S.

Cowdrey, M.J.

Szakacs, J.K.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (MINISTERIAL DIARIES) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 November 2022.)

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:52): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes24
Noes.....16
Majority8

AYES

Andrews, S.E.
Brown, M.E.
Close, S.E.
Hildyard, K.A.
Hutchesson, C.L.
Mullighan, S.C.
Piccolo, A.
Stinson, J.M.

Bettison, Z.L.
Champion, N.D.
Cook, N.F.
Hood, L.P.
Malinauskas, P.B.
Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)
Picton, C.J.
Thompson, E.L.

Bignell, L.W.K.
Clancy, N.P.
Fulbrook, J.P.
Hughes, E.J.
Michaels, A.
Pearce, R.K.
Savvas, O.M.
Wortley, D.J.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
Ellis, F.J.
McBride, P.N.
Pisoni, D.G.
Tarzia, V.A.
Whetstone, T.J.

Batty, J.A.
Gardner, J.A.W. (teller)
Patterson, S.J.R.
Pratt, P.K.
Teague, J.B.

Bell, T.S.
Hurn, A.M.
Pederick, A.S.
Speirs, D.J.
Telfer, S.J.

PAIRS

Boyer, B.I.
Marshall, S.S.

Cowdrey, M.J.

Szakacs, J.K.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

*Motions***INTERNATIONAL DAY OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITY**

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (10:58): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises that 3 December 2022 is International Day of People with Disability;
- (b) notes that this is a day to celebrate people living with disability, to promote public awareness of the issues people face, and to consider how we improve access and inclusivity in our communities;
- (c) acknowledges that 46,000 South Australians, including children, receive support from the National Disability Insurance Scheme, with South Australian taxpayers contributing more than \$840 million to the scheme each year;
- (d) remembers that the NDIS is a scheme that was designed by Labor to give people with disability choice and control over their own lives—which is an objective we continue to strive for in our state-run supported independent living homes and other disability services; and
- (e) applauds the dozens of state and local bodies that have developed and implemented disability access and inclusion plans.

I am delighted to speak on this motion, which celebrates people with disability and the importance of the International Day of People with Disability. This year, we are being asked to look beyond and to start having real conversations about disability, to challenge some of our preconceived community attitudes and to celebrate the unique stories and experiences of people.

This is a call to action. Together as a community we need to start to look beyond and discover more about the person, their skills, talents and interests, and to change attitudes and perceptions of disability while taking real action to be more inclusive. People are not defined by their disability. It is also important to note that, while there are 4.4 million or one in five Australians who have some form of a disability, not all disabilities are visible.

Promoting a similar theme in South Australia, the Department of Human Services launched the multiaward-winning See Me for Me campaign aimed at shifting the narrative by asking people to see disability as another form of diversity in society. The campaign focused on the interests of four people while using humour to get the message across. The campaign introduced us to Annette, who cannot change that she is a motorsport fanatic with a need for speed; Charles, who is tired of feeling judged for being Nickelback's number one fan; Michael, who does not care what anyone thinks about his love for pineapple on a pizza; and, finally, Charlie, who is not changing his Crocs and socks for anyone.

International Day of People with Disability asks our community to stop and think about how we can be more inclusive, and I am proud to be part of a government with a vision to build an accessible and inclusive South Australia that is based on fairness, respect and equity. Through the state's Disability Inclusion Plan, Inclusive SA, we have a commitment to address the challenges facing people with disability and to ensure our state is accessible and inclusive for all South Australians.

All government agencies and nearly all local councils have released and commenced implementing the actions in their Disability Access and Inclusion Plan. These plans and actions are decreasing barriers and increasing opportunities for people living with disability, their families and carers to participate in the community more fully.

This year our government delivered the country's first, and perhaps the world's first, Assistant Minister for Autism. The Hon. Emily Bourke MLC from the other place will help our government to deliver South Australia's first Autism Strategy, which has been co-designed with the autistic and autism community. We will also develop an autism charter that all government agencies will be required to sign up to.

Our Minister for Human Services recently launched the uniquely South Australian Pavely smartphone app, which provides users with a directory of venues and facilities across the state and the opportunity to find, rate and review their experiences based on accessibility and overall inclusiveness. The minister also announced in this chamber the members of the new disability

ministers' advisory council, which will play an important role in advising the government on high-level strategic issues relevant to people living with disability right across our state.

Importantly, the Minister for Housing and Urban Development has advocated for new minimum accessibility standards for residential builds that will improve our accessible housing stock. It was unfortunate and very concerning to learn that those opposite did not support these new minimum accessibility standards at the previous Building Ministers' Meeting.

A critical part of inclusive communities is the ability for people to get out and about and for people to be visited at home. So it is great that tens of thousands of people, especially those living with disability, will continue to be able to use the South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme after our government secured a deal with the commonwealth to fund its NDIS participants.

Following years of mismanagement, our new federal Minister for the National Disability Insurance Scheme, the Hon. Bill Shorten, has been working with our state minister and disability ministers right across the country to rebuild community trust in the NDIS. As well as agreeing to bring forward to this year a much-needed review of the scheme, the disability ministers have set an ambitious agenda focusing on:

- employment opportunities for participants;
- forward and compliance;
- hospital discharge; and
- reducing the number of cases referred to the Administrative Appeals Tribunal.

We need to get this right.

In closing, I would like to touch on some of the events and celebrations that will occur across South Australia in line with the International Day of People with Disability this year:

- Minda Incorporated will be holding its annual celebration, featuring 24 market stalls, food trucks, live music, dances and amusement rides and a petting zoo, and I am told there will even be an appearance by Father Christmas himself;
- the Mount Barker Library will be hosting an art exhibition by members of the local disability community;
- AMPLIFY! is a new theatre production by No Strings Attached Theatre of Disability running from 1 to 3 December at the State Opera's rehearsal studio;
- Nature Play SA will be hosting a guided nature work through Onkaparinga National Park; and
- the City of Playford will be hosting Celebration of Ability—Mission: Is Possible at the Playford Civic Centre.

These are just a few of the events that are being run by community organisations and local government across this weekend. I encourage everyone in this place to get out to these events and ensure that you look beyond the disability. Information on those events this weekend across the state and the country can be found by visiting www.idpwd.com.au. I commend this motion to the house.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (11:05): In speaking to this motion, I will reflect on some personal experiences I have had with a friend who had a terrible accident at the age of 23. He went from a self-employed, successful person working with livestock to falling off a horse, breaking his neck and becoming a quadriplegic. It is really not until you experience something with someone who is close to you, whether that is a child who is born with a disability or a child who has had an accident, or where a disability has been detected some time later, or in the case of a close friend who has had a life-changing accident—and I have experienced some issues through my friend.

Back quite some time ago, in 1986, there was a lot less awareness of those with disability, a lot of ignorance, I guess, of what to expect—for example, when you book a table at a restaurant and say, 'And, by the way, we'll need a chair removed because one of our guests is in a wheelchair,' and you turn up at the restaurant and find that the table is the furthest away from the door and that it

is impossible to get to the table without everybody in the restaurant standing up and moving their chairs to allow the wheelchair through.

You think, 'Well, why did that happen? How could that possibly have happened?' Obviously it is a lack of awareness and perhaps some embarrassment by those running the restaurant not knowing what to expect when somebody turns up in a wheelchair. This may sound like a very First World problem, but it can be humiliating for that person with the disability. In this case it was a wheelchair, but of course it could be any disability that may require special attention or an alteration or a special request, whether that be when visiting a restaurant, whether it be on public transport, or whether it be even in private transport.

One of the other things my friend experienced was the use of disability cabs. Most of us take for granted that, when we want a cab, we simply ring for one, or if we are in a busy street we can wave one down, or we call an Uber or equivalent and one turns up. But of course if you want a disability taxi, often you need to book the day before for an appointment, in particular, whether that be a social appointment or a medical appointment, but there is still no guarantee that taxi will turn up on time. There are stories of a taxi being three hours late for a booking that was made 24 hours prior.

I am very pleased that situation has improved since the previous government increased the lifting fee that would be paid for those who were operating disabled cabs to increase the incentive to use those cabs to service people with disabilities, rather than using them for anybody who wanted a cab. I believe that has improved the situation, but there is still plenty of room for improvement.

I was also pleased that, through the previous government's Skilling South Australia program, we saw the highest growth in the nation quarter after quarter of those with disability who were starting apprenticeships and traineeships. Paid traineeships and apprenticeships were taken up by those with disability. South Australia had the best numbers for quite some time in that space, and it was because of the flexibility of the Skilling South Australia program, that we were able to work with RTOs that specialised in working with people with disability or working within that industry.

With the extra funding they received to support on-the-job training, they were able to work with disabled people and bring them into the workforce not as people with disability but as part of a team, as part of the workforce in a business or an industry in which non-disabled people work because of the changes that were made and the flexibility that program gave.

It is important that we recognise the International Day of People with Disability. I am so pleased that so many gains have been made over the years from what I first experienced with my friend back in 1986 and also for families of people who unexpectedly have a change of life situation, whether it be a young child breaking a neck while skiing or a workplace accident or some other situation that has impacted the person and hence the family. I know that planning the future in those early days and the adjustments that are made are very difficult.

In my friend's case, from working as a livestock contractor he transitioned into becoming an artist, an artist who was able to produce work that demanded thousands of dollars and sold out exhibitions. It was quite an amazing transition, but of course there was a lot of support from family and friends in order to get that up and running. Obviously, I am talking about a success story, but it was not without a lot of pain and a lot of adjustment in that person's life. Programs like the NDIS are very important because not everybody has family support and not everybody has the financial ability to buy those services.

It is also very important that the NDIS be sustainable and that we do not have a situation where those who provide NDIS services have one price for customers who walk in without NDIS support and a higher price for those who have NDIS support. I have had reports in my office of people who have made an appointment to see a physiotherapist, an occupational therapist or some other provider and, and when they arrived and presented their qualification for NDIS funding, all of a sudden the price went up. This must change. I do not know why that is happening, but it is obvious that it is not a situation that is sustainable.

We have seen it with products sold to support the lifestyle of those who may require chairs that lift, for example, or machines that help with exercise. If you buy them from a normal retailer,

often they are half the price than if you buy them from somebody who is on the NDIS list and specialises in providing those things for people with disability.

I think it is important that we recognise the different lifestyle, the different challenges that people with disabilities have, but that we also recognise not just the challenges brought about by their disability but the challenges in navigating everything from catching a cab to actually receiving the health services and care services that they require to help them live a standard of living closer to that of the rest of the nation. In doing that, we can provide a service through government, through not-for-profits and through families and friends that improves the quality of life for those with disability and, of course, their families.

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (11:15): I would like to thank the member for Unley for contributing to the debate and sharing some of his personal experiences over the years. I take this opportunity to once again encourage all members to get out and about this weekend and visit some of these fantastic events and to start some real conversations about disability. I commend this motion to the house.

Motion carried.

LOT FOURTEEN

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:16): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises that during its four-year term the Marshall Liberal government completely transformed the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site into a hub of technology, innovation and culture;
- (b) recognises that Lot Fourteen is creating thousands of jobs and showcasing South Australia to the world;
- (c) recognises that Lot Fourteen is host to Australia's national Space Agency, cementing South Australia as the national centre of Australia's space industry;
- (d) recognises that Lot Fourteen will showcase our rich and diverse Aboriginal culture to the world and attract more visitors to South Australia with establishment of the Aboriginal Art and Cultures Centre; and
- (e) acknowledges the Marshall Liberal government for establishing a vibrant, world-class innovation, startup growth precinct at Lot Fourteen.

I take this opportunity to speak in parliament today about Lot Fourteen, which in such a short period of time has been transformed into an entrepreneurial technology and innovation hub that really is, and will be into the future, an engine room of growth for the South Australian economy in the high-tech sectors, in the space sectors and also, equally, in the defence sectors.

The changes that have occurred in the last four years have been rapid, and I got to experience the transformation of Lot Fourteen throughout that time, and most especially in my previous role as the Minister for Trade and Investment, collaborating and working with so many businesses that are setting up there, that are interested in setting up there as well, with the opportunities.

Lot Fourteen will be able to establish an ecosystem there, and it is all about the synergies and even just interactions with companies, interacting and being able to problem-solve together. It is that sort of collaboration that then fuels further growth as well. Certainly, it is worth noting that in my new role as shadow minister for defence and space industries Lot Fourteen is still really important to those two areas, so my interest in Lot Fourteen certainly remains very much to the fore.

In terms of Lot Fourteen, it is on the site of the former Royal Adelaide Hospital. It is a seven-hectare site, really strategically located within the city. It is close to the CBD, along North Terrace. It is located right near the university precinct and fronted by a number of existing heritage buildings, and it really has a lot of opportunities. Those opposite were not so sure what to do with it. They had a number of attempts at thinking what to do with the former Royal Adelaide Hospital, and in the end they decided to go down the housing development path, looking to establish about 1,300 houses on that site.

On this side of the house, the former Marshall government saw there was so much more opportunity that could be created on that strategic parcel of land, a seven-hectare parcel of land. We wanted to turn it into a really major economic engine room for the city and for the state of South Australia as well. How are you going to do that? Really, it is about looking at what are the growth industries so that South Australia can compete on equal terms with what is becoming more and more a global economy.

Certainly we saw that opportunity was to create in Lot Fourteen a hub of technology, a hub of innovation, while recognising that it could also be a centrepiece for culture. We see that along North Terrace we have the Museum there as well, so we continue in that vein. Importantly, we are looking to create this innovation centre so that it can not only be a jobs factory for people but also showcase South Australia. More and more it becomes necessary that we give people a reason to actually see South Australia for what it is—that is, it punches above its weight on so many occasions. I think it is better for the world to know that as well.

As I mentioned, one of those key industries that we are looking at for future growth in a global economy is the space sector itself. Currently, the space sector in Australia is worth about \$5.6 billion, but that is projected to grow to around \$12 billion by 2030 and, importantly, create about 20,000 jobs. There you can see the synergy between growing the economy and also growing jobs.

I was really excited to be present at the site of Lot Fourteen nearly four years ago on 12 December, when the former Prime Minister Scott Morrison, alongside the member for Dunstan and former Premier, announced that Lot Fourteen was going to be the location of the national headquarters for the Australian Space Agency and that it was going to be based in Lot Fourteen. That really was an exciting announcement for South Australia.

At the time, Australia was one of the very few OECD countries in the world that did not have a space agency, so as a country we were not engaged in the opportunities for what space is going to become. To be able to secure the Space Agency here at Lot Fourteen in South Australia really was a once-in-a-generation opportunity for the state and again brings us to the fore as well. At the time, there was a lot of push to put the Space Agency in Canberra. The problem with that was that it would invariably become quite bureaucratic in nature.

What is driving the space industry at the moment is the fact that it is being commercialised. No longer is it the domain of governments having to put in big amounts of money. What you find is really forward-looking, innovative companies that want to invest in space because they can see the opportunities there. The opportunities are not actually in space; it is more how they can make our life here on Earth so much easier.

There are massive opportunities around the Internet of Things. More and more, technology is miniaturising, and a great example is the amount of computational power we have in our iPhones today. It dwarfs the amount of computational power of decades ago, when space was first being formed. That is what is driving it and, because it can be miniaturised, it allows commercial operators to get into space. As to the cost of putting something into space, the laws of physics mean that you have to have a certain amount of thrust, and so the lighter things are the easier and the cheaper it is to put them into space, so more and more commercial operators are able to move into this area.

In South Australia, we have some great companies that are really pushing forward into this space because they recognise the opportunities. Companies such as Nova Systems, Inovor Technologies, Silentium Defence, Fleet, Myriota and Southern Launch are really at the forefront of this. One of the big reasons why we were able to convince the national Space Agency to be headquartered here in Lot Fourteen in South Australia was that ecosystem that was already thriving and that we were looking to further grow. That shone a light on what is going on here in South Australia in terms of why the Space Agency should be here and has also created a lot of attention.

It is worth talking about what the Space Agency is all about. It is based upon a lot of science, technology, engineering and maths skills. It is trying to push into solutions in terms of space operations, space science, along with Earth tracking, positioning and observation. It was not just the Space Agency landing in Lot Fourteen that helped us to support the space industry but it was also Mission Control being set up. The \$6 million Mission Control Centre was also to be located in

Lot Fourteen. The reason for having Mission Control is to allow the small space missions, the small space sector, to be controlled right here in South Australia and not to have to rely on other countries. That is going to help them further grow their business.

As I said, Mission Control was run by Saber Astronautics. It is a great facility and it allows not only small satellite missions to be controlled but also real-time control and testings. Even before the launch, it allows satellites to be tested to make sure they are going to be compliant once they are in space. That also helps to accelerate Australian satellite technology, which is really important. Having it here in South Australia means that satellite technology is able to be developed closer to home, which, of course, is in South Australia.

Alongside Mission Control in Lot Fourteen in the same building is the Space Discovery Centre, a fantastic tool to help engage our youth wanting to get involved in space. Space does inspire a lot of students, especially in the fields of science, technology, engineering and maths. This gives a tactile way for students to come and learn about space and how it relates to Earth. They will have gained from movies what their view of space is, which involves things in far away galaxies, but as I said before, the real advantage of having a space sector here in South Australia is that it has on-the-ground applications in agriculture, in mining, in water tracking, and in bushfire management and recovery as well. That \$6 million Discovery Centre is helping to grow our space sector.

Another fantastic result was that in 2019 we had the SmartSat Cooperative Research Centre also looking to set up here in South Australia at Lot Fourteen. That was really pushed by the University of South Australia's Professor Andy Koronios, among others. That brings to South Australia a big research powerhouse working with around 85 international and national partners looking to invest over \$190 million, with a further \$55 million from the then federal government.

That is a total of \$245 million in research based here over the next seven years looking to focus on three key areas: advanced communications; Internet of Things connectivity; and also Advanced Satellite Systems, Sensors and Intelligence and Next Generation Earth Observation Data Services. This is a real example of building out the space sector and having real-world application here and the jobs that flow from that.

Another significant institution set up at Lot Fourteen is the Australian Institute for Machine Learning. It is one of the top three institutes in the world for artificial intelligence in the vision field and also machine learning, so it is doing some great things in terms of big data and being able to analyse that. Closely aligned with that is the MIT Living Lab. MIT is one of the other big research institutions with a very high rank (I think it is No. 2) in terms of machine learning, and to have that based here in South Australia is fantastic. To have it based in Lot Fourteen is phenomenal as well. Other places in the world with MIT Living Labs are Beijing, New York and Istanbul, so South Australia is in really good company there.

Of course all this data analytics is very important, but more and more we have seen the need to have safe and secure data. That comes in the area of cyber, and also on Lot Fourteen is the Australian Cyber Collaboration Centre. This is vitally important to get our small businesses up to speed with cyber. Out of that, they will be able to look to grow into defence contracts, and also make sure they are resilient, because there are certainly massive threats in the world.

These key pillars in Lot Fourteen are thriving, but what they are also doing is attracting global companies to South Australia. We had Accenture come here, which has 500,000 staff globally. It has set up here in South Australia, and AWS, Amazon Web Services (I think the No. 2 biggest company in the world), set up a presence in Lot Fourteen based on what was going on. There were no incentives for AWS to come here, and what that does is give great service for other small businesses to be there.

Other big companies, such as Google, have set up there. Microsoft have set up their Azure Space, and Nokia have come here. There are massive opportunities in the area of 5G, and that is set to grow to about \$8 trillion globally by 2030. Having these massive companies here allows for fantastic job opportunities. South Australians no longer have to go overseas or interstate to get those opportunities; they can be here in South Australia. It is going to play a big role going forward, in terms of setting up globally significant careers based here in South Australia.

It is very worthy that we acknowledge the efforts of the Marshall government in attracting Lot Fourteen as such a transformational legacy that will help generations to come.

Mrs PEARCE (King) (11:32): I move the following amendments to the motion:

Delete (a) and insert new (a):

recognises that during its four-year term, the Marshall Liberal government enacted the former Labor government's plan to transform the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site into a hub of technology, innovation and culture;

Delete (e) and insert new (e):

acknowledges that Lot Fourteen is a vibrant world-class innovation and startup growth precinct.

In 2018, the Weatherill Labor government committed to spending \$350 million over nine years, if re-elected, to redevelop the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site into a technology hub. At that time, former Premier Jay Weatherill stated:

The old Royal Adelaide Hospital site presents us with an enormous opportunity to bring together educational institutions, government and the private sector to work together

This included converting a portion of the site into a space for high-tech startup companies. Adelaide University was intended to be the first tenant, with an artificial intelligence institute. Lot Fourteen now hosts the Australian Institute for Machine Learning (AIML), which conducts globally competitive research and development in artificial intelligence, machine learning, computer vision and deep learning.

We acknowledge and credit the work done by the Marshall Liberal government, in particular by the former Premier, to create an innovation district at Lot Fourteen. Lot Fourteen is now a flourishing innovation district that is attracting national and international attention. Recent announcements include:

- the opening of BOM's Australian Space Weather Forecasting Centre, which will deliver 24/7 space weather forecasting and warning services to support Australia's space industry;
- Airbus Defence and Space announced that it will open its first Australian office at the Defence and Space Landing Pad; and
- The Circle—First Nations Entrepreneur Hub, located at Lot Fourteen, presented the First Nations Business Showcase at the Adelaide Entertainment Centre, with almost 100 First Nations businesses in attendance. This is the largest event of its kind in South Australia today.

Personally, I have been to Lot Fourteen quite a few times, and every time I am absolutely blown away. I was there earlier this year to launch Deloitte's Digital Pulse report, which was extremely honest and open about the need to address diversity within the sector, focusing on where the issues are currently stemming from.

I recently had the pleasure of being a guest speaker at the EY space leadership breakfast, focusing on ESG (environment, social, governance) and its relationship to international space agencies. I must say that the panel, and the leaps and bounds that we are making in this space, is absolutely out of this world—pun intended.

I am pleased to share that the Malinauskas Labor government will continue to support Lot Fourteen and ensure its success. This is why the Premier recently announced that we have suspended work on Tarrkarri—Centre for First Nations Cultures, as this is a unique opportunity to promote and celebrate First Nations culture. The Premier has appointed a panel comprising former Indigenous Australian Minister Ken Wyatt, former New South Wales Premier Bob Carr and former investment banker Carolyn Hewson, to urgently review the \$200 million project, with their findings due to be handed down early next year, which I am very much looking forward to seeing.

I am proud that we are encouraging innovative minds in our state, and Lot Fourteen is the absolute place to be for that. I cannot wait to see what is achieved next there.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (11:35): I am just recovering from the claims made by the member for King. I clearly remember the Weatherill government's competition for what they were going to put on that site; they had no idea what they were going to put on that site. I remember that one of the ideas put forward was a large mound of dirt with grass on it. That was one of the ideas, and then it moved on a bit further and it was going to be a housing development—very original. What an original idea for that site.

It was quite extraordinary—again, handing over Parklands to private ownership through a housing development. That was six months before the election and it all fell apart and did not happen. Then there was a change of government and there was a Premier who had a vision for that site, and within days work started on turning that site into a significant innovation centre for South Australia.

There is no doubt that we have shaken off our reputation as the city of churches. Remember, that was based upon St Peter's Cathedral at the top of the hill and all the parishes we see in the suburbs. That has all been replaced now and we have Lot Fourteen, the innovation centre and all the centres of innovation we have throughout the suburbs and regional South Australia.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall: We've still got the churches.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: We still have the churches, but not many people attend them these days. I think we have more people working at Lot Fourteen than attending church on a regular basis in South Australia. This is a success story, and I congratulate then Premier Steven Marshall on driving this project.

When I first spoke on their first visit to those who were interested in running the Startup Hub on behalf of the government at Lot Fourteen, the work was so advanced. That was less than 12 months after the change of government, and they actually thought that we had taken over a project from the previous government because the work was so advanced. Of course, there was no work by the previous government. There was a competition, an announcement of a building site—

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: We hear interjections from the member for Mawson, who I think on his site—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley will not respond to interjections.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I think he put on his Facebook site, 'Lot Fourteen I call bullshit.' Is that on your Facebook site?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I think it is, or it was at some stage.

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I think it was at some stage.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley knows the standing orders.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: It took Premier Malinauskas a week to debate before the election before he supported Lot Fourteen. It took him a week before the election before he congratulated Steven Marshall on Lot Fourteen. He did not congratulate Jay Weatherill: he congratulated Steven Marshall on Lot Fourteen.

This amendment put forward by the member for King is insulting to the intelligence of everybody who works in that sector and everybody who has a connection with Lot Fourteen. They know who drove the innovation agenda in South Australia, and it was not Jay Weatherill. It was Steven Marshall who drove that agenda and the rapid change we saw in Lot Fourteen.

People from around the world came to South Australia to set up their businesses in South Australia. Not only that, small businesses and startups had a home base and they had an introduction and a connection to those who wanted to invest. Getting investment funding into startups

in South Australia is a difficult task that has been made easier because of the work done by Premier Marshall in conjunction with the work being conducted at Lot Fourteen.

South Australia is on the map when it comes to innovation. I was so disappointed to hear the Deputy Premier, who is the minister responsible for innovation, tell the estimates committee that this government is not interested in IP ownership remaining here in South Australia. IP ownership is an export industry, but it has been our downfall for years where we have invented things in South Australia and then sold that invention off instead of developing that product here—having the IP here, having that foreign currency coming in, paying the bills and paying salaries that people spend here in South Australia.

There is no plan from this government to actually get behind startups in South Australia. Inventors and scientists are producing services and products that are in demand around the world, yet the government has no desire for that to remain here in South Australia. I was shocked when I heard that was the policy of the new government. That is not where we need to be. We do not want to be in the situation where we are relying on others to move to South Australia. Yes, it is always great to have someone moving to South Australia and expanding their business into South Australia, but it is even better when South Australians are expanding their businesses from South Australia. South Australia is their home.

We saw a major shift happening in South Australia over about a 40-year period with the closure of head offices here. What did that mean? Whenever it was time for those head offices, which had moved to the Eastern States or transferred their South Australian office to the Eastern States, to rationalise their businesses, guess what? South Australia was the victim of that rationalisation—whether it was banks, pastoral companies or manufacturing companies. South Australia was the victim because we did not have those head offices in South Australia.

That is the vision at Lot Fourteen, that South Australia is the base. South Australia is the place where people go who are innovators, who are inventors, who are entrepreneurs. I am very pleased that just as the member for Morphett was speaking we saw a tweet from Lot Fourteen where tenants at Lot Fourteen had just won several awards in the last week across the nation.

DTEX Systems won the cybersecurity category of the national awards run by InnovationAus.com. MyVenue, another South Australian company, which sells purchasing systems to American football and basketball stadiums, won the national emerging exporter of the year award at the Australian export awards by the Australian Trade and Investment Commission (Austrade). Professor Andre Luiten from QuantX Labs won the Innovator of the Year Award at the Science Excellence and Innovation Awards run by the Department for Innovation and Skills. That is another showcase of what has been happening in South Australia over the last four years when science and industry come together and people invest in locally developed science and innovation in South Australia.

We did more than just facilitate innovators in South Australia: we actually engaged them to do government work. Our Go2Gov program invited government departments that had problems that needed to be solved to go out to the innovation market and out to the startup market. We invited those people to come up with a solution. It was a process that funded these startups to put their pitch together. We had solutions developed from Corrections through to the Department for Primary Industries and many other departments that were able to go out to the startup sector and produce these solutions and products for the South Australian government.

Rather than the government giving grants and then hoping that something would happen, we were actually in business with these businesses, which could then tell prospective clients from around the world that the South Australian government was one of their clients. It was a very, very successful program that saw the growth of startups and the scale-up of startups here in South Australia. I do not accept the nonsense that is coming from the other side, that this is a Weatherill government initiative. Steven Marshall was responsible for this and the former Liberal government.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:45): I will first address my remarks briefly to the amendment that has been moved by the member for King. Ill-advised it really is and inappropriate in the circumstances of the great success of Lot Fourteen for the government to come along here on this motion and to

somehow endeavour—as the member for Unley has just expressed—in a completely unnecessary way to reinvent a history that is so well known by the people of South Australia given the experience of the government in the last four years.

What we are talking about in Lot Fourteen is a \$2.2 billion innovation precinct. It has been hugely successful, and it has been driven by the initiatives in government of former Premier Marshall, who transformed what was in the lead-up to the 2018 election a story of faltering and failure, including in particular the failure of what had been—and uncontroversially so; it is just a fact—a negotiation of long standing by the Weatherill government with a consortium of Commercial and General and John Holland to develop the precinct for residential purposes.

The government when it announced in September 2017 the collapse of those negotiations, including with reflections on that by then Premier Weatherill and with reflections from the now Treasurer, the member for Lee, about the amount of government investment necessary in order to make that site attractive for that location said, 'Well, we've had to throw our hands in the air and drop that, so we're now going to scratch our heads and go back to the drawing board.'

It is all very well for the member for Mawson to interject and say, 'This is all heroically the Weatherill government's initiative,' and for the now Minister for Planning to say, 'Oh, well, this is all about us,' but it is completely—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Omnipresent, member for Taylor.

Mr TEAGUE: Well, if the member for Mawson wants to take complete responsibility, I reflect on what I heard from the member for Mawson and I acknowledge what has been an indication across the floor.

I say that because here we are in the Parliament of South Australia at a moment when we need to make sure that all shoulders are to the wheel in terms of promoting innovation, promoting the good things that go on in this place and promoting the great success that Lot Fourteen has become, because it is precisely the result of a change of direction that occurred and very much in the lead-up to the 2018 election at which the Marshall Liberal government succeeded and then commenced pursuing the course that we have seen so successfully pursued with the result, as I said at the outset of my remarks, that we celebrate a \$2.2 billion world-class innovation district.

So those who are following along might have reference, and in case anybody else might like to pursue the argument of the revision of history in the form that is expressed in the amendment, I refer for members' benefit to the article in InDaily that was published on 19 September 2017. I will take the journalist's summary as a suitable point of reference for these purposes and in this moment, with the amendment having just been announced in recent minutes.

The article by Bension Siebert is under the heading 'Govt kills "penthouses on park lands" as oRAH deal collapses'. It is quite a lengthy article that spells out all the things that occurred in the lead-up to the September collapse of what had been that longstanding proposal by the Weatherill government. What we saw post September 2017 from the then Weatherill government could have been no more than a series of workarounds and attempted fixes to say, 'Alright, well, what do we do?' So much ought to be uncontroversial.

There is the fact that we had got to a point where something else needed to be done and that there was assessment of the rehabilitation of the land that was necessary, a determination of what might be viable and so on. We see cogent reflections on that from, among others, Pat Gerace from the Urban Development Institute, where he said, 'Alright, you are not going to build houses there. You better build them somewhere else.' That is what we heard from Pat. That made sense in the context of that announcement.

We heard reference—and he is quoted in the piece—from the then Master Builders SA chief executive Ian Markos, who was urging at that point: 'Government, get on with the job. Give us work that we can do. We would be interested in doing what we can.' But make no mistake: at that point we had a situation in South Australia where we had an old Royal Adelaide Hospital site that had been the subject of extensive consideration, and it ought not to be a matter of controversy that the

plan, such as it was, that the Weatherill Labor government had, actually fell over and that the government was at a loss as to what to do next.

I would say one thing more to underscore the lack of a coherent plan that was available, articulated, planned, negotiated, or anything in that regard. It is importantly the question of a contemporary gallery on that site, which was in the context of the same article, so it is there conveniently for reference and is no doubt not the only one. We heard from the then premier at the time that it was far from a certainty that there would even be an institution of that kind that might get the go-ahead because there was no business case for it at that time.

There are any number of aspects of what has gone on at Lot Fourteen over the last four years, but do not go ahead and attempt to rewrite history in a way that, as the member for Unley has observed, treats the people of South Australia as dummies. They know what has happened over the last four years. It has been a roaring success and we ought to continue without this reinvention or attempted reinvention of history in that regard.

If I have not done it loudly enough already, I take the opportunity to pay tribute to the important leadership in this regard of former Premier Marshall. It is well known that all through the period that ensued post 2018 former Premier Marshall was front and centre in promoting the innovation capacity of Lot Fourteen. The state owes former Premier Marshall a great debt of gratitude for that work over that sustained period and he continues, I am sure, to be a key part of promoting further development on that site.

In the short time that I have available in this debate, I reflect on two participants at Lot Fourteen. One is the First Nations Entrepreneur Hub, The Circle. It is providing business development support and has been doing so successfully for getting on two years, having been officially launched in 2021 and opened by former Premier Marshall at that time. It is a space where startups can collaborate, develop their business ideas, enter new markets and create jobs for South Australians, a typical example of the sorts of activities that are facilitated at that site. I commend the motion in its original form.

Ms PRATT (Frome) (11:55): I certainly very happily and with great alacrity intend to speak to this motion and support and commend the member for Morphett for giving us an important opportunity to laud the creation, the imagining, the existence and delivery of Lot Fourteen to South Australia. It certainly was an initiative of the former Premier, the member for Dunstan. I take great pride in the fact that the Marshall Liberal government recognised the opportunity to create a hub of technology, as we have discussed, of innovation and culture, to create thousands of jobs and to showcase South Australia to the world.

Lot Fourteen, of course, is a \$2.2 billion world-class innovation district on North Terrace. While the current government were very busy at the time building the most expensive hospital in the world, which we now call the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, they had made no plans for the old site. In fact, as we have heard, they planned for the site to become a high-rise housing development. Of course, what we did instead was to imagine something much more exciting. Lot Fourteen is one of the most exciting urban renewal projects in Australia. It is the centrepiece of the 10-year Adelaide City Deal, which has attracted global talent in space, defence, high-tech and creative industries.

As we continue to prosecute, former Premier Marshall was the driving force behind the announcement that the Australian Space Agency was to be based in Adelaide at Lot Fourteen. As a former teacher, I know for certain that this has given teachers an impetus and a real-life example of a workforce application to encourage the further take-up of STEM or STEAM subjects (science, technology, engineering, arts and mathematics). I think the inclusion of arts comes into its own at this particular site when we reflect on the inventions and innovations that are forthcoming but that require application, creation and ingenuity.

Lot Fourteen is still leveraging the power of collaboration to drive innovation and the translation and commercialisation of cutting-edge research into global markets, on which my farming communities depend. Lot Fourteen also supports world-class research and development of excellence in, as I mentioned, the space, defence, high-tech and creative industries.

I want to push the significance of Lot Fourteen back into regional South Australia and reference the significance of agtech to our economy. Under the former Liberal government, in 2020, the South Australian AgTech Strategic Plan was developed by the AgTech Advisory Group, and it is clear that there is potential for an additional \$2.6 billion to be unlocked by the advancement of agtech take-up.

The primary focus of this plan, the strategic plan, is to accelerate adoption of agtech on farm while also taking the pre and post-farm agricultural value chain into account. The key agtech stakeholders were consulted on the strategic plan, and those stakeholders included primary producers, agtech developers, members of industry and researchers, scientists and government agencies. They did discover that there are some key barriers to the adoption of agtech and, in conjunction with Lot Fourteen, I am confident that they will be overcome.

I think it is important to note that where there are barriers on farm, we will not be able to unlock the potential of the \$2.6 billion. It goes without saying that some of those barriers were that the technology was not always fit for purpose or that it was a prohibitive capital cost for farmers to adopt. We certainly appreciate in regional South Australia that poor connectivity will inhibit the use of the software and the apps that have been designed.

Those challenges notwithstanding, the opportunities are endless. We know from comments made recently by Adrian McCabe of Alma and of course the chair of Grain Producers SA that, although weather has delayed harvest, there is still the expectation of a bumper grain harvest this year. The application of software on farm management, the product traceability and improvement of the genetic value of plants and animals just compound from there.

Of course traceability and sustainability also have an essential link to the agtech industry in relation to our state's significant wine industry. Wine exports are impacted by the growing issue of wine fraud. It is estimated that 20 per cent of wines worldwide are fake. One startup at Lot Fourteen is tackling this problem head on—and why wouldn't they?—using the most advanced technology to track and trace produce from grower to consumer. Who does not want that?

Innovation in my own beloved Clare Valley delivered the initiative of screw-tops on wine bottles to the rest of the world. Not stopping there, Jeff Crosse wines has continued to innovate with the introduction of blockchain technology embedded into the screw-top to further enhance traceability and provenance. Consumers and exporters alike can be comforted by the quality of wine they are buying. It is precisely these innovations in primary industries as supported by startup entrepreneurs at Lot Fourteen that we celebrate its existence and the delivery by the former Marshall Liberal government. SA is the better for it.

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (12:02): Thank you to the shadow minister, the member for Morphett, for bringing this motion before the house because it is a very important opportunity for this house to acknowledge something that stands as one of the greatest achievements of the Marshall Liberal government. Lot Fourteen, which I described in my maiden speech as being an innovation precinct that the likes of Sir William and Sir Lawrence Bragg would be proud of, has quickly developed into a hub of technology, innovation and culture.

Despite the attempts by those on the other side of the house to rewrite history, we know that this was not always the plan for the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site. We have heard the member for Heysen quote media reporting from InDaily, and he said there are many more. There are indeed many more, including from the ABC, which quotes then Premier Jay Weatherill in 2016 spruiking plans for a thousand apartments on this site. It quotes the then I think urban development minister, Stephen Mullighan, spruiking the site and about how good it is going to be to have people living on that site. It also quotes the then opposition leader, Steven Marshall, who said: 'That sounds like a missed opportunity to me. That sounds like a missed opportunity for us.'

On coming into government, Steven Marshall, the member for Dunstan, had a better idea, had a better plan, had a bold and transformative vision for this site that has fast become a reality. Already this precinct has developed into the incredible hub of innovation that it is today, with more than 140 businesses on this site employing more than 1,400 people. It is attracting some of the world's best and most innovative organisations, and it is exactly what we needed at this site.

Importantly, this did not happen as an accident. This was not the result of luck, and it certainly was not the result of some sort of vision from Jay Weatherill. Instead, it was the result of the former Liberal government's strong leadership on this issue. State and federal government investment on this site has seen around 20,000 square metres of office space across the heritage buildings on North Terrace and Frome Road repurposed into an innovation and entrepreneurial ecosystem. Importantly and pleasingly, as this was happening the development was underpinned by an ethos of sustainability. It is expected that in excess of 100,000 tonnes of materials will be recycled from that site by the time that works are complete, which is very important indeed.

Also importantly, we can see that the transformation at the site is not just a physical one. Above all, it is and will be an economic transformation. As one of the youngest members in this house, it is incredibly important that we keep young people here in South Australia. To do that, we need to have the jobs of the future right here in South Australia. We need to reverse the brain drain and we need to attract talent and capital from interstate. What we have seen already in just a few short years is South Australians, young South Australians, who might ordinarily have gone interstate or overseas seeing greater opportunities right here in South Australia. The future is brighter right here in South Australia and the jobs of the future are here for them at home.

We see people staying or we see people, like I did, leaving for a period of time and returning because we are at the cutting edge of new innovative fields. I say that Lot Fourteen and the member for Dunstan deserve a lot of the credit for this. What we have seen on this site now is a focus on those jobs of the future: digital technology and innovation, creative industries, international education, tourism, health and medical industries, defence and space. Lot Fourteen is helping South Australia be at the cutting edge of all these innovative fields. It certainly is not the wasted opportunity that 1,000-odd apartments and a hotel building would have been.

What we instead see is Adelaide becoming a centre of excellence for various sectors, and perhaps the best well known is the Australian Space Agency. In December 2018, I was incredibly proud when the then Prime Minister and the then Premier announced that Adelaide would be the home of the Australian Space Agency. This was a once-in-a-generation opportunity, a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity, and the Liberal government of the time seized that moment, which means we now have not only the national space centre here but a huge ecosystem of private sector interests setting up around its hub of excellence.

We know that the space industry is going to triple in the coming years and that it is going to employ up to 20,000 South Australians by 2030.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Schubert knows better, as does the member for Frome. The member for Wright will cease interjecting. The member for Bragg has the call. Member for Schubert!

Mr BATTY: It is not an apartment building and it is not just a space agency either because we see a number of other centres of excellence setting up on the site. The Australian Institute for Machine Learning, a bold co-venture with the University of Adelaide, has 160 members and together they are responsible for ranking sixth globally for computer vision research and in the top three in Australasia for AI research generally. As the member for Bragg, it was a pleasure for me to recently meet with the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide to discuss the institute and to attend the University of Adelaide's Ingenuity Convention, which showcased some of this research and some of the great work that their researchers and students are doing.

It does not stop there. The Australian Cyber Collaboration Centre, or A3C as it commonly known, is also located at Lot Fourteen, and we are going to see cyber become incredibly more important as our modern digital and information economy grows. Again, this also provides those jobs of the future for our IT graduates coming forward. I could go on and on about the science and technology innovations at Lot Fourteen—and I will go on and on because I have not yet even mentioned the collaboration with MIT to develop Living Labs, Accenture's establishment of a hub, or the very recent announcement by Airbus that they are establishing a research facility at Lot Fourteen.

It has already, in a few short years, grown to a centre of excellence in so many different and innovative fields. It has attracted some of the world's largest and best organisations and companies—the likes of Google, the likes of Amazon, the likes of Microsoft and the Commonwealth Bank. This is the sort of innovation that is going to keep young people in this state and keep our economy growing.

I could go on more about science and technology innovation, but I want to briefly talk about how it is also a cultural hub at Lot Fourteen, and that is something I am pleased this motion also acknowledges. It is home to Tarrkarri—the Centre for First Nations Culture, which will honour over 60,000 years of continuous First Nations culture in this country. I very much hope that work on this centre can recommence and continue so that Adelaide can continue to cement itself as a significant world centre of art and culture and attract more visitors to our state.

What we have seen with what the Marshall Liberal government did at Lot Fourteen is the establishment of a truly world-class and vibrant space. It is a space that is already benefiting South Australia and it is this space that is going to continue to benefit South Australia well into the future. It is quite right that the Marshall Liberal government should be recognised for this outstanding achievement, and I am very proud to support this motion in its original form.

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12:12): It is with a great sense of pride that I rise today to support the motion moved by the shadow minister for defence and space, the honourable member for Morphett.

Lot Fourteen is one of the nation's leading entrepreneurial hubs, and it has attracted interest not only from right around the nation but from right across the world. This is what I would say is one of those once-in-a-generation investments, indeed a once-in-a-generation opportunity. It is a beacon of opportunity that has created thousands and thousands of jobs and set up our state as the startup state, the startup capital of the nation.

Who would have thought that the former Royal Adelaide Hospital site would be transformed into a springboard of innovation that would bring together some of the sharpest minds across the nation, creating significant capabilities in space and defence, in cyber, in high-tech and in creative industries? It very nearly did not because as far as the Labor government at the time were concerned the boldest vision they could muster was to turn it not into a startup precinct for this generation and those to come but into a housing development—a housing development in this prime real estate in the heart of the city.

I am not very often gobsmacked, but today I am genuinely gobsmacked at the rewrite of history those opposite have tried to portray. I am not sure who wrote the amendments of the member for King, or whether she believes it was genuinely the initiative of Jay Weatherill and the former government, but that is false and dishonest. We know that.

In fact, it is not just those on this side of the house who know that but those thousands and thousands of South Australians who have started jobs on Lot Fourteen, those thousands of businesses that have seen opportunities come right here to our state. It is not just the big companies like Google, like Microsoft, like Amazon who decided to set up here in South Australia, but the little guys, too, who actually just have an idea that they want to pursue right here in South Australia. They are now no longer drawn to the eastern seaboard or to Hong Kong, London or New York to pursue their opportunities in space: they are staying right here in South Australia.

In fact, this is one of the key projects that played a significant part in the Marshall government reversing the brain drain, where all our smartest, most creative and ambitious people were leaving the state because they saw no future here. The reason they saw no future here is because of the catalyst decision of the then Weatherill government, which said, 'No. In fact, our vision reaches as high as housing flats.' It was Steven Marshall, the member for Dunstan, who prosecuted that vision, who absolutely left no stone unturned to use this once-in-a-generation opportunity to turn Lot Fourteen into a beacon of opportunity.

It is now one of the main reasons that South Australia is known as not only the defence state of the nation but also the space state of the nation. We are now home to the national Space Agency. The national Space Agency is right here in South Australia, and it is right here on North Terrace in

Adelaide. We are home not just to the Space Agency but to Mission Control and hundreds and hundreds of people who are excited about the future of this state.

Every single premier at the time—from Western Australia, Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria—wanted it, and we got it here in South Australia. The reason we got it here in South Australia is that our former Premier actually had a vision, and that vision has been delivered. It is atrocious that those opposite are trying to claim some credit and pinch this idea.

Where do they get off suggesting that this was their idea? You could look anywhere to see that they wanted a housing development on it. It was as a result of the former Liberal government that we are now seeing more South Australians stay here in Adelaide to reach for the stars and to follow their own dreams. So it is with great pleasure that I support this motion.

I was listening to some of the contributions on this side of the house, and I would like to echo some of the comments made by the member for Frome. It is an important point to reflect on because, when people think about the national Space Agency, sometimes they rightly think about going to the Moon or going into outer space and launching rockets right from the heart of Adelaide, but actually sometimes it is much more practical than that.

We have farmers right across South Australia who are utilising some of the software and innovation that have been started and curated here. Ideas have been seeded and have grown into practical opportunities for farmers to utilise for their crops, to get more out of what they put in, and I think that is so fantastic. It is the direct result of the ambition of our former Premier Steven Marshall. It is the environment that he set up, the environment that said to businesses right across the world and right across the nation that South Australia is the place you want to be, that South Australia is the place where you can get ahead with a basic idea that starts right in the heart of the city, which the former government wanted for a housing development.

I do believe very strongly that this will be one of the biggest legacy items, not just for this generation but for those to come. It started with Steven Marshall, but ultimately the people who will be most rewarded are the people of South Australia and all those people who can stay here and set up a business right here in the state. I thank the member for putting forward this motion.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:19): I rise to support this motion by the member for Morphett.

The Hon. B.I. Boyer: I'm looking forward to it.

Mr PEDERICK: You can have a go if you like.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order! The member will be heard in silence.

Mr PEDERICK: Thank you for your protection, sir. The motion is:

That this house—

- (a) recognises that during its four year term the Marshall Liberal government completely transformed the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site into a hub of technology, innovation and culture;
- (b) recognises that Lot Fourteen is creating thousands of jobs and showcasing South Australia to the world;
- (c) recognises that Lot Fourteen is host to Australia's national Space Agency, cementing South Australia as the national centre of Australia's space industry;
- (d) recognises that Lot Fourteen will showcase our rich and diverse Aboriginal culture to the world and attract more visitors to South Australia with establishment of the Aboriginal Art and Cultures Centre; and
- (e) acknowledges the Marshall Liberal government for establishing a vibrant, world-class innovation, startup growth precinct at Lot Fourteen.

I, too, am agog that those on the other side would attempt to rewrite history and suggest that we enacted on a so-called Labor innovation under former Premier Weatherill to create an innovation and culture hub. What a pack of hogwash! That is probably as impolite as I can be.

Mr Teague: It's a technical term.

Mr PEDERICK: A technical term; that is a technical term. Seriously—people try to rewrite history, and this is what has happened here today, and it is completely outrageous. As the member for Schubert and others have rightfully said from this side, the best thing that the former Weatherill government could come up with was a block of flats. Seriously? It was going to be housing on some of the most prime land in South Australia.

We have arguments about what goes on parkland, and here we have a thriving innovation centre opportunity, which is the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site, and the best the other side, the former Labor government, could come up with is a block of flats. I look at some of that innovation that people are doing over there, and I think of the work of Myriota and others, with miniature satellites that can assist farming and agriculture and the work that they can do so that you can remotely look at water sources, whether they be tanks or troughs or bores or dams, especially for those people on vast properties who do not have the time to travel across thousands and thousands of square kilometres in some of those places.

I look at the opportunity for space that we have here in South Australia as we have seen over many years with what has happened up at Woomera. I had not been there before and I dropped in a few years ago and it is amazing the history of what we have done out of Woomera. I look at what we have been doing in more recent times with Southern Launch systems and looking at the launch site at Koonibba Aboriginal community not that far from Ceduna on the West Coast and the work that happens there where the launch operators come in. They have a lot of material in containers, they have a launch, everything gets packed up and they take everything away. It virtually leaves the land unscathed.

I look at the work that is happening at Whaler's Way with potential to launch there. Space is the frontier that we have been looking at so many times and it offers so much opportunity and innovation. Our former government did recognise the opportunity to create this hub of technology, innovation and culture to create these thousands of jobs and showcase this state to the world. This whole project is a \$2.2 billion world-class innovation district on North Terrace and it is a curated collaborative research and business ecosystem dedicated to driving productivity and solving complex global challenges on the site of the former Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Many companies have been attracted to this site and attracted to South Australia, which is a fantastic place to live. I am not a city boy, but if I had to live in a city I would pick Adelaide. So many people have come here from either interstate or across the world either to set up their startups or to take their businesses further into the future. It is a major economic opportunity for our state. It is one of the most exciting urban renewal projects in Australia and the centrepiece of the 10-year Adelaide City Deal to provide a springboard for innovation and bring together the state's leading abilities in space, defence, high-tech and creative industries.

Back on 12 December 2018, former Prime Minister Scott Morrison, alongside the former Premier, the Hon. Steven Marshall MP, announced that the Australian Space Agency was to be based in Adelaide at Lot Fourteen. This created a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity that positioned South Australia as a key player in the nation's space industry. The decision to make South Australia the home of the Australian Space Agency could be largely attributed to our vibrant and entrepreneurial space ecosystem.

Lot Fourteen is also home to the headquarters of the SmartSat Cooperative Research Centre, as well as the Mission Control Facility and the Space Discovery Centre. The SmartSat Cooperative Research Centre is one of the most significant space research collaborations ever forged in Australia. This research powerhouse brings together around 85 international and national partners. The Mission Control Centre is a focal point for space missions in Australia and accelerates growth of the space sector.

The centre provides the facilities for space startups, companies and researchers to control small satellite missions, enabling real-time control and testing and the accelerated development of Australian satellite technology. The Space Discovery Centre provides real leaps ahead in science, technology, engineering and mathematics or, as we know it, STEM. It is about education, engagement and inspirations for young Australians.

As an integral part of South Australia's growing innovation network, Lot Fourteen is leveraging the power of collaboration to drive innovation and the organisation and commercialisation of cutting-edge research into global markets, supporting world-class research and development excellence in the space, defence, high-tech and creative industries. The Entrepreneur and Innovation Centre is setting the global pace for multidisciplinary innovation, collaboration and entrepreneurship, which is specifically designed to suit the secure environment for defence, space and high-tech businesses and education and research institutions.

The flagship building will be a 16-level, 35,000 square metre building, which will be central to this area and home to a flexible campus-style innovation hub and ground floor collaborative event and food and beverage retail spaces. This is where the rubber hits the road. Already this year—2022—Lot Fourteen is home to a skilled workforce of more than 1,400 people from over 140 businesses attracting some of the world's most innovative organisations, including Google Cloud, Amazon Web Services, Microsoft Azure, the Commonwealth Bank and MITRE Corporation. They work alongside highly respected organisations, including the Australian Space Agency, MIT, the University of Adelaide's Australian Institute for Machine Learning, Stone & Chalk and the Australian Cyber Collaboration Centre.

Let us never forget who was responsible for Lot Fourteen: it was Steven Marshall and the former Liberal government.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:29): I, too, rise to support a very important motion by the member for Morphett because, as many of us would know in this place, the opportunity for South Australia to attract some of the brightest minds globally has been groundbreaking. I want to acknowledge the former Premier for his forward vision and his forward thinking for what he saw as an opportunity for South Australia to be an incubator as well as a support base for what the world is heading towards—that is, advanced technologies. It is about having an incubator hub in the CBD of Adelaide that is drawing attention to and putting focus on South Australia as a go-to, particularly for the advanced technology we now rely on as our new manufacturing base.

It is also something that I have been very focused on. As a former Minister for Primary Industries, I saw fit to what I would consider as hanging my hat on the Lot Fourteen hook to acknowledge the advancement of agtech here in South Australia and also for the primary sector to have a go-to centre or an attractant centre for the advancement of agriculture. I saw very early on in my term that South Australia, particularly the ag sector, food producers and the primary production area, needed some form of stimulus. What came away from the former Premier's vision was an ability for me to go to the then Treasurer and put proposals and policy on the table so we could potentially stimulate some of the forward thinking within agtech.

What I saw in my tenure as minister was that there were huge opportunities not only for new technology but for advancement in the already existing technology in the ag sector. We know that in recent times we have seen a lot of government institutions around the R&D programs within SARDI and under the umbrella of PIRSA, which gave me the opportunity to go to the private sector, just as the Premier did with Lot Fourteen, and attract some of that interest and attract some of those inquisitive minds so we could progress the ag tech sector not just through a government lens. It was about giving the private sector the opportunity to be a part of an open-door precinct, and that is what we saw over a lot of the research stations administered by PIRSA.

We saw that down at Struan. I want to acknowledge the catastrophic fire in the science lab there in recent times. It is such a pity that it happened, but we move on. As a primary producer myself, we are the eternal optimists, so we look forward at every opportunity. I am sure Struan will rebuild those labs just like any other business would do in a time of uncertainty.

The opportunity is more about looking through the lens of a private business wanting to make good within the advancement of agtech. What we have seen is a collaboration between PIRSA, SARDI and the Thomas Elder Institute as a prime example of what we saw down at Struan and at Kybybolite and also what we have seen, in particular, with opportunities within the forestry sector.

I do not digress away from Lot Fourteen. What I am trying to demonstrate is that we had a vision—the seed was planted—at Lot Fourteen on North Terrace. The government wanted to put apartment blocks there, but the former Premier had a vision for making South Australia a better place

to attract business, to be an incubator for manufacturing and to also attract the world's attention to our shores, and he has done that. As I listened to some of the government's contributions this morning, I was gobsmacked to think that they would not commend and give some level of appreciation for what a vision means here in South Australia, particularly at Lot Fourteen.

The vision that we have seen through government or the PIRSA agencies right across South Australia has meant that we have been able to open the door and have that policy to allow the private sector to come into our state and collaborate with government. I think that is a great outcome. I have mentioned the Thomas Elder foundation. I will mention Meat and Livestock Australia and AGT. GRDC and some of the great research and development institutions within the ag sector are now looking to South Australia for opportunity.

We know that some of the programs have been questioned as to why they would come to South Australia, but I think Lot Fourteen has now given the stimulus to any of those particularly commonwealth government focused bodies, whether it be in grains, whether it be in meat, whether it be in wine. The primary sector now has a focus on South Australia that there is opportunity, that there was a government that was focused on the advancement of the new technologies that potentially would grace our shores.

As the member for Morphett and others have contributed on this side of the chamber, the opportunities have been many and, I guess, quite diverse. We look at space, we look at defence, we look at all the other advanced technologies that would help us in our day-to-day lives. I think the opportunity has been that we are seeing that growth with advanced manufacturing. I want to pay homage to every business that has an investment in Lot Fourteen. We say thank you for showing faith in what the former Premier had a vision for in South Australia.

I would also like to quickly reiterate the opportunities that Lot Fourteen is presenting. It is about some of the satellite imagery. It is about making primary producers, not just people here in South Australia but globally, more productive. We know that the world is screaming out for more protection and more monitoring on food production. We know that the world is screaming out for better and safer measures put in place, with threats of biosecurity, and again that is some of the technology that has been overlaid within agriculture.

We look at the defence industry, how it is working collaboratively with the ag sector, and we look at some of the great technologies that agtech has put its arm around and that have come into the fold. We are very proud to have the Agtech Advisory Group. That was very well put together. Leanna Read was the chair and she has done an outstanding job as a leader all around South Australia, but particularly embracing that AgTech Advisory Group. There are great strategic thinkers coming together looking at ways that they can format and have that exchanging of ideas, those gatherings to stimulate people's thinking.

The workshops they are doing right around all those diverse sectors I think have been an outstanding success, and it is all on the back of what the former Premier's vision was. It is about advancement in South Australia with the technology and all the sectors that I think will lead South Australia into a very exciting advancement of manufacturing, advancement of space and defence, making sure that we in South Australia are proud of what we have on North Terrace at Lot Fourteen.

We are very disappointed to see that the Indigenous cultural centre has been pushed aside. I call it kicking the can down the road, but the government would say that they have deferred that project because they have had other priorities elsewhere. I urge them to reconsider not deferring that project any longer than it has to be. It was there to complement what is one of the most exciting precincts anywhere, not only in South Australia, not only nationally, but right around the globe. The globe's eyes are watching South Australia. They are watching Lot Fourteen for the opportunity in advancement with any technology that we care to talk about. I commend the motion.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (12:39): Firstly, I rise to say that I totally reject the amendments put by the member for King. Any look at this attempt to rewrite history plainly undoes it very quickly. Planning for what was to be done on the former Royal Adelaide Hospital site started in 2013. It took the Weatherill government three years to actually come up with a plan, which in 2016 was the net sum of a housing development and 1,300 apartment blocks.

A deal with Commercial and General went along for a while and, all of a sudden, in September 2017 the announcement was that it was not going to go ahead and, instead, the new plan would preference short-term and student accommodation to be released in stages. Any thought that housing development could be classified as technology and innovation is plausibly incorrect.

In fact, to further belie this statement, when the Marshall government came in in March 2018 with this innovative plan for Lot Fourteen to turn it into an innovation and technology hub, the first thing that had to be done was to undo the deal that was still in place with Commercial and General. Such was Labor's plan for innovation and technology there that it was still really rooted heavily in short-term housing and student accommodation.

Compare that with Premier Marshall and the effort he put in to really progress in a rapid state what was to go on in Lot Fourteen. I think that the real rubber hit the road when, alongside the former Prime Minister, on 12 December 2018 he signed the City Deal, which was then to provide significant hundreds of millions of dollars of funding into this precinct to unlock it. Alongside this was the fact that the national Space Agency was going to be located on that site at Lot Fourteen.

The efforts Premier Marshall made into getting the Space Agency to land in Lot Fourteen were significant. As I said in my earlier remarks, the big push was to put it in Canberra and to play even stevens with all the states, but it was in South Australia where Premier Marshall saw the opportunity for it to really be the foundation piece for our space industry—and that it was. That City Deal was more than just the Space Agency: it was also about unlocking Lot Fourteen.

I spoke before about Mission Control and the money that went into that, I spoke before about the Space Discovery Centre and the money that went into that and I spoke before about the MIT Living Lab and the Australian Cyber Collaboration Centre that sit alongside the Australian Institute for Machine Learning. Those institutions were attracted by what was going on in Lot Fourteen and what it could become, and they were vitally important. As I said, they then went on to unlock significant attraction in terms of business.

I talked before about AWS, Google and Microsoft Azure—these are massive worldwide players. One I did not get to mention was LVX Global, another fantastic company. It is a homegrown company based in Adelaide, and they specialise in delivering the Internet of Things and smart city building and infrastructure solutions. I can only surmise that that tenuous link is what Labor have between their 1,300 houses and actual technology innovation. The fact that we have companies here that want to set up in Lot Fourteen to do this smart city building and the Internet of Things right here in Lot Fourteen came about because of the work of the Marshall Liberal government.

Part of that City Deal, and something that was very forward leaning from Premier Marshall, was the significant \$200 million commitment invested into the Aboriginal arts and culture centre, Tarrkarri as it is known, meaning 'the future' in Kaurna language. That is transformational for recognition of a 60,000-year culture that we have here in South Australia. We have pieces throughout in our museums, in our art galleries, and having that as a centrepiece to showcase to the world our Aboriginal arts and culture is going to be transformational.

Those opposite have decided to delay it, and I think that is a huge mistake and does not do justice to the fantastic art and culture the Indigenous community has here not only from the Kaurna world but also from the other nations in South Australia, making up that art and culture. Lot Fourteen has been significantly transformed, and I acknowledge the Marshall Liberal government for establishing a vibrant, world-class innovation and startup growth precinct in Lot Fourteen.

The house divided on the amendment:

Ayes27
Noes.....18
Majority9

AYES

Andrews, S.E.
Boyer, B.I.

Bettison, Z.L.
Brown, M.E.

Bignell, L.W.K.
Champion, N.D.

Clancy, N.P.
Fulbrook, J.P.
Hughes, E.J.
Malinauskas, P.B.
Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)
Picton, C.J.
Szakacs, J.K.

Close, S.E.
Hildyard, K.A.
Hutchesson, C.L.
Michaels, A.
Pearce, R.K.
Savvas, O.M.
Thompson, E.L.

Cook, N.F.
Hood, L.P.
Koutsantonis, A.
Mullighan, S.C.
Piccolo, A.
Stinson, J.M.
Wortley, D.J.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
Cowdrey, M.J.
Hurn, A.M.
Patterson, S.J.R. (teller)
Pratt, P.K.
Teague, J.B.

Batty, J.A.
Ellis, F.J.
Marshall, S.S.
Pederick, A.S.
Speirs, D.J.
Telfer, S.J.

Bell, T.S.
Gardner, J.A.W.
McBride, P.N.
Pisoni, D.G.
Tarzia, V.A.
Whetstone, T.J.

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

RUBY AWARDS

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (12:50): I move:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges the important cultural, social and economic contribution of the South Australian arts and cultural sector to our state;
- (b) recognises the importance of the Ruby Awards in honouring the best of South Australia's arts and cultural sector—recognising artistic excellence, creative achievement, innovation, community involvement and inspirational leadership; and
- (c) congratulates the winners of the 2022 Ruby Awards.

Art has the power to transform, to illuminate, to educate and to motivate. It has the power to connect us and create stronger, more inclusive communities. As Japanese writer and Buddhist philosopher Daisaku Ikeda put it, 'The power of art can break the shackles that bind and divide human beings.'

In many ways, this is what art did during the period of the COVID-19 pandemic. Imagine the lockdowns and periods of isolation without art—without painting, reading, watching film and television, or listening to music. It allowed us to travel to different places and to different worlds while staying in the same place. I know we are so incredibly grateful to break the shackles of the pandemic and once again come together to celebrate art in person, and step back and acknowledge the sector's contribution to the cultural, social and economic wellbeing of our state.

One such event that does exactly that is the Ruby Awards, which honour the outstanding work of South Australia's arts and culture sector. The awards are named after late arts patron Dame Ruby Litchfield and recognise artistic excellence, creative achievement, innovation, community involvement and inspirational leadership. The 2022 Ruby Awards were announced at an invitation-only event on 25 November attended by the Premier and the arts minister.

I want to recognise one particular award in regard to an outstanding artistic or cultural event or project that had a significant impact on our community in South Australia. I am incredibly proud to say that the winner of this important community award was from my electorate; it was awarded to Uniting Communities and Guildhouse for its U City art project, 'The Encounter of Strangers'.

This multifaceted project was led by U City's Artist in Residence Claire Wildish in an open studio format, providing various workshops that allowed participants to explore their own creative projects and be mentored by professional artists, as well as get involved with exhibitions and community arts projects. This year's workshops included weaving, felting, jewellery, mosaics, mask making, lino and acrylics. As Claire put it herself:

Through art people are finding connection, friendship and even new purpose in their life. From learning to catch the bus for the first time just so they can go to art each week to finding their voice through poetry, pottery and

paint. This is who we are...supporting and growing a safe, creative place for strangers to meet, connect, make and create.

To quote one of the participants of the U City workshops:

You always let us be completely ourselves no matter what that looks like—the messy, the ugly and the beautiful. You have always created such a safe space for us, and I know that for myself and others this was the first safe space we have experienced. That is something that I get to treasure forever.

Congratulations to Claire, to Uniting Communities and to Guildhouse on the incredible positive impact you have had on the U City community on Franklin Street. It is another feather in the cap for U City, which has become such an incredibly vibrant, inclusive and thriving vertical community. I also have to note that it has amazing Italian food at Luigi's Delicatessen.

In closing, I would also like to acknowledge the short-listed nominees for this Ruby Award category: the Adelaide Youth Orchestra for *Verdi Requiem* and Writers SA for the Deaf Writers Project. All the Ruby Award winners and nominees should be so incredibly proud of what they have achieved. Through art you really are making the world a better place.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:54): I am very pleased to be able to speak in support of the motion before us, and I congratulate all the winners and nominees from the Ruby Awards. I was absolutely very sorry that I could not be there on Friday night—we had a very unwell two year old at home. Nothing short of that would have restrained me from coming along. I was very much looking forward to being there and celebrating the achievements of those artists, those South Australian companies small and large and, indeed, so many in the cultural sector who were honoured on Friday night.

This is, of course, a sector that did it very tough during COVID. Indeed, the whole community that benefits from the work of the artistic and creative sector in South Australia and around the world was denied the opportunity for so many periods during COVID in 2020 and 2021 to experience live performance. It was very disappointing. In South Australia, the restrictions on performances and on interaction were less than in a number of other jurisdictions.

I know in particular that the support provided to artists under the stewardship of former Premier and arts minister, Steven Marshall, was generous compared with that in other jurisdictions. It was nonetheless a very difficult time for many people in this sector, and that is to be acknowledged. Being able to come together to enjoy and to celebrate the opportunities and to appreciate, experience and participate in art and perform is absolutely wonderful.

The motion also talks more broadly about the social, cultural and economic contribution of the South Australian arts and cultural sector, and that is an important part of the motion too. Sometimes the perception of government investment in the arts is limited to only the economic impact that investment can realise. It is not just related to the arts group, but anyone who is pitching to government for the use of public funds for what they believe in will always talk about the economic impact. Sometimes you have the ratio presented of what sort of economic impact and investment by government will unlock. Invariably, Treasury will provide advice back to cabinet that this economic activity may well happen without government investment or it may not.

My view is very strongly that arts investments often realise in excess of what is anticipated, even by a highly paid consultant who might produce a report. Arts investments, especially if they are wise investments and investments strategically placed, will often encourage cultural tourists to come to South Australia—cultural tourists who are more likely to spend extra nights visiting South Australia exploring other aspects of our cultural heritage, our performances and festivals, and other parts of what South Australia has to offer. So, for its economic contribution, the arts cannot be undervalued.

When I was the education minister, I very strongly believed that the cultural and educational opportunities that are unlocked by government investment in the arts are really significant. They expose the next generation to high-quality art both through our elite performance companies and through small and medium companies who travel regularly and perform in schools, work with schools and encourage young people to go along to their performances. It is very special.

The Minister for Education and the Minister for Arts and I were all at Patch Theatre's 50th anniversary birthday function very recently. It is a perfect example of a company that inspires

our littlest learners to be interested and engaged in the arts. There are so many other great new theatre companies and great examples of young people achieving their best by being introduced to the arts, loving the arts and also having their broader minds opened to the possibilities and their capacity in other subjects enhanced by their engagement in the arts. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (12:59): In the last 60 seconds that I have I want to say how fantastic it was on Friday night at the Ruby Awards. It was a genuine privilege to be there, to give the opening address and to acknowledge all the fantastic winners of various awards.

The two I really want to touch on in the last few seconds are the recipients of the Premier's Award for Lifetime Achievement. Both were posthumous award winners: Bob Jesser, who did fantastic work behind the scenes in technical production at the Festival Centre and also for many years at the Odeon Theatre; and Hossein Valamanesh, who passed away earlier this year, was a great visual artist, sculptor and public artist. They made a fantastic contribution to the arts world. I want to acknowledge them both and say how sad it is that we lost them this year.

Motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Petitions

TUMBY BAY JETTY

Mr TELFER (Flinders): Presented a petition signed by 289 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to invest significant funding to ensure the long-term future of the Tumby Bay Jetty.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Independent Commission Against Corruption—Evaluation of targeted aspects of the Central Adelaide Local Health Network—Report—November 2022

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.C. Mullighan)—

Annual Reports 2021-22—

Compulsory Third Party Insurance Regulator
 Distribution Lessor Corporation
 Essential Services Commission of South Australia
 Funds SA
 Generation Lessor Corporation
 Government Financing Authority, South Australian
 HomeStart Finance
 Industry Advocate
 Lifetime Support Authority
 Local Government Finance Authority
 Motor Accident Commission
 Transmission Lessor Corporation
 Treasury and Finance, Department of

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

Child Protection, Department for – Government Response to Coronial Inquest into the deaths of Amber Rose Rigney and Korey Lee Mitchell—Report—November 2022

By the Minister for Human Services (Hon. N.F. Cook)—

Housing Trust, South Australian—Addendum to Annual Report 2021-22

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (14:02): I bring up the 20th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Question Time

UNION ADVERTISING

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:03): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier intend to take action to stop CFMEU advertising on trams? If not, does this send a message to domestic violence survivors and local construction businesses? Sir, with your leave, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: It has been reported this week that the CFMEU has taken out advertising on government-owned trams with an estimated cost of upwards of \$50,000.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:03): It's fair to say that this government's view is that when trains and trams come back into public hands there will be no political advertising—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hartley is warned. The minister has the call.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order. The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This is a matter for the Department for Infrastructure and Transport. However—

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is now engaging in stunts and will leave the chamber under 137A for the remainder of question time.

The honourable member for Hartley having withdrawn from the chamber:

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This is a matter for the Department for Infrastructure and Transport; however, the government does not believe that controversial advertising of this nature belongs on public transport. The advertising appears on Adelaide Metro trams and external advertising on department-owned assets is managed by a third-party agency, which is—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As part of this contract, advertising of this nature should have been brought to the department's attention for review. The requirement for the advertising agency did not occur in this instance, and the department is working with the third-party agency to ensure it has the opportunity to review advertisements in the future consistent with that contract. The department has advised that it does not intend to remove the advertisement at this time. I can inform the house that when the operation of our trams and trains is brought back into public hands—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —there will be no political advertising on our trams and trains.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The question has been asked; the minister is answering.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We do not believe that political advertising belongs on government infrastructure—

Mr Cowdrey: Well, remove it.

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —so we will ensure when our trains and trams are brought into public hands that—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: When the trams and trains are brought into public hands, the government will take a much more proactive role in the management of advertising on our public transport infrastructure—indeed, all government infrastructure.

Mr Cowdrey: Is this honestly your excuse?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The CFMEU entered into a contract with the Department for Infrastructure and Transport. They bought the ad. The ad is being advertised. The ad would not have been approved by the department if it had been made aware of it by the third-party ad agency. That did not occur. The ad will run its course and no other political advertising would be allowed on our public transport infrastructure. These are the rules the South Australian government has put in place. These are the rules that the government will impose and make sure that—

Mr Pederick: Do it now.

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We will make sure that the department has the appropriate instruction from the government to make sure that these types of adverts in future do not occur.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Frome, I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of Patricia Lawson and Dawn Grose, guests of the leader. I also observe that it is the member for King's birthday today.

Question Time

UNION ADVERTISING

Ms PRATT (Frome) (14:07): My question is to the Minister for Women. Has the minister received any correspondence, including from domestic violence survivors, in relation to John Setka's

CFMEU advertisements on trams, and has she counselled the Premier on whether he should take action to stop such advertisements?

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) (14:08): Thank you very much to the member for the question. Thank you also to the member and other members from both sides of this house who joined me last night when the lights to Parliament House were lit in orange as part of the 16 Days of Activism against gender-based violence. Thank you, Mr Speaker and the President of the other place also, for allowing that really important lighting up.

What I speak to the Premier about in relation to domestic violence is our very, very clear set of policies—comprehensive policies—which are being enacted, policies that we took to the election focused on the prevention and eradication of domestic violence and what work we can do towards that very, very important goal, the most important goal. We have a comprehensive set of policies around that.

I speak to the Premier often about progress on those policies. One of the things which we have already committed to and which we are progressing is consultation about the preparation of legislation to criminalise coercive control. It's legislation that I actually moved some time ago from opposition. However, sadly, it wasn't progressed by those, who are now opposite, at that time.

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

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, there is a—

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: What I have been speaking with the Premier about—

The SPEAKER: Minister, please be seated. There is a point of order from the member for Morialta, which I will hear under 134.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Thank you, sir: standing order 98, debate.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully. The minister is required to answer the substance of the question.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: As per the question, I have been speaking to the Premier in relation to domestic violence prevention and that conversation is multifaceted. One of the issues I have been speaking about with him recently is the consultation that we have been undertaking with particular groups of community members about their views on the progress of legislation to criminalise coercive control.

Just in the last couple of weeks I have had a very incredibly rich and informative conversation with Aboriginal members of our community from different parts of the state about their views in relation to the criminalisation of coercive control. Just this week, as I have been filling the Premier in on, we had another session with members of diverse multicultural communities—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: —about their views—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey!

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: —in relation to the criminalisation of coercive control, and the reason for those conversations with those communities, as I have spoken with the Premier about—

Mr BROWN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I ask the member for Flinders to withdraw that comment he made about the Labor Party enabling perpetrators of domestic violence.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, please be seated. We will resolve the point of order. The member for Florey—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.A. Hildyard: That is so deeply offensive.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have the point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is warned. The member for Chaffey is warned.

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Flinders.

Mr TELFER: Sir, I would ask that you ask the member for Florey to apologise and withdraw his false accusations because that is not what I said at all.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will hear the minister on the point of order. Minister, I will hear you on the point of order under 134. You have the right to be heard, and then I will resolve it.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: I would like to raise a point of order—125—to express how deeply upset I am by anybody, let alone someone over there, telling me in this place that I enable perpetrators of domestic violence. That is absolutely deeply distressing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: —to me. I have spent every single day—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: —I have been in this house absolutely working every day to move—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: —legislation, to speak about, to shine a light on domestic violence, and I do not ever—

The SPEAKER: Minister—

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: —need to hear that again. It is completely unacceptable and deeply offensive.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order. I am on my feet—

The Hon. N.F. Cook: You are a disgrace!

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale! I am going to ask the member whether in fact the words were uttered. If the member answers no, that will resolve the issue. The member may also inform me as the Speaker as to what was in fact said.

Mr TELFER: Sir, the words which I was accused by the member for Florey of uttering were not my words at all.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TELFER: And I am very happy to privately tell you the words that I spoke.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am on my feet, members. Members, the member has made plain to me and the house that what he is accused of saying is not what in fact he said. That is sufficient to dispose of the point of order. I did not myself hear it; however, I am prepared to hear other points of order in relation to disposing of this matter. I did not hear it, the member denies it, the matter is resolved. We will return to question time.

Matter of Privilege

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:14): Sir, I rise on a matter of privilege.

The SPEAKER: I will address the privilege matter immediately.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, the member has claimed to the house in full display that he did not utter the words 'You are enabling—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Don't worry, it's coming.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The member has denied the accusation made by the member for Florey. Sir, I would ask you to review the *Hansard* and the footage to contemplate whether or not the member has intentionally misled the parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! A matter of privilege has been raised. I will give the matter consideration and return to the house. Minister, you have the call.

Question Time

UNION ADVERTISING

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) (14:15): To return to the substance of the question, I am not sure whether the chamber heard, amongst the cacophony of noise affronting me from the other side of the chamber when I was speaking about domestic violence, that one of the other matters that I have kept the Premier informed of is the consultations that I have been undertaking in relation to the criminalisation of coercive control.

One of those consultations occurred just on Monday this week, and that was a consultation facilitated by the Multicultural Communities Council, which brought together women from diverse multicultural communities to share detail about their views of the criminalisation of coercive control and exactly how that would impact them and their families and to share their views on that.

MINISTER FOR RECREATION, SPORT AND RACING

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Now the minister has had 24 hours to

review her correspondence, can she advise the house if she has abided by the Ministerial Code of Conduct. With the leave of the house, sir, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Section 3.3 of the Ministerial Code of Conduct states:

Ministers are under an obligation to [write to] the Premier...after becoming aware of any conflict of interest...

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) (14:17): I think I have answered this question on multiple, multiple occasions in this house and outside of this house, and I will answer it again. I always, at all times adhere to relevant processes and procedures and the code of conduct and I will continue to do so.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morialta on a supplementary.

MINISTER FOR RECREATION, SPORT AND RACING

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): On what date did the minister write to the Premier about this matter?

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) (14:17): It's quite extraordinary that you just continue down this path.

Mr Cowdrey: Take it on notice.

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Colton!

Mr Cowdrey: When did you write the letter?

The SPEAKER: The member for Colton is warned.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: As I spoke about yesterday, I am utterly diligent in adhering to necessary protocols and procedures and processes and the code of conduct—incredibly diligent in that regard, and I will continue to be so.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:18): My question is for the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. When was the minister first advised that accreditation from the College of Intensive Care Medicine of the Women's and Children's Hospital Paediatric ICU was at risk and what action was taken by the minister at the time to rectify it?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:18): This is a concerning development in terms of the Women's and Children's Hospital, specifically the training accreditation for the Paediatric Intensive Care Unit. I was informed of the report that came from the College of Intensive Care Medicine on Monday afternoon, and I sought briefings from the Women's and Children's Health Network on the implications and the issues surrounding that and whether or not there were going to be particular impacts immediately in terms of training of future staff in the unit.

Subsequently as well, I have now asked Lindsey Gough, who is the chief executive of the Women's and Children's Health Network, to have prepared within the course of a fortnight a plan to make sure that we can rectify the issues that have been raised in the report from the college.

Mrs Hurn: When were you first told about the warning?

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I have answered that.

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I have asked that that report be prepared within two weeks, in terms of the plan that will be in place to rectify the issues and the recommendations that were raised in relation to that report of the accreditation from the college. It is very important that we fix this issue because we need to train—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned for a second time. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —future doctors in the Women's and Children's Hospital in the Paediatric Intensive Care Unit. This is a very important part of the hospital, so important in fact that the concerns that were raised about the future layout of the Paediatric Intensive Care Unit are one of the reasons why we have now proceeded in terms of the development of the new Women's and Children's Hospital on a new site. One of the key areas of concern that was being raised was about the connection between the intensive care unit and other services of the hospital. This is not an issue in terms of the staffing of the Women's and Children's Hospital that has sprung up overnight.

Mrs Hurn: When did you get the warning?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Years and years of warnings from the—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned for a final time.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —doctors of the Women's and Children's Hospital in terms of the safety of services particularly for paediatric patients of the hospital have been there. In fact, the Medical Staff Society wrote a particularly damning letter signed by 200 doctors at the hospital. They wrote that on 21 October not of this year, not of last year, not of the year before, but in 2019. That letter was written to the former government raising concerns about the safety of services. That's why—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Patterson: When were you warned by the college?

The SPEAKER: Member for Morphett!

Mr Whetstone: When were you warned by the college?

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: That is why we have taken action and made a very clear commitment at the election that we will invest in an additional 48 doctors at the Women's and Children's Hospital. Already two of those have been slated to be added in addition to the Paediatric Intensive Care Unit and we will be doing the work over the course of the next two weeks as to whether that now needs to be added to to address the concerns that have been raised by the college. We will get that plan in place to address these concerns. We are recruiting these extra doctors because these issues have been highlighted again and again—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —but were ignored repeatedly. That is why we are now investing in the additional 48 doctors at that hospital to make sure that our kids in South Australia get the services they need and the concerns of doctors can be addressed.

VALO ADELAIDE 500

Mrs PEARCE (King) (14:22): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house about the impact of the previous sale of infrastructure on the staging of this year's and future years' Adelaide 500 events and about any views on these impacts?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:22): I would like to thank the member for King for her question. I have good news for the member for King: the Adelaide 500 is back. It is coming back bigger and better than ever before. I am very pleased to be able to report to the member for King and all members within this place that this weekend we are set to see well in excess of 200,000 people. In fact, our fingers are crossed that we might crack the quarter of a million mark in the number of people who come to Victoria Park to see one of the most spectacular events in motorsport, not just nationally but globally.

The whole city is excited. It doesn't matter if you are a motorsport fan or otherwise, there is a buzz about our beautiful city at the moment about the prospect of the return of motorsport to the streets of Adelaide. If you want to book a restaurant on Saturday night in Adelaide, good luck, because all the reports we are hearing is that the joint is full—and that is something that we on this side of the house are incredibly excited about indeed.

We are very proud of the fact that we are doing everything we can to support the resurgence of our tourism sector. All in this place know all too well the extraordinary sacrifice made by people in the hospitality industry: small business owners and individual workers giving up their capital, their labour, their incomes and sacrificing themselves in the name of everybody else's safety. We have long held the view on this side of the house that those people deserve a reward and the Adelaide 500 is very much part of our strategy to restimulate that part of our economy that did pay a very dear price and made a big sacrifice during the course of COVID indeed.

I did, however, receive a piece of correspondence from the member for Bragg dated 19 October. To summarise the contents for the member for Bragg, it failed to mention any support of the Adelaide 500. The letter did raise concerns regarding the prescribed works period in Victoria Park—

Mr Batty interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The member for Bragg interjects about the time that it is taking to address this. The member for Bragg is looking for an explanation as to why it is taking longer to set up the program and maybe a bit longer to pack it down. I say to the member for Bragg: the reason why it is going to take a little bit longer this time around is because the people sitting around you, in the immediate vicinity, sabotaged the whole scheme—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

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

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —they sabotaged the whole project.

The SPEAKER: Premier, there's a point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There's a point of order. The member for Taylor knows better.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Standing order 98: the Premier is well out of bounds; this is debate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Mawson! It was a reasonably broad question; nevertheless, it doesn't in any case permit debate. I bring the Premier back to the substance of the question and certainly the response.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: There have been concerns raised by the member for Bragg and other people who have made the observation that the set-up and pack-down time is a little bit longer than has been the case in years gone by and that's because there was a deliberate act of sabotage of the Adelaide 500: selling off infrastructure and the like.

I would like to inform the member for Bragg and the South Australian public that on this side of the house we are investing in the Adelaide 500 to make it the success it should be, which is not a policy position that I understand those opposite have and certainly not in the past.

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

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order in the dying seconds of the answer.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Standing order 98 again, sir.

The SPEAKER: Very well. Of course, standing order 98 requires that an answer respond to the substance of the question. I draw the Premier back to the substance of the question—15 seconds.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: In respect of the Adelaide 500's future, we have invested in it. That will enable an increasingly expedited process in terms of the set-up and pack-down of the Adelaide 500, something the member for Adelaide has been advocating for and we are looking forward to delivering in due course. Rest assured, for those people who are more recently arrived in the parliament and wondering why this is the case, I invite them to consider their own policy within the Liberal Party.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:28): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. What is the minister's response to details outlined in the College of Intensive Care Medicine's recent accreditation report of the Women's and Children's Hospital. With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: A report publicly released moments ago from the College of Intensive Care Medicine states:

The committee determined that the intensive care unit at the Adelaide Women's and Children's Hospital cannot continue to be accredited for training in intensive care medicine by the college as it falls substantially short of expectations on several fronts—

with *The Advertiser* reporting that the ICU is significantly understaffed and overcrowded, with sick children fighting for their life left without a doctor in sight.

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is warned. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:29): Absolutely we have released the report. This morning I was asked if we would make the report public and I have asked the Women's and Children's Health Network to make that report public and now that report is public and that's what the shadow minister is quoting from.

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Absolutely it's how you got it because we released that report publicly today. This is, as I said, a serious issue that we need to address. We have already committed, because we saw this need, 48 extra doctors. Where did we get the 48 extra doctors—

Mrs Hurn: When are you going to fix it?

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The question is: what are we doing about extra doctors? I say that we are committing extra doctors, and, 'Well, what are you doing?' We are committing those extra doctors because—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Schubert is on a final warning. Member for Chaffey, you are warned for a final time. The member for Giles knows much better. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The commitment of 48 extra doctors is because we have listened to the doctors at the hospital. The Medical Staff Society at the hospital did work over the past two years in terms of looking at what additional doctors were needed across the hospital, particularly in terms of paediatric medicine areas, to bring the staffing levels up to an acceptable level, to make sure not only that patients could get an acceptable level of care but also that appropriate training, education and research could happen. That's where these 48 extra doctors came from.

That proposal was put to the former government and to the former opposition. We decided to take action and made it one of our commitments at the election. Unfortunately, we didn't see that commitment from the previous government. As I said, this is an area that has been raised time after time after time over the past three years, and we are now taking action. It was back in 2019, on 21 October, when these issues were raised by over 200 doctors at the Women's and Children's Hospital in an open letter that they wrote. They said:

The universal concern, expressed by all medical staff, is that many services that our community (a catchment of [approximately] 2 million [people], in a developed country) should expect to receive from a specialist women's and children's hospital, seem unachievable in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert! Member for Frome!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: It continues:

The resulting adverse effect on the safety and quality of the care we can provide has become increasingly hard to justify to our patients and the community.

Ms Pratt interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Frome!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: It continues:

The [Medical Staff Society] wishes to ensure that decision-makers are fully aware of unintended consequences of making cost savings our ongoing primary focus.

That is what the Medical Staff Society said back in 2019.

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: They raised those concerns with the previous government time after time after time and they didn't do anything. They didn't address these issues—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —and that's why we have committed extra doctors, including to the Paediatric Intensive Care Unit. What did the previous government do?

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: They did absolutely nothing in terms of addressing issues of the Paediatric Intensive Care Unit.

Ms Pratt interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Frome, you are warned.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: This is why we are committed, and we are rolling out and hiring those additional staff. Some of them have been hired already, but there's a forward plan for all those additional staff to be hired across the hospital.

Now that we have this report, we will be taking immediate action, as well, to make sure we implement those recommendations and make sure that kids can get the care they need but that we accredit as well, and make sure we have the appropriate training for a future workforce—because we are hiring additional doctors in this government, and we want to make sure that training can continue.

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert, but noting that she must now be on five warnings.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:33): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister assure South Australian parents that the care of their children is not compromised, given the failure of the state's flagship Women's and Children's Hospital to keep its Paediatric ICU accreditation?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:33): This is obviously accreditation in regard to training, but I think there are two key factors—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister, please be seated. The member for Schubert will leave the chamber under 137A for the remainder of question time.

The honourable member for Schubert having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Thank you very much, sir. I think there are two key things to say. One is that we have incredible doctors and nurses who work at the Women's and Children's Hospital, who work day in and day out, in sometimes very difficult circumstances, to provide the appropriate care their patients deserve. I want to thank them on what I am sure is a difficult day for them.

On the other hand, we have a health service that is significantly under strain, significantly under pressure, which means that there are only so many places that those doctors and nurses can be to be able to provide the level of care they would want to. That's why we need the additional staff—

Ms Pratt interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Frome is warned.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —and that's why we need the additional doctors we have committed to. We were the only party at the last election that committed to additional doctors at the Women's and Children's Hospital.

Ms Pratt interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: We set out in—

Ms Pratt interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Frome is warned for a final time.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —a large amount of detail where those doctors were going to go, what level of doctors they were going to be, the time line in terms of those doctors. That has been warmly received by the doctors at the Women's and Children's Hospital, who have felt that their calls for more resources to address these issues have been falling on deaf ears time after time.

I refer back again to the letter from 2019 from the Medical Staff Society. This is over three years ago that this was written to the previous government. They said again:

There is concern that medical advice relating to the provision of appropriate contemporary care is being consistently ignored without explanation or justification. This relates to the resourcing of both hospital and community departments. The medical interventions and equipment provided at the Women's and Children's Hospital are falling behind those available in peer hospitals in Australia.

This was on the record back on 2019. In addition, they said:

Gaps in current care have already been identified and documented by medical staff to our Executive.

That is back in 2019. They also said:

The lack of advanced training positions (both senior registrars and fellows) at the Women's and Children's Hospital compared with other local and interstate hospitals is compromising our ability to achieve consistently high standards of service delivery, blocking career development, sending high quality trainees interstate and jeopardising the future medical consultant workforce for South Australia.

So warning after warning was there on the record to the previous minister, no doubt to the previous Premier, the member for Dunstan. Where is he on this issue?

Ms Pratt interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Frome, you are warned.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Why did they not listen to these warnings three years ago?

Ms Pratt interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Frome!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: We are now taking action.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: We will put in additional resources that need to be put in place.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: We will put in the additional resources that need to be put in place in relation to the Paediatric Intensive Care Unit, but also in terms of other areas of paediatric medicine at the Women's and Children's Hospital that have been identified as understaffed. That's why we have a costed, fully planned—

Ms Pratt: They've got to wait 10 years.

The SPEAKER: Member for Frome, you are on a final warning.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —proposal/plan that we are rolling out. We have already hired a number of different doctors at the hospital. We will continue to hire more and that will include the Paediatric Intensive Care Unit to address the concerns that have been raised.

ELECTION COMMITMENTS

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister update the house on the state government's delivery of infrastructure election commitments in his portfolios?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:37): I can. Our commitments to the public of South

Australia are vast, ranging from delivering local road upgrades to delivering the world's first large-scale hydrogen production and power generation facility. We have got on with the job and have been meeting milestone after milestone and delivering project after project.

The member for Adelaide would be pleased to know that the state government has worked diligently to deliver on our election commitments: for instance, to construct a fit-for-purpose modern Adelaide Aquatic Centre—site selected and community consultation for the design commenced; to implement a school zone on Gilles Street, including 25 km/h signs and road marking—delivered; and to create a pocket park at Scotty's Corner—initial consultation complete and design works underway.

If we keep looking north of the CBD, we turn our attention to other commitments made by the member for Newland and the member for King, notably: upgrade the auditorium of the Clovercrest Baptist Church—consultation undertaken and design is being finalised; install shelters at 20 bus stops in the electorate of King—solutions at each stop identified and confirmation of scope underway; and upgrade the intersections of Main North Road, Target Hill Road and intersections with The Grove Way at Canterbury Drive, Green Valley Drive and Atlantis Drive—community consultation for planning studies have commenced.

If we turn our attention to the south and east of the city, you will continue to see progress and delivery of our election commitments. It is a common theme here. There were the member for Waite's commitments, such as installing flashing warning lights at the western approach to the CFS station in Upper Sturt in September—delivered; and providing a reconfigured carriage on the Belair line dedicated to bikes on weekends—delivered.

For the members for Gibson and Elder: upgrade Ballara Park Reserve at Warradale—works scheduled for early next year; upgrade the playground at CC Hood Reserve at Panorama—stage 1 consultation complete and a competitive tender is now underway for a landscape designer; and construct an entry arch at Ludgate Circus in Colonel Light Gardens—concept design is complete.

To wrap up, let's consider one of the commitments from the member for Davenport: implement local school traffic upgrades at Braeview Primary School—delivered; implement local school traffic upgrades at Aberfoyle Hub Primary School and High School, Craighburn Primary School and Pilgrim School—construction programmed for these school holidays; upgrade Main Road at Cherry Gardens—onsite survey works are underway to inform detailed design early next year.

Lastly, another commitment from the member for Davenport, who is a very strong advocate, is a commitment that the Leader of the Opposition has previously endorsed—the construction of an on/off ramp for Majors Road, proposed design released for public consultation. I am pleased to say that it was recently endorsed in the most recent federal election. Our consultation has shown an overwhelming majority of the Leader of the Opposition's constituents support the on/off ramp.

I held a public meeting recently with the member for Davenport. I understand that a close friend of the Leader of the Opposition attended, who raised concerns about the consultation for the Majors Road upgrade, so I posed the obvious question: 'To those 40 of you in the room, please raise your hand if you support the government's proposition that we should upgrade Majors Road and allow an on/off ramp.' Thirty-nine hands went up. Who was the one person who said no? The one person the Leader of the Opposition could find to send to the public meeting. Here endeth the lesson.

RIVER MURRAY FLOOD

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water. Can the minister please update the house on any modelling of the Lower Lakes and River Murray around Goolwa to provide reassurance to my community? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr BASHAM: On 26 November, approximately 800 anxious local residents attended a community meeting with the SES, SA Water, Department for Environment and Water and the Alexandrina Council about predicted river flows, impacts and how to prepare. The venue seats about 300 residents, and approximately 500 were turned away. In response to the keen local interest, a second, unplanned meeting was provided later that day. The community is extremely concerned

about the fear of potential flooding in the region, as reflected in the large attendance on Saturday and a surge of inquiries to my electorate office. The mood has become very anxious since the meeting, and my community is eager for information.

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) (14:42): I am happy to answer this question and also to acknowledge the role that the SES has played not only in offering the initial planned meeting but also in providing a supplementary one to make sure that people had access to information.

As we have noticed in the last several weeks, the information that we have about what is happening with the flooding coming down the Murray has had to be updated frequently. The modelling is only as good as the knowledge of the water that is currently in the system. We are aware that, should more water come into the system as most recently has happened through some release in the Hume Dam, that then requires updating. The advice I am giving the chamber today is contingent on information that we have now and that that remains the same.

However, what I can inform the chamber is that at present we expect the Lower Lakes will be managed without a flooding event through barrage releases. With the current flow as we expect it to be, we expect that the level of the Lower Lakes will remain below one metre Australian Height Datum (AHD), which is about 15 centimetres above the normal operation but does not constitute a flooding event.

As members may know, we have five separate barrages that influence the flow of the Murray, and they comprise some 593 openings that are able to control the flow of water. While some weeks ago there was some concern that for a couple of days those barrages were closed, and that was in the context of a very high tide event coming in and not wanting to see the saltwater wash back through into the Lower Lakes, they are now in what is known as flood operating standards, which means that they are open mostly. They will be used to as speedily as possible allow water to be removed from the lakes. Indeed, I am told that the aim for the lakes will be to get them down to 0.65 metres AHD which allows a buffer.

There may be some infrequent salt coming in because, although the tides are now much more favourable for managing this flooding event through the Murray, there may be at some point some saltwater incursions, but that is expected to be short term and infrequent.

So at present it looks like the way in which we are having to anticipate some pretty serious impacts high up in the Riverland and down through the Mid Murray and the Murraylands is not going to be of serious consequence for those living close to the Lower Lakes. Indeed, it has had already some significant environmental benefit for the Coorong and the Murray Mouth. It was a delight to find that the dredging which goes on normally 24 hours a day 365 days a year to keep the Murray Mouth open, has been suspended at this stage for a four-month period to allow a natural scouring through the mouth.

Nonetheless, we are aware that this is all contingent, as I said at the beginning, on understanding the flow of water coming through and the consequences of that should there be additional water coming through that is currently not anticipated that could have an alternative outcome. Therefore, I urge members of parliament and also their constituents to make sure they are keeping up with the WaterConnect website, which allows the flood maps so that they can understand individual impacts, and to go to the sa.gov.au website to make sure that they are keeping up to date with what is occurring and what is expected to occur.

Again, I close by acknowledging the significant role and leadership undertaken by the SES, not only in making sure that people are kept safe but also that the information flow has been continuous.

RIVER MURRAY FLOOD

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Has the minister met with SA Power Networks and the technical regulator to clarify how power disconnections are likely to impact homes and irrigators in the Riverland?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:46): Yes, I have.

Mr WHETSTONE: Excuse me, minister—and with your leave and that of the house, I will explain, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is an explanation that is to be offered.

Mr WHETSTONE: Minister, last night, myself—

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey, you have sought leave. Is leave granted?

Honourable members: Yes, sir.

Leave granted.

Mr WHETSTONE: Minister, last night, myself, households, primary producers and irrigators in my electorate were advised via text message that their power may be immediately disconnected for several weeks, possibly months.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I share the member's concerns for this, and we have discussed it together personally. The member has my mobile phone number. He can call me any time he likes about these matters, in particular about individual disconnections, and I will follow each and every one up with SA Power Networks.

What we are doing—the Office of the Technical Regulator and SA Power Networks—is asking the OTR to double-check and triple-check every single time SAPN wishes to disconnect a cohort of energy users from the grid to make sure that their reasons are justified in the interests of safety. I have no doubt that the level of inconvenience the member is talking about is real and that the people he is advocating on behalf of have legitimate fears about being without power for months.

For example, there are a number of people who won't be directly impacted by the floodwaters who are being advised that because infrastructure that they are reliant on for power is on the flood plain and that they may be disconnected.

SA Power Networks have been told by the South Australian government, as have ElectraNet, that we want to do everything we can and we will do everything we can to try to not so much bend the rules but give exemptions where necessary where we can put in safety parameters that will allow power to be allowed to be kept on.

For example, there are currently about 50 lines across the river and the reason that SA Power Networks may choose to disconnect some people is that, as river levels rise, boating on the river could reach a mandatory height ceiling close to powerlines, and that means that there could be a danger of electrocution, so there are very real reasons. What we can do as the OTR and the Department for Infrastructure and Transport is put a cordon around that area to make sure that all boating facilities, all boating use, around that area are prohibited to try to allow those powerlines to be in use for longer. Ultimately, we reach a point where it might become impractical, so we are trying to find practical solutions to this.

I share the member's frustration. He is right to be annoyed at this. He is right to be angry at this because in the 21st century anyone going without power for prolonged periods of time is unacceptable. I agree. We agree. The member knows how his constituents feel. He is closest to them. We are doing everything we possibly can to make sure that we only turn power off where it is absolutely necessary.

But I do caveat that statement with this: there are going to be times when we are going to upset people because of the rules we have all uniformly put in place. When I say uniformly, I mean uniformly—all of us, unopposed, in this parliament. There are regulations and rules about electrical safety around live lines, transmission and distribution lines and they will be enforced.

Where we can find commonsense solutions to try to keep power on, we will. The Treasurer has put in a pool of money that SAPN can access to put in generation and of course we can also augment and move pumps, so we are doing what we can.

My very strong advice to the member for Chaffey is to contact SAPN or contact me directly as these scenarios come up. I give him this undertaking: I will work with you in a non-partisan way to make sure we can keep as many of your constituents on the grid, on power, for as long as possible. But there will be occasions when the member and I will have to give some disappointing messages to his constituents about power, and those members in this house who live in the Adelaide Hills know exactly what I'm talking about.

RIVER MURRAY FLOOD

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:51): Supplementary to the Minister for Energy and Mining: minister, what power provisions for households will be enacted for my constituency living on life support systems who fear that their lives will be cut short should they lose power?

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey, that is not a supplementary question. It introduces new subject matter; however, the minister may choose to take it as a new question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:51): I think it's a legitimate question and the member is right to raise it because there are people who live across South Australia who are on life support systems, and they rely on the regular supply of power in their homes. It's an appropriate question for him to ask and I'm glad he has asked it.

There are provisions currently in place and SA Power Networks have provisions where they can continue to provide power, if necessary, even by portable generation on properties where people have life support systems in place.

I understand that SA Power Networks and the Department for Health are working to coordinate to try to move people. Where that might become impractical and unsafe is where generators can get inundated and it's not appropriate or where some homes are not geared up to have that type of generation, but for most people who have registered that they have important life support equipment in their homes that cannot tolerate blackout there are provisions in those homes.

I ask the member that, if he knows of people in his electorate who have life-threatening situations where they require power to maintain hydration or levels of oxygen in their blood, he should contact me or SA Power Networks and we will move heaven and earth to make sure that those people are accommodated. We don't want anyone—anyone—to die as a result of this natural disaster.

This is a slow-moving freight train heading towards us. We know that there are substations that would have been inundated had it not been for bunds being built. We know that there is going to be power infrastructure that is going to be inundated. It is built to a standard. It should work, but things will go wrong. In natural disasters, things go wrong. We will do everything we possibly can that is within our power to make sure we can do everything we can. The important thing is that we keep the lines of communication open.

The member for Chaffey is in a unique position in this house: he knows his neighbours. He knows his constituents. He knows who they are. They know him. They have his number. He has our numbers. He has the Premier's number. He has my number. I assume he has the Minister for Emergency Services' number and the Deputy Premier's number. Call anytime night or day. We are ready to take those calls and we are ready to act.

This is a time when there is no Labor Party and no Liberal Party, there are just South Australians. We are here to make sure that every South Australian, no matter where they live or what constituency they are in, knows that the South Australian government is here for them. We will do everything we can, and the tip of the spear of that is the member for Chaffey. If he has people who come to him, come to us and we will act on your behalf because we want you to succeed here.

We want the member for Chaffey to do as much as he possibly can to help his constituency. He is now their point of call, so reach out to us, as is the member alongside him. Reach out. This is not a time for politics, and they know that. We are not saying that they are trying that. What we are saying—

Mr Pederick: I have reached out, as you know.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I know. The member for Hammond says he reached out. He did. He reached out about borrow pits to get clay for levees, and within 24 hours that situation was sorted, and I thanked him for raising it with me. The moment he raised it with me we fixed it, and that is how this parliament is designed to work.

Yes, it's adversarial. Yes, the opposition is designed to keep the government accountable and the government is designed to be accountable to the parliament, but at times like this in natural disasters it's every shoulder to the wheel—everyone.

I thank the member for reaching out—and we fixed it. There will be others, and there will be some phone calls that you make to us where we can't fix it. That is just the nature of a natural disaster, but I give you my undertaking that we are all doing everything we can to make you succeed.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Mawson, I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of Mr Daniel Gannon, the former Executive Director of the Property Council in South Australia.

Question Time

ELECTION COMMITMENTS

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water. Can the minister inform the house about the progress of environment-focused election commitments that she has been delivering as part of her portfolio as the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water?

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) (14:56): I want to sincerely thank the member for Mawson not only for his question but also for his ongoing commitment to environmental issues and to making sure that I am extremely well aware of the nature of those concerns and interests as they relate particularly but not exclusively to Mawson.

It is quite a pleasure to run through the achievements to date in delivering election commitments on the environment. As many members will know, I was first active in the environment movement a very long time ago—probably getting close to around the time that some people in this chamber were born—and worked for a number of years in the environment department, and then to have the honour of being the minister has been an extraordinary privilege to date.

One commitment that I would like to highlight is the 15 Aboriginal rangers, five of whom are coming on board this year. This year is leading into a referendum on a First Nations Voice to Parliament and is also the year when this parliament will be asked to consider a First Nations Voice to Parliament, and if it goes through and when it goes through we will be the first jurisdiction to have a Voice to Parliament for First Nations.

It is important to remember how much we have to learn from Aboriginal culture about engagement with country. I am personally very delighted that we are getting on with getting these Aboriginal rangers employed not only for their own sake to have employment opportunities but much more significantly in order to learn more and to celebrate more with Aboriginal culture.

We have \$6 million for heritage agreements that are currently being finalised. The structure of that grant over the next four years will be rolled out. That is when private landowners, or leaseholders, have bits of land that deserve to be protected, and they can get some grants to put them under a heritage agreement and make sure that they are protected properly and fenced, and so on.

We have moved the Pastoral Unit back from PIRSA into the environment department where it always was. The rangelands need to be managed sustainably for primary production but within the context of being sustainable, and of course we are in the process of rolling out an additional \$1 million over the four years to make sure that those assessments of the land use are being managed properly.

Very early on we repealed the regulation that was brought in by the previous government which enabled private development in Flinders Chase to jump over normal processes for land clearance and native vegetation clearance. We repealed that regulation so it can never be used again. It was a disgraceful way to treat a very important part of the biodiversity.

We have written already now to the minister, the Hon. Tanya Plibersek, about supporting a World Heritage bid for the Bight, which is an issue I know is very close to the member for Mawson's heart. I still have the photograph of him with his 'Fight for the Bight' T-shirt.

With respect to the Murray, we have appointed Richard Beasley as the commissioner for the Murray. He has been working on an appropriate response to the royal commission—an updated one. He is also making sure that the new government in Canberra, a government that is finally interested in delivering the full plan, is able to get the benefit of this his advice, including the full 450 gigalitres, and using any mechanism necessary. We of course put on record the withdrawal of our support for those socio-economic criteria that got the last minister into a bit of strife with the royal commission.

We have \$3 million being rolled out for Friends of Parks through the small grants program, \$1 million for Landcare to enable coordination of volunteer effort, and we have been able to restore funding for the local environment centres that were cut off in the change of boundary—of course, again, it affects the member for Mawson with his Willunga centre—and we have increased funding to the peak body in order to ensure that they are able to do proper community consultation.

We have capped the number of breeding dogs that are able to be part of breeding kennels. Breeding kennels is the first step in banning puppy factories. I am looking forward to the review of the Dog and Cat Management Act that will make sure that is taking place more fully. We have increased the funding for the RSPCA by \$1 million to enable better prosecutions of animal cruelty. There are others, but I have run out of time.

SCHOOLS, SPECIALIST SUPPORT

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Education. When was the minister first advised about the accuracy or otherwise of the comments made by the Assistant Minister to the Premier in the Legislative Council? With leave, sir, I would like to explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Yesterday, the assistant minister apologised to the council for providing inaccurate information on 8 September in question time, which was contradicted by the Department for Education's chief executive earlier this month.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (15:01): I thank the member for Morialta for this question. I understand that the Hon. Emily Bourke in the other place made a personal explanation about this issue yesterday. I understand the advice to which Ms Bourke referred in her personal explanation yesterday, in terms of where she receives her advice about these things, is, as you would expect, from the Department for Education, which is the agency which is leading the work on the initiative we are talking about here, which is the 100 extra FTE mental health and learning support positions, which this government committed to back in October last year, when we were in opposition, and which we have already made some real progress in delivering as well.

Really, I think the member for Morialta's question—I understand some questions might have been asked in the other place today on this same topic—is a question for Ms Bourke. I think she largely covered this area in the personal explanation that she gave yesterday afternoon.

SCHOOLS, SPECIALIST SUPPORT

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:02): Supplementary: on what date was it brought to the minister's attention?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (15:02): I thank the member for Morialta for his question. I am very happy to answer as best I can the member for Morialta's question here, but I have to say I think it is a tad disappointing that we have found

ourselves in this semantics back and forth about a funding initiative which I am pretty sure everyone in this chamber would agree is desperately needed out there.

We are talking about 100 extra FTE for things like psychologists, speech and occupational therapists, youth workers. We know we have an enormous issue in our society with issues around mental health presenting earlier in young people's lives and more severely. We have suicidal ideation presenting itself from primary-age students, and we are taking action. Ms Bourke, as the Assistant Minister for Autism, is part of that action. I support her work greatly. I think it is very disappointing if we get bogged down in who said what and when, instead of focusing on the fantastic work these 100 extra FTEs are going to do.

Grievance Debate

SPORTING AND INFRASTRUCTURE GRANTS

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:03): Strange envelopes, mysterious couriers and unmarked vehicles—the questions just keep on coming. It is official: a question that we have been asking for months, yet we never received an answer to, we have seen now in black and white. Minister Hildyard was advised that she had 12 conflicts of interest.

An honourable member: Twelve!

Mr TARZIA: Twelve. Why was it so hard? It raises more questions than answers. Why did the Office for Sport and Recreation advise the minister of 12—

An honourable member: Twelve!

Mr TARZIA: —12—conflicts? Look at the FOI. Check the FOI that you signed. Did the minister recuse herself from all cabinet deliberations surrounding the payment of those grants? She cannot tell us. Why can she not tell us? Why can she not tell us when she did and if she did?

So many unanswered questions remain. Let me reassure those opposite: we will get the answers one way or another. It is only a matter of time because the sharks on that side of the chamber are circling—people like the member for Mawson, who I am sure would love to be a minister once again.

We are talking about \$133 million in sports and infrastructure grants, more than it would cost to build the new Aquatic Centre, more than the Majors Road on/off ramps and likely even larger than the potential break cost with Keolis Downer. Make no mistake, this is a lot of taxpayer money, public money that this government cannot provide information on that is in the public interest.

This government will not provide the information to a high ranking public servant, and this person's job is to independently and objectively audit the expenditure of the public's money. None of this, quite frankly, passes the pub test. These were payments that took place behind closed doors, in locked backrooms, payments of even more than 95 per cent which went to Labor gained or controlled seats: 69 out of 72 of the sports and infrastructure grants received.

We knew at the time that ministers had roles of significant authority in a number of these clubs that received funding. We said at the time that if any minister had signed a grant for one of these clubs, then there would be real questions to be answered. We still do not have those answers. We know now that there were conflicts of interest. Why does this government still refuse to release cabinet documents to the Auditor-General? What do they have to hide?

The Auditor-General could not rule out misconduct, maladministration or conflict of interest in the recent committee. He could not comment because he did not have the documents to suggest otherwise. Why would the government not put this matter to bed? Why would they not just hand over the documents? If they have nothing to hide, what is the big deal? It raises many, many questions, and we will continue to ask questions because this is public money. We will get those answers. Even if they are delivered in hard copy in unmarked envelopes by mysterious couriers, we will get those answers.

I would also like to take some time to reflect on the achievements of a leading sporting club in my electorate of Hartley—that is, the Hectorville Sports and Community Club. We know that the Heccies have a proud record and that they have had a tremendous year of which they should be

very proud. During 2022, they had over a thousand junior and senior players register, with many fans and I am overwhelmed when I go there. They register with football, tennis, netball, cricket and even now basketball. It is fantastic to see such growth in our local sports clubs and to see our youth so passionate about sport and staying active. They even have an over 35s team, so you never know what might happen. In particular, I would like to congratulate:

- the A grade under 13 girls footy team, who defeated the Unley Jets in a nailbiter of a grand final;
- the division 2 netball seniors, who also won their grand final;
- the sub 3 netball juniors, who won their grand final; and
- the under 15 division 2 girls, who won their grand final 37-23 against Glengowrie.

It is a pleasure to support the Hectorville Sports and Community Club, a staple and a cornerstone of the local community. I wish them all the very best leading into the future.

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITY

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:08): Today, I would like to draw the house's attention to a couple of international days when we celebrate various matters. The first is the International Day of People with Disability, which is on 3 December, this Saturday. This day helps the community to focus on those people who live with disability. An important role we have as a society and also as a government is to ensure that we enable those people living with disability not only to engage fully in the community but also to live with dignity.

Some years ago now, a federal Labor government, in cooperation with state governments, introduced the National Disability Insurance Scheme. That scheme was based on the principle that people living with disability would have control over the services they needed and received and also have a level of independence so they could actually determine what they needed, when they needed it and the purposes for which they needed it. I agree that is a very fine principle.

This is a market-based system, which has both its strengths and its weaknesses. There are some issues to be dealt with in terms of some market failure in the delivery of services for people living with disability. Of greater concern, though, is the way the scheme was underfunded by the previous federal government to the extent that there were quite arbitrary cuts to various plans supporting people living with disability.

A number of people in my own electorate have spoken with me and sought advice and assistance to get funding back mainly for their children. We have had a number of cases where we have had to support people through the internal review processes, including helping people go through the AAT, where the NDIA, under pressure from the then government to reduce the so-called costs of the scheme, was cutting funds left, right and centre.

These cuts caused quite a bit of distress not only to the families. Importantly, it put the development of young children back many years because they were not getting the support and services they required. It is good to hear that a former minister responsible for this in the previous federal government, Bill Shorten, has come out and said quite clearly that governments need to spend what they need to spend to make sure that people living with disability get the necessary support to live a dignified life. That is very reassuring.

I know the Assistant Minister for Autism is doing a lot of great work in this field, but one thing we need to ensure is that people living with disability, particularly young children, can actually access services. Often, as a community we are not aware of some of the challenges and barriers that exist. Even taking a child with autism into some retail outlets is quite a challenge because of lighting, noise, music, etc.

Recently, I was happy to read and be told that one of the new businesses in Gawler, Beast and Beauty Co, a hair salon plus a beauty salon, is going to try to provide services for people living with disability and particularly address children with autism because I am told that sometimes it is quite challenging for a child with autism to have their hair cut. I commend that new business in Gawler, which opens on 10 December to reach out and provide services. Something we need to do

more of is help small business get accredited so they are more disability friendly and have the information they need to do so. I commend that.

The International Day of Volunteers is on Monday 5 December. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all the volunteers in my community who do an enormous amount of work to enrich the lives of other people in our community. There are very few walks of life that do not have a volunteer involved in some way, whether it is education, faith organisations or recreation and sport. You name it, there is a volunteer there and they play an important role. The number of volunteers in communities has been affected by the impact of COVID, and we need to make sure that we help organisations help those volunteers. I would like to acknowledge the important work in my community undertaken by Northern Volunteering in training and recruiting volunteers for our community.

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF RURAL WOMEN

Ms PRATT (Frome) (15:13): On 15 October each year we have the opportunity to mark International Day of Rural Women. Given the volume of rain and wet spring weather we have had, and the projections for this year's harvest are cautiously optimistic—\$4.2 billion for our state—you can be sure that women are in the thick of this work.

I am about to embark on a recognition of some particularly shining stars in my own electorate. Time will limit me to do all of them justice, so I hope I get a chance to return to this topic again. I expect that I will be inundated with more examples of women to celebrate in this chamber going forward.

As I whizz around the electorate of Frome, hitting collections of women in different townships, I want to take this opportunity to celebrate some who, in recent months, have really been doing the heavy lifting. To kick it off there is the fabulous Ali Paulett, who is responsible for Bush de Vine at Paulett's cellar door. She has surrounded herself with an award-winning team; they have had the top gong for Best Tourism Restaurant and have won the Wine of Provenance Award, the Trip Adviser Travellers Choice Award, with many more to come.

Still in my town of Clare, there is Olivia Hoffman Barry of Jim Barry Wines who, with the introduction of the Nurse Series rosé, will help fund specialist breast care nurses in partnership with the McGrath Foundation. Ali (Chook) Meaney, of Bukirk Glamping is an innovator, an entrepreneur, a builder, an interior designer, mother to Kevin Kevi Bacon and Jett the lamb. She is just a generally good egg.

Katherine Nugent is the busiest person I know. She is a lawyer turned teacher, she volunteers with Operations Flinders, she is a mum, she is a tennis player, she is certainly a fantastic mental health advocate and, of course, she distils gin. Janet Angus deserves special mention as a nonagenarian still managing Hill River Station.

Still in Clare, I recognise Sandy Davies for winning a national award in services to mental health. Finally, just last week Dr Mel Considine, with her fantastic husband, Gerry (we will throw him a bone on this topic), were both the inaugural recipients of the Fellowship in Advanced Rural General Practice.

Up the road in Burra, the fabulous and multitalented Jenny Loftes is involved as chair of the National Trust and the CWA. She is involved in arts in a significant way, she provides tech support, she is a web designer for council initiatives, she is involved with the Open Garden festival, she is certainly a musical theatre entrepreneur and she is a historian. I also commend her for running for council recently.

Heading west over to Jamestown, there is no shortage of fabulous women working in this regional community. Ali Cooper has restored and is running The Park tourism accommodation centre in Jamestown. It is award-winning, and she is a fantastic mum, a farmer in her own right and a volunteer in town. Mel Kitschke is a remarkable woman. She is the current custodian (my words) of Bundaleer Forest Maple and Pine function centre, she is an arborist, an environmentalist and a doer of all things.

Emily Riggs just last week won the Shine Awards, recognising those who make a difference in their communities and industries. She has done that through her entrepreneurial establishment

and startup business Iris and Wool. Not to be forgotten, Stephanie Lunn was a finalist in this year's PIRSA AgriFutures Rural Women's Awards, and I commend her for her initiatives.

In Kapunda, special mention goes to Katharine Crane, who is a really creative entrepreneur in the social media space, with her Crane Creative business that supports the local community event the Kapunda Makers Market. In Two Wells I want to acknowledge two separate women: Rachel Bombardieri, the genius behind the beautiful floral designs of her family business and, in the same family tree, I understand, Alana Bombardieri who, with Terry-Ann Keen and Kay Boon, were all elected to the Adelaide Plains Council.

I want to make a special mention of all the women who ran at the recent council elections. In my electorate of Frome, over 100 people participated, and 40 per cent of them were women. I commend them all for their efforts.

In every corner of my electorate of Frome there are amazing women. There are also amazing men, and children, seniors and volunteers. Our country communities are brimming with talented people, and I celebrate them all. However, today I especially recognise that women play a crucial role in ensuring the sustainability of rural workplaces and households.

The SPEAKER: The member for Flinders, on indulgence.

Matter of Privilege

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (15:19): Further to the point of order raised earlier regarding an interjection, I withdraw my remark and apologise.

The SPEAKER: That may be sufficient to discharge the matter of privilege that has been raised.

Grievance Debate

KING ELECTORATE

Mrs PEARCE (King) (15:19): We are nearly at the end of the year, my first as the member for King, and what a year it has been. I absolutely love my home, the place where I am proud to be raising my two kids, and it is absolutely the greatest honour to be a voice for my local community in this place, which is why I have not wasted any time delivering for it. I am absolutely revved that the 500 will be back this weekend, something that has meant so much to local motor enthusiasts, residents and businesses in the north and the north-east. My local community recognised that getting this done would not be easy, especially—

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the status of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Mrs PEARCE: As I was saying, my local community recognised that getting it done would not be easy, especially because the infrastructure was sold off, but it is looking to be an exceptional weekend. We also committed to helping stop paid parking at TTP, which we have seen through legislative changes to achieve just that.

What about my local commitments? I am pleased to report that there is a hive of activity underway all across my community. Firstly, support for both Tilley and McGilp recreation parks has been provided and planning is well underway. In fact, the City of Playford will be seeking feedback at the One Tree Hill Country Market this weekend, and I encourage all in the community to have a look and share your thoughts.

Over to Salisbury Heights, we have literally hit the ground running to discuss directly with my community the plan, design and construction upgrades we will deliver on The Grove Way junctions with Canterbury Drive, Green Valley Drive and Atlantis Drive, as well as the junction of Main North Road and Target Hill Road. I thank the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport for joining me there to share the news earlier this month.

There was a lot of talk regarding traffic congestion and road safety in this area during the last term of government, but little else—and that is not what my community wanted. Talk is cheap. We want action and that is exactly what we are going to do. Whilst we are on the topic of transport and infrastructure, scoping is well underway for the installation of bus shelters all across my electorate.

We appreciate how important public transport is to communities like mine, which is why we have wasted no time in finally getting the expansion of the TTP park-and-ride underway, and we have commenced tap and pay on the O'Bahn, making the daily commute even easier, especially if you have forgotten your Metrocard. Over to emergency services, our very hardworking SES crew in Salisbury have already received their funding for new information communication technology equipment, something that will make the world of difference particularly with all the terrible weather we have been experiencing this year.

Delivering for my community does not stop with delivering on my commitments. As you would appreciate, everyday matters are brought to my attention that need addressing. At times, they may fall under the state government jurisdiction and at other times federal government or local government jurisdiction. As the local member, I have been more than happy to help in any way that I can.

I have been able to secure repair works for the retaining wall on Main North Road, as well as the replacement of gutter guards that were being pinched on Golden Grove Road, although I must admit I am still perplexed as to why someone would want to steal them in the first place. I have been able to organise for a give-way sign to be installed very soon on the intersection of Black Top Road and One Tree Hill Road, a very busy and sharp intersection in the One Tree Hill precinct—one where, I have been advised, cars often cross over by accident and crash into adjacent property.

I have not forgotten Golden Grove and Greenwith, where I have helped to ensure that there will be yellow no-parking lines installed on Olympiad Court and Charlton Court in order to prevent accidents at the blind spot there. As to the installation of a bench halfway along Lukin Crescent and bus stop 61A on The Grove Way, for those who have never been to that patch I can vouch that it is very deeply needed. Having this bench installed will make it easier for some to be able to walk to and from the local and to access public transport.

We have also sought agreement to improve a blind spot by ensuring that vegetation on the intersection on Tahlia Road and Naughton Court is reduced. We have sought agreement to have council land in Pistachio Way maintained and added to their planting program.

I could go on all day about all the things that we are doing in my local community, but that is just a small taste of the matters that I am advocating for in my town. A local good member is one who listens to and works with their local community. I am doing my absolute best to deliver for mine, and I am looking forward to what we will achieve next.

I also want to very quickly congratulate all the graduating students in my electorate. It has been an absolute pleasure getting to all the graduating ceremonies to recognise their special day. Their achievements and significant values in terms of perseverance and resilience in our community are very admirable traits to have and will serve the students well in times to come.

MAYORS

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (15:25): As the dust is settling on the most recent local government elections around the state, I rise to speak as the shadow local government minister on some of those who have finished their term on council, including a number of mayors, some of whom served for a short time and others for a longer time.

As I am well aware, the role of mayor is much more diverse and complicated than anyone who has not done the job would ever know and, more often than not, is a thankless job. I would like to congratulate retiring mayors Alison Nunan, Kay Rasheed, Graham Excell, Brenton Lewis, Neil Martinson and Leon Stasinowsky on their hard work as mayor, as they have decided not to renominate for their position at the election. Leon, in particular, was on the Loxton Waikerie council for decades.

I would also like to thank them for the strong working relationship they have had with me throughout the years. As a former President of the Local Government Association for two years and a member of the LGA board for a number of years, there are also three mayors I worked closely with on that board who decided to conclude their term.

First is the retiring mayor of the City of Whyalla, Clare McLaughlin. Clare is someone who was determined and hardworking in her term as mayor, putting forward the future of Whyalla and the challenges it was facing to decision-makers across government and business. She also worked collaboratively in her region, both Eyre Peninsula and Spencer Gulf, and I truly admire the integrity she showed throughout her term.

Special congratulations go to retiring mayor Peter Matthey from the Goyder council. Peter is a man I have worked closely with throughout the years, especially on the LGA board, including during my time as the president. Peter is an example of someone who has given so much to his regional community over 40 years on council, firstly as a councillor at the district council of Hallett and then Goyder and then taking on the role as mayor for a significant period of time. Peter has also been a voice for regional local government and local government as a whole throughout that time. I would like to publicly acknowledge that work.

Congratulations also to David O'Loughlin from the Prospect council. David is another man I have worked with a lot over the last number of years, even though we might have had different political affiliations. David has led local government at all levels, as the President of ALGA, the national association, the President of the Local Government Association SA and, most importantly, the Mayor of Prospect. His commitment and drive should not be underestimated. I have always enjoyed robust debate as well as healthy banter during all our interactions throughout the years.

There were also a number of results through the local government election process which saw incumbent mayors lose their positions, including some long-serving ones. I would like to acknowledge Erika Vickery OAM from the Naracoorte Lucindale Council as someone I have worked with closely and collaboratively to put forward the interests of regional communities in particular. Erika is a passionate community leader who has always put her local community first and has been a champion for the long-term future of the Limestone Coast, including the ever-increasing multicultural community of the South-East.

I would like to acknowledge some other long-serving mayors who were not returned by the community but who have been serving their communities and the local government sector as a whole: Dave Burgess, Peter Hunt and Ann Ferguson OAM. These three have been regional Local Government Association leaders and LGA board members as well as passionate community advocates for a long time.

In my own electorate of Flinders, the tenure of three mayors finished up: from Port Lincoln, Brad Flaherty; from Ceduna, Perry Will; and from Elliston, Malcolm Hancock. These three men have been regional leaders and a regional voice for the whole of Eyre Peninsula. I have enjoyed over the last four years in particular working with those gentlemen to put forward the opportunities, issues and challenges—the future as a whole—of Eyre Peninsula.

There are other mayors who finished up at the election, some of whom have been serving for a long time and some for a shorter time but, as I said before, they are all worthy of recognition. I note Brett Benbow, Wayne Thomas, Greg Flint, Richard Sage, Phil Heaslip, Ben Browne, Simon Rothwell, Simon McMahon, Hannah Allen-Jordan, Elizabeth Fricker—and Sandy Verschoor, with the Lord Mayor role in particular being a significant challenge and responsibility. Local government leadership is unique. It is so challenging yet so rewarding. I would like to acknowledge the hard work and commitment of these mayors in particular in taking up this unique challenge.

As the shadow local government minister, I am looking forward to continuing my close working relationship with the local government sector, including the Local Government Association, its board and its organisation, with Clinton Jury as the CEO and new President Dean Johnson, and the number of new mayors and local government representatives from around the state. The future for local government is bright, but we must be bold and visionary with the opportunities for further reform and continual improvement.

REGIONAL EVENTS

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:30): I rise to make a few comments. First, I would like to acknowledge and congratulate the Premier of South Australia on attracting the AFL Magic Round here to Adelaide. Beating out Sydney and every other city in Australia was a master stroke. I think everyone is waiting eagerly to see how it all comes together, as it will be a very difficult logistical exercise. This city is starting to feel a bit like Melbourne did in the nineties—bold and prepared to fight to attract major events to the city as much as an economic driver as a sporting one. Wouldn't it be good to one day secure the Formula One back to South Australia?

This weekend we will see the Adelaide 500 put the City of Adelaide on the world stage from a tourism point of view, with LIV Golf, the AFL Magic Round, combined with the exciting events such as the Tour Down Under, the ICC T20 World Cup, the NRL State of Origin and many others. My comment to all of this is that it is fantastic and something I support 100 per cent, but we cannot lose sight of our regions.

These events I have previously identified are predominantly, except for the Tour Down Under, city-based attractions. I commend the previous Labor minister, the member for Mawson, who as a minister started a conversation with me and my community about bringing an aspect of the Tour Down Under to Mount Gambier. Having footage of riders riding around the Blue Lake and those images being beamed across the globe would be a fantastic tourism opportunity. In fact, I remember him saying, and I do not know if I will hold him to this, that if he did not deliver something he would ride a unicycle around the Blue Lake and then jump in. Unfortunately, he did not deliver, so we are waiting for that part.

Mount Gambier is the state's second largest city and we would love to work together with the state government to look at opportunities going forward. Being located between Melbourne and Adelaide, there are many sporting opportunities that could be attracted to the Blue Lake city. One such opportunity would be a game from the AFL Magic Round to be played in Mount Gambier. In fact, as I am sure the member for Schubert would agree, it is a real opportunity to showcase regional South Australia to a national audience—a game in the Barossa, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, Mount Barker and Mount Gambier.

I know there would be logistical challenges; however, anything is possible if you dare to dream and have the will to succeed. Whatever is required regarding facilities, grounds, transport, player protection and so on could be achieved if we were given a chance. Just as some might argue a metropolitan street is not the best place to hold a car race, when the time and money and expertise is invested and infrastructure goes up, the city will be completely transformed into the perfect street racing venue.

The main argument is around our city not having the venue or infrastructure to support 8,000 people. I am heading to the Adelaide 500 this weekend and could see the grandstands being relocated to an oval in Mount Gambier providing this seating. I am told there are facilities for well over 10,000 people, and I would almost guarantee we would sell out every single one of those seats twice over, plus the corporate facilities.

For those who say it is too far away, just look at how far fans travel. They hit the Dukes Highway for 10 hours to travel from Adelaide to Mount Gambier to watch the Crows play over in Victoria. Being equally located between Melbourne and Adelaide, Mount Gambier has a major advantage. We would gladly host the Victorian team, as there are just as many residents who support a Victorian team in Mount Gambier as support a South Australian team. We have locals who play for Geelong, in Brad Close and Jeremy Cameron.

Victorians would travel just over the border, and it would be a massive economic and tourism-related input into our incredible city. I would like to see Mount Gambier's hotels booked out, just as Adelaide's are for the Adelaide 500 this weekend. So, when the state government says South Australia is hosting the Magic Round of AFL, I believe it should be all of South Australia that benefits not just the City of Adelaide.

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:36): Given the member for Flinders' generous and wholesome and fulsome apology and withdrawal, I withdraw my matter of privilege in full.

The SPEAKER: The matter of privilege has been resolved and it is therefore unnecessary to rule on it.

*Bills***NATIONAL GAS (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (EAST COAST GAS SYSTEM) AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:36): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the National Gas (South Australia) Act 2008. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:37): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The government is delivering an important reform to national energy frameworks agreed by Energy Ministers on 28 October 2022, which involves amendments to the National Gas Law to extend the Australian Energy Market Operator's (AEMO) functions and powers to manage reliability and gas supply adequacy for the east coast gas market over winter 2023 and beyond.

This is in response to events experienced in the National Electricity Market and east coast gas markets in the winter of 2022 and forecasts of future risks to reliability and supply adequacy going forward. These risks are emerging with the forecast decline in southern gas reserves, increasing reliance on gas from Queensland and challenges to the reliability of coal generation as the energy market transitions.

The domestic east coast gas market has become more susceptible to external shocks. In winter 2022, impacts of the Russian invasion of Ukraine increased international demand for Australian gas (in the form of Liquefied Natural Gas). Additionally, coal generator outages and lower renewable energy generation increased domestic demand for gas powered generation. This confluence of events, amongst others, led to record high prices and multiple interventions from AEMO to address supply adequacy risks in the Victorian Declared Wholesale Gas Market (DWGM) and the Short Term Trading Markets (STTM).

The Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) and AEMO have raised concerns that domestic gas supply adequacy has declined substantially since early 2022. AEMO's *2022 Gas Supply and Systems Adequacy Risk report* and the ACCC's *July 2022 Gas Inquiry interim report* both highlight increased risk of peak day and seasonal gas supply shortfalls in southern states in winter 2023.

While LNG exporters have committed to offer additional uncontracted supply to the east coast market, risks to supply shortfall remain, such as unexpected maintenance or outages, production and infrastructure constraints and unexpected increases in demand.

In August 2022, Energy Ministers agreed to the accelerated development and implementation of a broad range of actions to address the significant risks of forecast gas supply shortfalls and help AEMO to manage those risks.

Unlike the National Electricity Market which has well established frameworks under which AEMO maintains reliability and supply adequacy, AEMO has limited powers and tools to identify and respond to supply-demand imbalances in the east coast gas market outside of Victoria.

The broad aim of the regulatory amendments outlined in the *National Gas (South Australia) (East Coast Gas System) Amendment Bill 2022* is to implement a framework that provides AEMO with the tools to monitor risks to supply adequacy in advance of those risks being realised, to signal those risks to the market and seek a response.

Should the market fail to respond, this Bill will give AEMO the power to manage reliability and supply adequacy threats through seeking further information, engaging the market to identify and implement actions, such as trading in gas—including related services such as procurement of pipeline services or services provided by a compression service provider or a storage provider—as well as directing participants in the market to better manage existing issues.

AEMO's ability to exercise its directions powers and trading function is limited to when AEMO is of the opinion that the giving of the direction or exercise of the trading function is necessary to prevent, reduce or mitigate an actual or potential threat identified by AEMO in the exercise of AEMO's proposed monitoring and signalling functions.

The Bill is intended to complement other initiatives by governments and industry to address forecast shortfalls in the east coast gas market. This includes the Commonwealth Government's actions to amend the Australian Domestic Gas Security Mechanism and the recent renegotiation of the Heads of Agreement. The Bill also builds on recently implemented transparency measures as seen in the- *National Gas (South Australia) (Market Transparency) Amendment Act 2022*.

More specifically, the Bill outlines AEMO's new east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy functions, which are broadly proposed to encompass:

- Monitoring trends in supply and demand of natural gas across the east coast gas system and factors which affect, or may potentially affect, the reliability or adequacy of the supply of gas within that system;
- Identifying, communicating and publishing information about actual or potential risks or threats to reliability and adequacy of gas supply within the east coast gas system;
- Reporting to Energy Ministers on these matters;
- Giving directions and trading in gas (and associated services) to maintain and improve the reliability or adequacy of gas supply in the east coast gas system where AEMO considers it necessary to prevent, reduce or mitigate an actual or potential threat; and
- Other functions conferred on AEMO by the Rules for the purposes of the new east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy functions.

The Bill introduces a new term, the east coast gas system. The east coast gas system encompasses the east coast jurisdictions covered by the framework and includes a natural gas industry facility, regulated gas market or gas trading exchange for which AEMO has an established gas trading exchange agreement as well as other matters as specified in the Rules.

The Bill outlines that AEMO must account to the relevant Ministers for performance of east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy functions.

AEMO will be empowered to exercise a range of directions powers, similar to those which AEMO can utilise in relation to the Victorian DWGM but modified to be more generally applicable to the east coast gas system as a whole. As set out in the Bill, these powers will be exercisable:

- to maintain and improve the reliability of the supply of natural gas within the east coast gas system; and
- to maintain and improve the adequacy of supply within the east coast gas system.

AEMO directions may relate to the operation, maintenance or use of any equipment or installation, the control of the flow of natural gas, or any other matter that may affect the reliability or adequacy of gas supply within the east coast gas system.

The Bill provides for the requirement for AEMO to prepare, in accordance with the rules, guidelines relating to the exercise or performance of AEMO's directions power and trading function.

The Bill provides a head of power for the Regulations to specify:

- the relationship between the operation of AEMO's east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy functions, or a provision of these functions, and a law of a participating jurisdiction, in the event of an inconsistency;
- the extent to which a relevant entity is or is not required to comply with an east coast gas system direction in circumstances where the direction is inconsistent with a law of a participating jurisdiction;
- the extent to which an east coast gas system direction is not valid in circumstances where the direction is inconsistent with a law of a participating jurisdiction.

The Bill provides for the Rules to specify matters that AEMO may or must consider in determining there is or is not an actual or potential threat to the reliability or adequacy of the supply of natural gas within the east coast gas system; the kinds of directions that AEMO may or may not give under this function; and the matters that AEMO may or must consider in determining whether to exercise its directions power or trading function.

The Bill provides that the East Coast Gas System Procedures may deal with the matters specified by the Rules and any other matter relevant to AEMO's east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy functions on which this Law or the Rules contemplate the making of Procedures. Compliance with the East Coast Gas System Procedures is also dealt with in the Bill and outlines who would be applicable and must comply with the Procedures.

AEMO's declared system functions will be expanded to include purchasing pipeline services or services provided by a compression service or storage provider.

AEMO's information gathering powers will be broadened to include its new function for east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy.

AEMO's powers to make general market information orders, or serve market information notices, will be expanded to include making or serving an order or notice in relation to the exercise of an east coast gas system reliability and adequacy function. The Bill allows for the Rules to specify a person, or class of persons, to whom such an order or notice may be issued. AEMO must determine the type of consultation that should occur before making such an order.

The Bill extends AEMO's ability to disclose protected information to include adequacy of gas supply.

The Bill extends the obligations to make payments under the Rules and Procedures to apply to relevant entities subject to AEMO's directions power.

Consistent with the introduction of most energy legislation, the Bill inserts a head of power for the South Australian Minister to make an initial set of rules. The Bill will allow the Minister to make further rules for a maximum period of six months from commencement of the Bill. This additional six month period is aimed at refining the initial package of Rules with respect to any outstanding issues. Once the time period has expired, the Minister will have no power to make any further amendments.

New subject matters for the making of National Gas Rules will be inserted into Schedule 1 under the heading 'East coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy functions'. This will empower the Australian Energy Market Commission to consider rule change proposals for further development of a range of matters in relation to AEMO's east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy functions including:

- The development of reliability standards;
- Arrangements to enable AEMO to contract with other parties to reduce or curtail natural gas demand;
- Arrangements to procure, by or on behalf of AEMO, the supply or storage of natural gas, transport capacity and other services for the purposes of AEMO's east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy functions;
- Obligations on retailers, gas powered generators and other large gas users to develop plans to manage peak or other demand scenarios; and
- Arrangements to assist AEMO and participating jurisdictions to coordinate with each other in relation to addressing actual or potential threats.

I commend this Bill to members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary 1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provision

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *National Gas Law*

4—Amendment of section 2—Definitions

Definitions are inserted for the purposes of the measure.

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

Additional subject matters are added to the list of subject matters in relation to which the AEMC may make National Gas Rules.

6—Amendment of section 91A—AEMO's statutory functions

Additional functions are conferred on AEMO, being the east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy functions.

7—Insertion of Chapter 2 Part 6 Division 1A

New Division 1A is proposed to be inserted into Chapter 2 Part 6:

Division 1A—AEMO's east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy functions

91AD—AEMO's east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy functions

AEMO's east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy functions are set out.

91AE—AEMO to account to relevant Minister for performance of east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy functions

AEMO is required to provide information about the performance of its east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy functions at the written request of a Minister of a participating jurisdiction or the MCE.

91AF—AEMO's power of direction—east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy

AEMO is authorised in specified circumstances to give a written direction (an *east coast gas system direction*) to a relevant entity for 1 or more specified purposes. Provision is made in relation to east coast gas system directions.

91AG—East Coast Gas System Procedures

Provision is made in relation to East Coast Gas System Procedures made for the purposes of section 91AD.

91AH—Compliance with East Coast Gas System Procedures

The section provides for compliance with East Coast Gas System Procedures.

8—Amendment of section 91BA—AEMO's declared system functions

This amendment is consequential.

9—Amendment of section 91F—Information gathering powers

10—Amendment of section 91FA—Making and publication of general market information order

11—Amendment of section 91FB—Service of market information notice

12—Amendment of section 91GG—Disclosure of protected information for safety, proper operation of the market etc

The amendments to the above sections are related to the conferral of the east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy functions on AEMO.

13—Amendment of section 91H—Obligations under Rules or Procedures to make payments

This amendment is consequential.

14—Insertion of section 294H

Section 294H is proposed to be inserted:

294H—South Australian Minister may make Rules relating to AEMO's east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy functions

The South Australian Minister is authorised to make Rules relating to AEMO's east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy functions. The provision expires 6 calendar months after it commences.

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

The list of subject matters for the National Gas Rules in Schedule 1 is extended to include subject matters relating to the east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy functions.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Tarzia.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (EDUCATION, TRAINING AND SKILLS PORTFOLIO) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (15:38): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Education and Children's Services Act 2019, the Education and Early Childhood Services (Registration and Standards) Act 2011 and the History Trust of South Australia Act 1981. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (15:38): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The Statutes Amendment (Education, Training and Skills Portfolio) Bill 2022 will amend the Education and Children's Services Act 2019, the Education and Early Childhood Services (Registration and Standards) Act 2011, and the History Trust of South Australia Act 1981 to address a small number of minor technical, legal or administrative issues associated with the operation of provisions of those Acts.

Part 2 of the Bill makes two separate amendments to the *Education and Children's Services Act 2019*.

Firstly, clause 3 will amend section 75 to clarify that section 75(2a) applies to both the notification of persistent non-attendance at school and persistent non-participation of a student in an approved learning program. Approved learning programs include secondary education as well as learning and training delivered by TAFE SA, private registered training organisations, universities and as part of apprenticeships or traineeships.

Section 75 requires a principal of a school or the head of an approved learning program to notify the Chief Executive, or cause the Chief Executive to be notified, if a student of the school or approved learning program is persistently failing to attend school or participate in an approved learning program. Section 75(2a) enables this notification to be made in the form of an electronic report at least once a term. However, as currently drafted, section 75(2a) does not expressly state that the head of an approved learning program is able to provide notification of students' non-participation in this manner. Clause 3 of the bill will insert a new section 75(2a) to address this issue.

Secondly, clause 4 will amend section 130(4) to provide the Chief Executive with the discretion to waive, reduce or refund a charge, allow it to be paid by instalments or require a person to give security for payment of a charge under section 130. This discretion will relate to charges fixed by the Chief Executive of the Department for Education under section 130 for full fee paying overseas students, students enrolled in schools who are not resident in the State, and children enrolled in schools who are dependants of a person who is the subject of a visa of a kind prescribed by the regulations. Currently this discretion rests with the principal of a school and is inconsistent with the practical administration of these fees, which is undertaken by the Department for Education.

Part 3 of the Bill will amend section 22 of the *Education and Early Childhood Services (Registration and Standards) Act 2011* to provide that a deputy of a member of the Education and Early Childhood Services Registration and Standards Board can act in the place of the member if the office of the member becomes vacant. The deputy is able to act as the member for the balance of the previous member's term of appointment or until a person is appointed to the vacant office, whichever first occurs. The amendment will ensure that where a deputy is available to act as a member, a temporary vacancy on the board can be managed in an efficient and timely manner without disruption to board activities.

Part 4 of the Bill will amend the definition of premises of the Trust in section 2 of the *History Trust of South Australia Act 1981* to provide that it includes premises being temporarily used by the Trust to conduct activities or events related to its functions under the Act during the course of such activities and events. This will enable the conduct provisions set out in regulations under the Act, which prohibit or regulate certain behaviour, to also apply to premises being used temporarily by the Trust.

*Explanation of Clauses**Part 1—Preliminary*

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Education and Children's Services Act 2019

3—Amendment of section 75—Principal etc to report persistent non-attendance or non-participation

This clause amends section 75 of the principal Act to extend the scope of that subsection to include heads of approved learning programs.

4—Amendment of section 130—Charges for certain overseas and non-resident students etc

This clause amends section 130 of the principal Act to shift who can waive, reduce or refund a charge, allow a charge to be paid by instalments or require a person to give security for payment of a charge under section 130 from the principal of a school to the Chief Executive.

Part 3—Amendment of *Education and Early Childhood Services (Registration and Standards) Act 2011*

5—Amendment of section 22—Composition of Board

This clause amends section 22 of the principal Act to allow a deputy of a member to fill a vacancy in the office of the member for whom they are a deputy.

Part 4—Amendment of *History Trust of South Australia Act 1981*

6—Amendment of section 2—Interpretation

This clause amends the definition of 'premises of the Trust' to include premises being temporarily used by the Trust to conduct activities and events related to its functions under this Act during the course of such activities or events.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Hurn.

AUTOMATED EXTERNAL DEFIBRILLATORS (PUBLIC ACCESS) BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

(Continued from 29 November 2022.)

Clause 8.

Mrs HURN: Casting my memory back to where we were this time yesterday, the minister was providing some answers in relation to what piece of legislation was relevant to the \$20,000 fine with the vehicles. He did make an assertion that, because we were asking questions about this, it indicated that we were not supportive of this bill.

I would like to outline to the house yet again, just in case the minister was not here or failed to hear our very clear position, that we do support this bill. That is why we are where we are, and that is why we have publicly stated that we support this bill. However, we do have some very genuine questions to ask in relation to the fines. The minister thinks it is unreasonable that the opposition asks questions that the business community and—

The Hon. C.J. Picton: Ask the question.

Mrs HURN: Well, I am just putting on the record the fact that you got the record wrong and I am clarifying it. If the minister thinks it is unreasonable that the opposition asks questions in relation to massive and hefty fines in relation to a \$20,000 fine for failing to have an AED at a sportsground and failing to have an AED in a vehicle, then that is for the minister and the Premier to explain to the people of South Australia, but members on this side will certainly be asking what we think are reasonable questions. With that in mind, I do think I have actually asked my three questions, but—

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Not according to the note I have, member for Schubert.

Mrs HURN: Thank you very much. That is excellent to know. In terms of the installation into vehicles, can the minister advise who it is that polices the AEDs? Who is it that ultimately ensures that compliance is met?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I refer to the answer I gave to a very similar question yesterday.

Mrs HURN: To be clear, I do not believe that specifically related to the vehicles, so perhaps for the benefit of the committee, and all the interested parties who are watching, could the minister advise who it is that is going to be policing the mandatory installation of AEDs? That would be helpful.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: It would be exactly the same situation that would be considered for both vehicles and buildings.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Member for Schubert, you have actually had your three questions now. You had one question earlier, I was advised, and you just had two.

Mrs HURN: You just said I did not have any questions.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): No, I said you had not used your three.

Mrs HURN: Okay, well, I will ask these next questions to the next clause.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): To the next clause? No problem.

Clause passed.

Clause 9.

Mrs HURN: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Hurn-1]—

Page 6, line 19 [clause 9(2), penalty provision]—Delete the penalty provision and substitute:

Maximum penalty: \$2,000.

Expiation fee: \$500.

The opposition really cannot understand the logic behind fining individuals or organisations \$20,000 for failing to maintain their AEDs. There is no underlying justification that has been given to the opposition as to how this figure was landed upon. We acknowledge, of course, that the maintenance and the testing are important, but we also believe that an expiation avenue, particularly in relation to this, is sensible; moreover, if our amendments are not successful we will certainly be pursuing it with the minister.

Who is policing it? What is the notice of a reminder to sporting organisations, to those that are required to have them in their vehicles and, indeed, for some businesses where this may be captured? What is the notification mechanism? Is there a reminder process that will be followed? I think we still need quite a bit of meat on the bones to justify why \$20,000 was the figure that was landed upon. It is with that in mind that we have put forward these reasonable amendments.

We have landed on these amendments after some consultation with not only businesses but also other organisations across South Australia. We think this strikes the right balance. Particularly when it comes to maintenance and testing, we believe that an expiation avenue is absolutely critical. Fancy being slugged with potentially a maximum of \$20,000 for failing to maintain and test your AED. As I say, we absolutely acknowledge that maintaining and testing is a critical element of this bill, but we have some serious concerns about how hefty these fines are, and that is why we are putting forward these amendments.

Mr TELFER: I rise to speak in support of the amendment put by the member for Schubert. I recognise that we have obviously had debate about the fine structures for any organisation, business or the like that has not installed an AED, if this legislation was to pass, in a place that is legislated. That is definitely one discussion to have, which we have had. To use the same fine regime for the maintenance and testing requirements I think is a misstep. This is why I am speaking strongly in favour of this amendment.

To have a maximum penalty of \$20,000 for an AED which, according to this legislation, is not properly maintained or tested at least once every 12 months, is putting in place extra measures that are unproven and the parameters are still uncertain. To have a maximum \$20,000 potentially for a community group, a sporting group, even a council, is a significant figure. It may well be that the minister will say that he does not believe there will be a time when the maximum penalty will be enforced. This is why, in the process of legislation and in the process of lawmaking with which we have been tasked by our community, we need to make sure we get the parameters right.

If the minister does not believe that we will get to the maximum of \$20,000, then how about we set a maximum that we believe is appropriate? That is why we on this side have put forward this \$2,000 change and the opportunity for an expiation. As I said on earlier clauses, there is a need for us to bring our community along with the progress when it comes to installation, testing and maintenance of these AEDs. For us to have the big stick of a penalty of up to \$20,000 really does put out of balance the need for us to have the community to go along with us. I am speaking strongly in favour of this amendment, and I hope the government has given due consideration to this clause in particular.

Amendment negated.

Mrs HURN: Can the minister talk us through what the process is for single-use AEDs and how they can be tested? I think this is a critical part of it, given we know that the cheapest AED supported by the TGA is \$360, and that is for a single-use AED. Can it be tested and how is it maintained, not only for that single-use AED? What is the testing process and how much does it cost for the more expensive ones?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I think, as we outlined yesterday, there are a significant number of different types of products and they will all have different procedures in place in regard to the testing. It is impossible for me to outline each and every product and each of their testing settings and what would be required to undertake that testing.

Of course, the requirement under this clause would be that you have to test it once every 12 months. That would be in accordance with the testing that has been set as part of the manufacturing and sales process and the guidelines that have been set out for that particular device.

Mrs HURN: I think the minister misunderstood my straightforward question, which was in relation to the single-use AEDs. Can they be tested and what is the process of maintaining them? I am talking specifically for a single-use one. I think it is helpful to know whether they can be tested and maintained because if it is just for a single use, would testing it, for instance, make it null and void for a further situation?

I am not going to waste my very precious three questions on asking the minister to clarify that because I think it is clear that there is still some further information that the minister needs to have on hand to be able to furnish the house with that answer. What is the government's intention when it comes to having a set of reminders for schools and for all the prescribed buildings and facilities? What is the planned reminder program that the government will be undertaking to ensure that each 12 months these are tested and maintained?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: In relation to the first part of the question, as I said, even for the single use there are a variety of different products. It would be impossible for me to outline all the various testing requirements that are set by the manufacturers of those different products. In relation to the second part of the question, clearly this is part of a communication that we will need to do if this legislation ever passes. Following that, we will have to make clear as part of that communication that not only is it a requirement to have in place the device but also there are requirements around testing as well.

Mrs HURN: Can the member outline how it is that the \$20,000 maximum fine was determined when it comes to ensuring that these AEDs are maintained and tested every 12 months? We have gone through chapter and verse about the fact that the installation of an AED in a building is based on section 157 of the PDI Act, noting that there are some serious inconsistencies with that comparison with this specific bill.

We have not had an answer to what the \$20,000 fine for vehicle installation is. I am just wondering whether the minister has an answer to how it was set that the maximum fine for failing to maintain and failing to test an AED would attract a maximum \$20,000 fine and whether he thinks it is reasonable that potentially sporting clubs could be slugged \$20,000 for failing to maintain and test their AED.

They already have a lot on their plate and this is just another thing they need to do. I am sure they would want to make sure that it was up to date. They would want to make sure that it was in an appropriate form to be able to utilise it—hopefully, they would not need to do that. Can the minister outline what piece of legislation this maximum fine is based on and how it was determined through stakeholder engagement?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: It is essentially the same answer that I have given to a number of previous questions in that this is a bill that was drafted by the Hon. Frank Pangallo. I believe it was drafted back in 2020 or 2021 and he undertook a range of consultation and consideration as part of the drafting process, and part of that was the setting of the penalties.

There have been some analogies drawn with various points of other sections on the statute book, one being in the PDI Act, as has been discussed, but I am sure there are other provisions in other acts that also refer to \$20,000. Do I think it is reasonable? Yes, on balance, I do, bearing in mind the fact that this is a maximum penalty, which seems to be lost in this consideration.

It does bring me back to where we were a bit over six months ago in debating COVID legislation that has now expired, where we had the shadow minister and the Leader of the Opposition claiming that a maximum penalty of \$60,000 in that circumstance, which was consistent with what was in the Emergency Management Act, was somehow draconian, dark age power.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I am answering the question. Clearly, the opposition have concerns around fines broadly in different bills that we see now, but I think that it is worth remembering that these are maximum penalties. I look at what happened in that piece of COVID legislation, which has now expired. I do not think we saw the absolute draconian, dark age situation that was professed by those opposite coming to pass. I do not think that we saw significant pain and anguish on businesses because of the penalties that were in that provision. Similarly, I think here there will certainly be common sense and reasonableness applied both when these things are brought to the courts, if that were to happen, and by the courts themselves in considering what would be a reasonable maximum penalty.

Mr TELFER: In regard to this clause to do with the maintenance and testing, as I mentioned in my second reading contribution, as someone who has been involved in the decision-making about the installation and ongoing maintenance in my own local community I know that there is an actual reasonably significant cost that comes to bear with this process. I know there are different components of these devices that need replacement at different times and for varying levels. The pads, for instance, need to be replaced every couple of years at the cost of a couple of hundred dollars, and the batteries themselves.

In reflecting that this is permanent legislation—not temporary legislation as the minister was referring to other legislation before—can the minister give me an insight into whether the state government is going to be budgeting to support the private sector, the not-for-profit sector and local government with the necessary ongoing not insignificant costs required of them under this clause, maintenance and testing in particular? Is there going to be ongoing financial support that the minister envisions the state government would be involved in?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Similarly with how we do not provide financial support in relation to testing of smoke alarms, etc., it is not envisaged that there would be a financial support package in relation to testing of defibrillators.

Mr TELFER: There is obviously a requirement under clause 9 that an AED is properly maintained and tested at least once every 12 months. Who is going to be the responsible body for monitoring the ongoing status of these AEDs once installed? There are going to be hundreds all around the state. Is the requirement going to fall on each organisation to ensure that the appropriate maintenance and testing is happening only to find out when there is unfortunately an incident that the AED called upon is not ready for the task at hand, whether it is properly maintained or tested, or is there going to be a body, either an existing one or a newly formed one, that will be tasked with the ongoing monitoring of the status of each AED around our state?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Certainly there is a clause 12 in relation to the register, but I do not see anything in there that would require separate registration in terms of the testing that will take place. That would simply be the locations and accessibility that would be part of the register, rather than periodic testing that would be in that register.

Mr TELFER: The main part of the question was whether there was there going to be a separate body for monitoring. Who is going to be tasked with the not insignificant challenge of visiting each of these areas with registered AEDs on all these different sites, multiple ones all around the state? Is this going to be an ongoing monitoring program, or is it going to be a sporadic one? What is envisaged by the government?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I think I have already answered. The enforcement will have to be considered over time, and it would be a reasonable, commonsense way in which this would be enforced. The suggestion that you would establish a fleet of people who would check every single AED in the state is not entirely practical.

Mr TEAGUE: It might serve the committee, at least from my point of view, to consider a couple of worked examples. Much of the subject matter 'designated entity' is the Crown, at least for the time being, and it will be for a year post 2025. In relation to subclause (3)(c), category of prescribed vehicle, I acknowledge that the owner in the small but distinct category of private bus operator will be a private owner, but in the vast majority of those cases the Crown will be the owner. As in the case of all the trams, all the trains and the bulk of the public buses, it is the Crown that is the owner—and I have in mind clause 6.

In relation to those public-owned trams, public-owned trains and public buses, the vast bulk of the prescribed vehicles, for the present moment, has the government done any work to identify the particular AED it would roll out? Is it uniform across those vehicles and is there a cost? In relation to the trams, trains and public buses, is there any engagement with the private operators presently operating those public services?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The procurement of those for the trains, trams and buses, etc. will have to go through the appropriate state government procurement processes. There is not a particular device, to the best of my knowledge, that is selected for that rollout. As I mentioned yesterday, there is an amount of funding we have allocated to enable those works to occur, and that work will happen over the course of the two years. Obviously there will be work that will happen in relation to the private operators as well.

Mr TEAGUE: To perhaps complete the picture then, and to use another worked example, this time in relation to a building or more particular a facility, which is what I have in mind—and I refer to clause 6 in relation to the Crown's liability or otherwise, as is referred to here. It might be appropriate to do a comparison with the provision in (1)(c) of clause 7, where you might have a private operator in this case, as opposed to in the vast bulk of cases the Crown being the responsible entity for prescribed vehicles.

Say you have a private operator, this time of a retirement village that might meet the definition of a facility where you have an obligation applying in accord with clause 7(1)(c)—the minister might just take the opportunity to indicate how this might be rectified if necessary and we have an obligation in the case of the facility. If we are looking at a clause 4(e) facility (a retirement village), one where, on the face of clause 7(1)(c), there is an obligation to install one of these AEDs, one per 1,200 square metres of the facility reading that directly, the minister might take the opportunity to indicate what he thinks of clause 7(1)(c) insofar as it appears to create an obligation vis-a-vis the size of a facility.

There might be a concern, as I say, sotto voce on the side, about where the clause is requiring one per 1,200 square metres of facility you have an obligation to say, 'Well, hang on, for the sake of the analysis we have 700 square metres of built area, but per 700 we have another 700 of garden beds, open space and so on, which is clearly part of the facility—managed and all the rest of it.'

The minister might take the opportunity to respond, but on the face of it it is going to require the operator of that retirement village to have to effectively put one in the garden bed in order to meet the obligation. If they are not going to do that, they are going to have to work around it and have maybe two side by side on the same building and somehow try to persuade whoever is enforcing this that they are complying.

In terms of the worked example for clause 9, the obligation to maintain and test might therefore be quite varied according to the circumstances in which that facility is seeking to comply. It will not be a single one-size-fits-all set your course because, if you are having to meet a facility obligation in clause 7, your maintenance and testing processes are really going to be quite different. Perhaps the minister might start by just addressing that facility point and then provide whatever guidance he can for those who might be facing that challenge from a facility point of view.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Certainly, the issue in relation to retirement villages was raised very recently with me, in fact, by Mr Daniel Gannon, a former President of the South Australian Property Council. I am not suggesting that he is writing the questions for the member for Heysen (I am sure he is writing his own questions), but it is just a coincidence. In relation to that, I have certainly said to Mr Gannon, and I say here, that if there are particular issues in terms of retirement villages it is certainly not the intention of either Mr Pangallo in the drafting or the government in its support of this legislation that a garden would feature in terms of the calculation.

If there are particular issues, then we will consider them over the course of the three years leading into the implementation and also whether there are particular regulations if there are issues that are identified in that regard. That is not to say that there necessarily will be, but I would note that the Property Council and the Retirement Living Council, as an aspect of that, certainly have indicated their general support in relation to access in retirement villages, which is very welcome, particularly given the age cohort of people who live in retirement villages. We have seen the average age of people living in retirement villages increase over time. It is an area where certainly a high incidence of risks of cardiac arrests can occur.

Mr TEAGUE: It seems the minister has chosen to address the matter in those terms. Can I highlight it from a drafting point of view. Again, if that is a concession that the bill needs to be amended before it commences—and I will not hold the minister to that, and I do not mean it in that way at all, to say here we are seeking a guarantee from the minister; far from it. There has been some disquiet, including at the last adjournment, about the time it has taken to come to grips with what is set out here. There is a period of time before commencement, and these are matters of serious concern that need to be addressed.

Far from limiting it to a clause 4(e) example, one might apply the same test to clause 4(a), clause 4(b) and clause 4(c) in each of those categories. I am sure that the CE of Corrections would be interested in relation to clause 4(d). I used the example of clause 4(e) because I know about some of the beautifully maintained garden beds in our retirement villages. The point is that the drafting of clause 7 provides in express terms at the moment—with the \$20,000 penalty attached, let's make no mistake—for the obligation clearly upon the owner of the designated building or facility to ensure that one AED is installed in the facility for every 1,200 square metres of floor area of the building or facility.

It is a matter that hopefully can be dealt with with common sense, like all things in life. Let's face it: the government is carrying the bill in the House of Assembly. It is all very well to say that it had its origins in working up via the advocacy of one dedicated member in particular. That is to be applauded. We emphasise our support for the bill in this regard, but we want to highlight how it is actually going to work on the face of it because that is what real people need to do each day once the bill comes into force.

Is it therefore to be understood that, in the case of the potential anomaly that might arise in just about any of the clause 4 categories around what might be an unusual disparity between the obligation per floor area of a building and the obligation per floor area of a facility, that will be subject to consideration by the government between now and commencement?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: To make this very clear, I do not believe that, as was being suggested, there is necessarily going to be a need to revisit this matter. I am merely stating that, if there are particular concerns raised, we will be happy to work through with, in this case, particular industry groups to make sure there is clarity. Looking at the clause, which I do not think is the clause the member was talking about, I do not particularly see that it would necessarily include garden beds, etc. within the definition. We will continue to talk to industry groups, etc. That is why it is very important that we have these three years of implementation time, and we will work those matters through.

Clause passed.

Clause 10.

Mrs HURN: I move:

Amendment No 4 [Hurn-1]—

Page 7, line 11 [clause 10(4), penalty provision]—Delete the penalty provision and substitute:

Maximum penalty: \$2,000.

Expiation fee: \$500.

Once again, we believe this amendment strikes the right balance and is consistent with the others we have put forward and the principles enshrined in them. Specifically, we believe that it is this clause that is most beneficial to have an expiation through it.

The proposal by the honourable member in the other place, the Hon. Frank Pangallo, in relation to fines for failing to have a sign near—and we still need to get to what 'near' exactly means and how far that is—an AED can attract a maximum penalty of \$2,500. Whilst this is not as hefty as the fines of \$20,000 that we have seen in the other clauses of this bill, we still believe that it is hefty.

More than that, we do believe that there should be an expiation notice specifically for this clause. As to all those sporting clubs and schools and all the facilities and buildings that are now going to be required to have an AED installed, which we support, we believe there should be an expiation notice, because fancy being slapped with a \$2,500 maximum fine straight off the bat when you could have an expiation notice of \$500.

It is with those principles in mind that we are putting forward what we think is another commonsense amendment for the house to consider, and we certainly urge those opposite to consider it wholeheartedly.

Amendment negated.

Mrs HURN: Specifically in relation to clause 10(1)(a), could the minister please provide some further context as to what 'near' means, because I do think it is important. Is 'near' 100 metres from the facility? If the AED, for instance, is only available and accessible inside a premises, how much further outside of the front door does that need to be? Could you give us a practical sense as to what this bill is hoping to achieve when it legislates that a sign must be installed near the AED?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I did not bring my Oxford dictionary with me. However, I believe part of the reason why in the drafting process between the Hon. Mr Pangallo and the drafters and people he consulted with in relation to this bill there was not a specific requirement as to a number of metres is that I am sure it would depend upon the individual circumstances of the facility and the location. I am sure that being too prescriptive might lead to your raising a whole series of concerns in terms of: what if it could not be 10 metres or 15 metres, etc?

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Schubert!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I will complete my answer.

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The CHAIR: No, actually I do not agree.

Mrs HURN: Okay, thank you. My next question is in relation to clause 10(5). Can the minister confirm what the process is in terms of adding additional requirements in relation to signs and what the Hon. Frank Pangallo in the other place means by that? We already know that there is no answer for what 'near' means, and I think that was a very straightforward answer, because is it near the actual AED? Is it a five-metre thing right near the AED? If this is a big facility, I think that people want to know where it is that they are going to be able to find the AED. Is it at the front door? When you walk through the front door, despite the fact that the AED may be on a separate level or whatever it may be, what is the signal that tells people this is where the AED is?

Is it near the actual AED itself? Is it outside the facility itself?

I think these are really straightforward questions and I am surprised at the minister's response. Nevertheless, what are the additional requirements in relation to signs that this bill is envisaging, and does he envisage that the regulations may prescribe any additional requirements to signs?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: There are no considerations or plans by the government at this stage in relation to regulations that would fall under subclause (5); however, obviously that has been

put there to give some flexibility should that need arise and that would obviously be subject to consideration and potential disallowance by this parliament should that occur in the future.

Mr TELFER: Further on the regulations, I absolutely respect that the minister does not have the answers to these and that a lot of these will be developed in the regulation process. Will there be a prescription of the size, design and type of sign within the regulation so there is certainty or will there be a little bit more ambiguity as to what a sign might look like? I know there are existing example signs. I am wondering whether that is going to be prescribed in the regulation.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I suspect that the majority of people will be looking to particular standard signs. I understand that, even amongst the manufacturers, there is help that they provide in relation to standard forms of signage that people could use. At this stage, there is no consideration for an additional regulation to prescribe a particular type of sign. Potentially, that could be considered down the track, but there is no consideration. No-one has raised that with me, and I am not aware of any advice in that regard.

Mrs HURN: I am hoping for some clarification about what the installation of a sign means, specifically in relation to a vehicle. I am referring specifically to clause 10(3)(a) and (b). Could the minister outline what that looks like? Presumably, it means that there will be a sticker or something on the vehicle, but could the minister provide some clarification as to what that looks like and whether that is indeed the practical intention.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Subclause (3) provides:

...must, on the outside of the vehicle, install a sign indicating that an Automated External Defibrillator is in the vehicle.

I think that is right that it would likely be a sticker. I am not an expert in these things. There may well be other ways of affixing a sign to a vehicle, depending on the particular type of vehicle. I know that, particularly with our ambulances, there is a particular type of affixing of the signage on ambulances. I am not sure whether that classifies as a sticker. The CEO of SA Ambulance might provide me some advice in that regard, but I think that this highlights again that there is some flexibility. There is not a prescribed type of sign that must be put in place but there could be a variety.

Clause passed.

Clause 11 passed.

Clause 12.

Mrs HURN: I move:

Amendment No 5 [Hurn-1]—

Page 8, line 3 [clause 12(5), penalty provision]—Delete the penalty provision and substitute:

Maximum penalty: \$2,000.

Expiation fee: \$500.

Mrs HURN: I think that the house has a very strong understanding of our position when it comes to the penalties and, much like our justification for moving an amendment in relation to failing to have a sign would lead to a maximum fine of \$2,500 and that we believe an expiation notice would be reasonable, it is for those exact reasons and those exact principles that we do not believe that by failing to register your AED it should attract a straight-out \$2,500 fine.

We do believe that it would be very logical to be able to have an expiation notice available for this, because it would improve compliance and just give a much easier framework for the government to utilise to ensure that people are doing the right thing when it comes to putting their AED on the register.

Of course, we understand that we want people to comply, we want people to use the register, we want South Australians to know exactly where these AEDs are, but we implore the government not only to strongly consider this commonsense amendment for a \$2,000 maximum fine, which is a slight reduction in the top rate, but also to install and give an avenue of an expiation notice.

Amendment negated.

Mrs HURN: I have a couple of practical questions. Can the minister run us through the process of how an organisation will register? I will start with that one because the next one is not really linked. Can you run us through what the practical process will be of a business needing to register their AED?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: We will have a registration portal, which will be run with SA Ambulance and which will enable people to input their details through that portal.

Mr TELFER: Minister, I am just trying to get an insight into whether there is an obligation on regular updating, checking or purging of the register, or whether the obligation purely comes from subclause (4)(b), which provides that, after any change, there is an obligation on an entity to notify the minister within two weeks, and that if they go beyond that two weeks they open themselves up to a potential \$2,500 fine?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The advice I have is that it is not envisaged that there will be a sort of purging of information on the register: it will be based on the information that is provided. It is worth reiterating that it is important that people update that information because we do not want a situation where people go to an AED where there is not one available when those emergencies strike.

Mrs HURN: Just following on from that answer, can the minister confirm that there will be some sort of leeway or commonsense understanding in relation to clause 12(4)(b), which provides:

- (b) notify the Minister in the manner and form determined by the Minister of any change to the information provided in accordance with paragraph (a) within 2 weeks after the change.

What if there is a very basic change in relation to the opening hours of a facility and all those matters? Can you talk us through what the practical framework would be for informing the minister of any change?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I think that there will certainly be a commonsense approach to updating the information and making sure that we are not being overly onerous. This section will be specifically managed by SA Ambulance, and I do not think they will be taking an unreasonable approach to that. They will certainly have an ability through the portal that will be established—in a reasonably practical way—to be able to update information to make it as easy as possible.

Mr TEAGUE: I will ask a question about whether or not this is an example of where clause 6 has some work to do insofar as the substantive obligations in clause 12, the bulk of them, are obligations on the minister and the consequences of any failure by the minister to comply with those obligations might be conceivably quite serious, as opposed to the quite confined penalty provision in respect of subclause (4), which is about obligations to provide information to the minister. One might understand the way that regime works and the motion to ameliorate that penalty having been defeated. The bulk of the serious obligations there are on the minister. The question is: is that an example of where clause 6 has some work to do? What are the consequences for the Crown in the event that the register fails?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: My reading of it is that subclause (5) is in relation to subsection (4), in which the responsibility falls on the 'designated entity' rather than the minister. The responsibility on the minister to maintain the register in subclause (1) is on a particular penalty. There are obviously a number of pieces of legislation on the statute book that have particular responsibilities on ministers. Ministers are ultimately accountable to both the cabinet and the parliament in the exercise of their duties.

Mr TEAGUE: I do not know if it needs clarifying; I think that is exactly what I said. The penalty provision in (5) relates to the call of the private obligation in (4), whereas the serious obligations in this clause are (1), (2) and (3). I hear the minister's answer. Does the minister recognise, in the event that the minister is responsible for the maintaining of a register, what consequences flow in the event that the register fails or is in any respect more particularly defective?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I think it is entirely consistent with many other pieces of the statute book where there have been responsibilities in relation to ministers over the decades, no matter what party, and those ministers are responsible to the parliament in exercising those duties.

Mr TELFER: I have a quick question, minister. We are obviously on clause 12(2), looking at what will be included within a register. Are we envisioning that a location of an AED will be a street address, or will there be a designation within that street address of exactly where the AED is? We envision a shopping centre, for instance, which has a single address, a single location, but the AED itself would have a location within that location. If so, when there is a change, within two weeks, to that location, is that what will be required of the entity in charge, or is it purely the address of the facility itself?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: My adviser and I are not sure we entirely understood the question. We can provide information in relation to when information is provided into the portal that will provide information to the registry. The hope is that this will flow through to what will be the GoodSAM portal that we have, and it should happen automatically that the information flows through.

It is also worth noting that we are working in relation to whether there could be a functionality that enabled photos to be uploaded. It would not be a mandatory feature necessarily, but it would help to further identify the locations in that regard.

Mr TELFER: I am not trying to be pedantic. I am interested in this in particular because there is a risk that if there is an incomplete or what could potentially be thought of as an inaccurate description of where the location is, then once again the entity opens itself up to a 2½ thousand dollar maximum fine. The obligation is on whichever entity is doing this. You are uncertain whether it is an address or a location within the facility at this point; if that is the case, will it be the detail within the regulation which you expect will designate that?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Every situation is going to be different. Certainly we will be working to make sure that the portal makes it as easy as possible for people to give the most accurate location possible with the appropriate ways—whether it is apps, whether it is the registry or whether it is dispatches from SAAS—that can navigate people to where the closest one is to them in the most accurate way. Obviously that relies upon getting accurate inputs into the system, so devising a way in which we can get those accurate inputs is going to be an important element of the process.

Clause passed.

Clause 13.

Mrs HURN: There is one question that I know the member for Frome and our shadow minister for aged care was particularly eager for me to ask the minister in relation not only to this clause but also, I suppose, to the broader awareness campaign, the software and the accessibility of information. I wonder whether the minister has engaged with—or whether he is aware that the honourable member in the other place, Frank Pangallo, has engaged with—the Council on the Ageing in relation to accessibility of information.

I think it is one of those situations where we live in a modern world where people have access to all this information on a smartphone and will be able to have access to it by their laptops and all those things. Specifically for the older community in our society, what engagement has been done with them? How will they ensure that they, too, have access to this information?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The good alignment that has occurred here is that we have already been working in relation to the GoodSAM app, which has been used around the world. We are looking to roll it out here—and a significant amount of work has already taken place in relation to that—so the alignment in relation to the AED legislation will connect with that. As that is rolled out, I think accessibility will be a key element. This is a standard piece of software in many regards that is used around the world and has been tried and tested, so there are certainly benefits from using something that we know has experience in other countries around the world.

In relation to whether there has been specific consultation by the Hon. Frank Pangallo or others with the Council on the Ageing, I am not sure. I certainly acknowledge that one of the things they do advocate on this is in relation to digital accessibility, in terms of making digital elements as easy to use as possible. I think one of the concerns they raise is more broadly in relation to whether things are only available in a digital form, and that leaves out people who are unable to connect with those digital platforms.

This is obviously a specific clause asking for us to have a digital platform and software. I think the key thing is that, as part of this work, dispatches from SA Ambulance will get a picture of— firstly, there are going to be a lot more defibrillators than are available now, and also SAAS will know the locations of a lot more defibrillators than they do now because currently there is not a requirement that people register them with SAAS. There are many people who do, but it is not necessarily a requirement. There will be a much greater possibility that, when people are speaking to SAAS in relation to an emergency, the dispatcher will be able to navigate them to a nearby AED without the requirement for the user and the caller to have digital capability with them.

Mr TEAGUE: To understand, and in the context of technology moving very quickly, is it the case that the clause 13 software provision really explains the necessary information for the purposes of clause 12(2)(a), in that if the register is purposive, which it appears to be, and there is a compliance element therefore that is associated with the provision of information for the purposes of the register—and in turn there is intended to be a software application that is going to provide directions to the location—it appears to be necessary to read clause 12 together with clause 13, but the register is, for the time being, going to be dependent on, I suppose, the level of accuracy of the location provided by the obliged person subject to clause 12(4)? The minister might care to confirm that or otherwise.

The question then is in terms of where things might be right now or moving on to. Has there been any consideration about identification of location built into the device and any prospect of planning for that so that the register might become smart and do away with the compliance aspect before too long, if not perhaps prior to the commencement?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I do not have advice in that regard. I guess future directions and potentials will have to be considered over time.

Clause passed.

Clause 14.

Mrs HURN: Can the minister provide some clarity around what the awareness campaign proposed in this clause looks like; furthermore, can he also confirm that SA Health will be the responsible agency for delivering such an awareness campaign and how much will it cost?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: No, yes, no. Obviously It has not been designed yet because we are still debating the legislation. The provision under clause 11 makes it clear that the Minister for Health is in charge of this part, and costing will have to be considered as part of the development of the awareness raising.

Mrs HURN: Perhaps I could provide some further information for the member, as just because it is being organised under the relevant minister does not mean that it is SA Health that is responsible for the advertising campaign. Indeed, there are often examples where a centralised agency, for instance DPC, may take responsibility. Nevertheless, I thank the minister for confirming that it will indeed be SA Health.

When it comes to promotion, how will this awareness strategy be prescribed over a five-year period? How will it be monitored over the five-year period, and what will be the indicator or measure of success over that five-year period? Importantly, why five years?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Why five years? I presume that in the drafting process it was considered an appropriate amount of time to make sure that these laws are appropriately promoted to the community. In relation to a number of the other details that are being sought, that will have to be developed if this legislation passes, and considered further.

Clause passed.

Clause 15.

Mrs HURN: How was it that the honourable member in the other place has determined a three-year period? By that I am referring to clause 15(2), which provides:

- (2) The scheme must ensure that the persons referred to in subsection (1) are provided with training within 3 years of the relevant day and within each 3 year period thereafter.

I am also hoping that in the same breath the minister might like to outline or clarify whose direct responsibility it will be for ensuring that the AED training is prescribed, and if he could just outline, as well, if it will just be through the usual process when you are getting all your other training.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I know for a fact that one of the organisations that Mr Pangallo has been involved with in the development of this has been St John Ambulance, which does undertake a lot of training for first aid across the state. The advice I have received—we will check this and, if there is an issue, certainly correct it to the shadow minister—is that a lot of the training that takes place is in relation to that three-year time frame. I presume that is where there has been a decision to align those two elements in this clause.

Mr TELFER: I have a question on the cost of the training program. Who does the minister envision will be responsible for paying the cost of the training required pursuant to this section of the bill?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I think the idea is that this would be part of the curriculum for people who do training already. Clearly, there are already a number of people who do training in relation to the Education and Care Services National Law and also the Work Health and Safety Act. At this stage, we are not envisaging that any other regulations will be made under subclause (1)(c), so we are not envisaging that there would be any particular additional costs in this regard.

Mr TELFER: In terms of persons or organisations who may be exposed to potential additional civil liability as a result of the operation of the bill, what does the minister believe their exposure will be in comparison to this part of the bill, maybe existing arrangements I guess?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I think we talked a bit about civil liability yesterday, but I have certainly received no advice that there are any issues regarding civil liability in relation to this clause.

Mr TEAGUE: Maybe this is a suitable opportunity to extend thanks for his assistance—and SAAS's assistance more broadly but particularly the chief executive, Mr Elliott—in relation to the bill. The training obligation is one that is applied perhaps to a reasonably broad number of those who are likely to be using the AED, but it appears on the face of the clause that there is no intent to be comprehensive. Rather, it is a provision to extend training to those who otherwise have an obligation.

I am thinking then, particularly in relation to those in the SA Ambulance Service and other responders who might themselves be making use of the published register, is there any particular intent for this to serve to enhance the capacity of SAAS and other emergency responders in terms of their capacity to access these devices, or is the training provision really just covering as broad a range of anticipated users as can practicably be legislated for?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The advice I have received is that our understanding is that such training in relation to defibs is already being provided as part of these packages and vocational training that occurs under these particular acts. I suspect that the introduction of this clause was merely to make sure that that is the case. We do not envisage that there would be any particular change that would have to occur.

I mention my own experience of first-aid training, as part of my bronze medallion certificate at Moana Surf Life Saving Club. Certainly, the use of a defibrillator was part of the training in relation to that, and I am sure that it is part of the training of every first-aid certificate. It is also worth reminding everybody in the community of how easy these devices are to use. You do not even necessarily need training.

Part of our efforts will be to make sure that we are communicating with the public not to be scared of using an AED, that it steps you through the process. It is as easy as possible and the shock is only administered when the device is able to detect that that shock is required. Otherwise, it can be very helpful to talk people through CPR. In particular, for people who are a bit rusty in doing CPR, it will help to talk them through what is required as part of that process.

Clause passed.

Clause 16.

Mr TELFER: On reflection of the fact that we have a registry, and not just a registry but a piece of software which then allows anyone to know exactly where every single AED is, has the minister received any advice that the very public nature of their location would lead to any additional damage, destruction or removal of them? What would be envisioned by the scenario which we have at the moment, where it is only if you are in the vicinity and you see the signage that you would know where it would be?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: We certainly do not have any advice in that regard, that by having a public list or an app that people could locate AEDs it is going to lead to people seeking them out to damage them. Obviously, I suspect—and this is not something that I have advice on, but it is my reasonable presumption—if that were to occur, it is likely to be a spontaneous, if not drunken, attempt by people to do something stupid, rather than something where people are undertaking research into that act before doing it. It is not something I have received advice on, in relation to it being a significant issue with the AEDs that are currently across the community either.

Mr TELFER: I recognise that currently any damage that would be done would be spontaneous, to use the minister's words. My point was there potentially could be one which would be more planned out. What is the current penalty in place for someone who damages, destroys or removes an AED that is in place at the moment? Does the minister know whether there is a specific penalty in place currently?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: To the best of my knowledge, there is not a specific penalty that is currently in place in relation to an AED specifically, but it would be dealt with in the same way as other property damage under the Summary Offences Act.

Clause passed.

Clause 17.

Mrs HURN: I move:

Amendment No 6 [Hurn-1]—

Page 9, line 30 [clause 17(2)(c)]—Delete '\$10,000' and substitute '\$2,000'

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): Do you wish to speak to that, member for Schubert?

Mrs HURN: No.

Amendment negated.

Mrs HURN: Minister, I refer to clause 17(2)(c), which states:

(c) provide for fines, not exceeding \$10 000, for offences against the regulations;

What are the regulations that the clause is referring to and what are the offences? Presumably it is just about going contrary to the regulations, but perhaps the minister could elaborate slightly.

Part of the fundamental reason why we have made another commonsense amendment of reducing the \$10,000 fine down to \$2,000 is specifically that we do not actually know what regulations are being referred to in this piece of legislation. That is not surprising, given they are regulations. Again, this is in line to our overall approach that we have to the penalties. If the minister could elaborate what regulations he is referring to or what he is envisaging, that would be helpful.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The regulations have not been drafted yet, but I think there are a range of different options that have been set out in relation to this clause that gives the government options in terms of how the regulations could be drafted. In regard to a number of the questions that have been raised about this or that particular thing, we have been very clear that, through the three years for private sector implementation, we will certainly be happy to engage if particular issues arise that need addressing. I think the regulations give us the ability to do that.

In relation to whether there are any particular fines that we are envisaging to be part of the regulations, there are no plans from the government at this stage to do that, but obviously that has been drafted by the Hon. Mr Pangallo to give that option. Obviously, if there were to be consideration of that by the government down the track, then that would be a matter on which the parliament would

have oversight through the Legislative Review Committee and then ultimately potentially through a disallowance in the parliament.

Mr TELFER: Will the minister give an undertaking that he will consult with those who would be impacted by the bill before enacting regulations pursuant to this bill?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I think it depends on the nature of the particular regulations, but if there are particular industry groups that would be directly affected I think we have already made clear that we would be seeking to work with them on any issues that arise. It is a bit hard to answer because it is a hypothetical question about regulations that do not exist yet.

Usually there is an approach of drafting regulations and consulting on them at least, if not on a limited but sometimes on a wide basis. We will have to see what the regulations are that we need to consider and whether they are ones that would necessitate impact of a broad range of people or a narrow range of people and hence what the level of consultation is that may be required as part of that process. I know that that is something the Legislative Review Committee keeps a close eye on as part of their consideration of regulations as to whether there has been the appropriate level of consultation that has gone into them.

Mr TELFER: I am interested whether the regulations that may be developed could reduce the scope of the application of the bill. For example, could a regulation remove a specific class of building or facility from the definition of 'designated building or facility'?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: My reading of subclause (2)(a) is that it does give the ability for exemptions to be provided in relation to specific areas. That could be a potential to exempt a person or a class of persons from the application of this act. I think there are a number of other provisions that could be helpful in that regard. There also could be considerations of definitions of particular areas; we have already discussed today issues of particular definitions of some of the areas for some premises such as retirement villages. If there was to be, and I am not saying that there is, any uncertainty in that, then we could certainly consider that through the regulation process.

Mr TELFER: I have another quick question. As to this clause—Regulations and fee notices—I am curious whether the government intends to use the regulations to set fees for the registration process which is contemplated in clause 12 of the bill which we discussed earlier.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: There are no plans at this stage to do that.

Clause passed.

Clause 18.

Mrs HURN: In relation to clause 18, specifically 18(2), reads:

The Minister must, within 6 months of the commencement of this section, have copies of the report laid before both Houses of Parliament.

That is about preparing a report on how the government will provide support to persons who are required to install AEDs. I am wondering whether any consideration has been given or whether the minister can give an undertaking that beyond the six-month period there will be a regular reporting—for instance, when it comes to compliance and how successful the awareness campaign has been and also to the overall implementation.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: To use a turn of phrase from the member for Heysen, the work that this subclause is trying to do is trying to make sure that the minister has to come forward to the parliament and say, 'How are you helping in terms of people's support for the implementation of these sections to make sure that people have the opportunity, whether it is a grant program or other means, to get support?'

I think we have already indicated that we are considering a grant program over the course of the next few years to help people with their installation, particularly the not-for-profit rather than the for-profit people who may be affected. That will be considered over time, and that report will be issued in the parliament. I do not think that this envisaged either (a) that there will be everlasting support that will be provided or (b) that the reporting on grant programs and so on would be every

year, etc. This was really in terms of trying to make sure that the minister provides some information to the parliament on how the government is helping with the implementation of the act.

Mrs HURN: I appreciate what the minister is saying, in terms of needing to have that immediate oversight as to the success of the implementation. I wonder whether he sees benefit in providing ongoing updates to the parliament on a yearly basis as to the success of the program, particularly in relation to compliance and the issues that we outlined throughout that entire process. I also wonder whether he sees benefit in the government providing those details. I think it is something that has received what I would say is unanimous support within the parliament in the other place and in this house, albeit we had some amendments in relation to the penalties. I think everyone wants this to succeed.

Throughout the journey of this committee stage, I think we fleshed out some practical considerations or some practical bumps in this legislation that will need to be ironed out in the regulations. Acknowledging of course that six months is a relatively short period of time for legislation that is ongoing and legislation that also has specific parameters of five years when it comes to the awareness campaign and all those things, I wonder whether the minister sees any justification in ongoing reporting, potentially on a yearly basis.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: It is not something I have envisaged, nor is it something I am necessarily pushing for. We have not proposed any amendments in that regard. I think that there are a number of other ways in which the matter could be monitored. There may well be avenues where SA Ambulance may give an update via their annual report. There may well be the opportunity for accountability through the parliament in the usual manner in terms of how the scheme is operating. We have not, therefore, recommended a more regular report that would be provided in addition to what is currently provided in clause 18.

Mr TELFER: Will the report that is envisioned pursuant to clause 18 set out the annual costs imposed by the bill on the state government, local government, the private sector and the not-for-profit sector?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: No, I think what this is trying to do is outline what support the government is providing to install an AED and particularly how that affects different sectors. As I have already outlined, we are considering a grant program that will be available to help not-for-profit organisations in particular that would be affected.

Clause passed.

Schedule.

Mr TEAGUE: This might be a question for cross-reference. The transitional provision appears to provide an extra year for persons who are not the Crown before the obligations kick in. Again, as a matter of practicality and to take one particular example, is there any example of circumstances in which an emergency services organisation uses a vehicle not owned by the emergency services organisation; that is, are they leasing the vehicle from a private owner, in which case is there an example where there may be a gap in the otherwise intended commencement of the obligation on public authorities? Is it otherwise the intent for the purposes of the transition to provide for such a clear line; that is, the intent is that it applies to the Crown in every respect from 2025 but not otherwise until 2026?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: In relation to emergency services vehicles, I am not aware of particular circumstances. However, that is not to say that there could not be some where there would be leased or private vehicles that could be utilised as part of those organisations, but the vast majority at the very least would be owned by the government.

I think that the broader question you are asking is that, from our perspective, there is a very clear demarcation as far as the government is concerned. We are aiming for 1 January 2025, so there is another year for everybody who is not the government. I do not think we are going to be trying to find particular loopholes to get around that. I think that has been an understanding that we have.

Obviously there have been discussions about trains and trams and things, and various ownerships and private management, contracts, etc., but for all of that we are working on the basis that those provisions on the government come into operation on 1 January 2025 whether or not there is a private operator who is running those services.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (17:13): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (MONITORING ORDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 November 2022.)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Sir, it falls upon me to draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Mrs PEARCE (King) (17:15): Under the bill, a person who is subject to a monitoring order must wear or carry the electronic monitoring device supplied by the Commissioner of Police for the purposes of the order at all times during fire danger season each year. The maximum penalty for noncompliance of a monitoring order will be \$10,000 or imprisonment for two years. An application for retraction or suspension of a monitoring order may occur but only with the permission of the Magistrates Court, and permission is only to be granted if the court is satisfied that there has been a substantial change in the relevant circumstances since the order was made or last suspended.

These steps would help to discourage the behaviour, helping to reduce the risk of reoffending which could cause widespread catastrophic damage to property, interruption to businesses and potential injury and death to multiple people and animals. It is one of the ways we can better protect our amazing communities from devastation caused by bushfire. With that, I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (17:17): I thank all members for their contribution, particularly the member for Heysen, who spoke personally about the impact that arson and deliberately lighting bushfires has on his community and other Hills' and rural communities. I commend this further passage.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (17:18): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) (NO 3) 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) (17:19): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I introduce today the Statutes Amendment (Attorney-General's Portfolio) (No 3) Bill 2022. From time to time, an Attorney-General's portfolio bill is required to rectify minor errors, omissions and other deficiencies identified in legislation committed to the Attorney-General. Given the minor or technical nature of these amendments, it is often more efficient to deal with such matters in a single omnibus bill rather than in a separate amendment bill for each act.

This bill makes amendments to two acts within the Attorney-General's portfolio, being the Coroners Act 2003 and the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Part 2 of the bill makes a number of amendments to the Coroners Act to clarify how deaths which occur in accordance with the Voluntary Assisted Dying Act 2021 are to be treated under the Coroners Act.

In particular, part 2 of the bill amends section 3 of the Coroners Act to remove an amendment inserted by the Voluntary Assisted Dying Act which provides that the deaths that occur in accordance with the voluntary assisted dying scheme (VAD scheme) are reportable deaths for the purposes of the Coroners Act, and to insert a provision which expressly provides that deaths that occur in accordance with the VAD scheme are not reportable deaths for the purpose of the Coroners Act.

Currently, lawful deaths which occur in accordance with the VAD scheme, under the Voluntary Assisted Dying Act when it commences, are reportable deaths for the purposes of the Coroners Act. Section 84(2) of the Voluntary Assisted Dying Act requires that medical practitioners who provide care immediately before a person's death, or who examine the body of a person after death where the practitioner reasonably believes the person was the subject of a VAD permit, must notify the State Coroner of the death.

When a death is reportable for the purposes of the Coroners Act, the Coroner is required to make a finding as to the cause of death in each instance and must consider whether an inquest is required. The South Australian VAD scheme is largely based on the Victorian model, as set out in the Voluntary Assisted Dying Act 2017 (Victoria). However, unlike the South Australian Coroners Act, the definition of a reportable death in the Victorian Coroners Act 2008 expressly provides that a death that occurs in accordance with the Victorian Voluntary Assisted Dying Act is not a reportable death.

Furthermore, the Victorian Coroners Act allows for the Coroner to determine that a death it has investigated is not a reportable death without the Coroner having to make findings of the cause of death. Unlike the Victorian Coroners Act, the South Australian Coroners Act provides that, if the State Coroner is notified of a reportable death, a finding as to the cause of death must be made by the State Coroner or the Coroners Court following an inquest. Consequently, there is no discretion for the State Coroner to investigate a reportable death without taking further action.

South Australia is the only jurisdiction where deaths that occur in accordance with a voluntary assisted dying scheme are treated as reportable deaths. It is clear that the full implications of making deaths under the South Australian VAD scheme reportable for the purposes of the Coroners Act were not fully appreciated at the time the legislation was debated in parliament.

Requiring the State Coroner to make a finding as to the cause of death for each death that occurs in accordance with the VAD scheme will have a significant impact on the workload of the State Coroner. More importantly, the government holds serious concerns that this requirement may lead to further delays in finalising the affairs of the person which, in turn, may further exacerbate the trauma of loved ones of the deceased.

This government has made a commitment to bring this legislation into operation as soon as practicable and we intend to deliver on that promise. Accordingly, the bill amends the Coroners Act to ensure that deaths which occur in accordance with the South Australian VAD scheme are treated under the Coroners Act in the same way as they are in other jurisdictions. Importantly, deaths which do not occur in accordance with the VAD scheme will not be excluded from the definition of reportable death for the purposes of the Coroners Act. These deaths will be subject to the existing processes set out in the Coroners Act.

As an additional measure, clause 4 of the bill amends section 39 of the Coroners Act to require the State Coroner to include the number of notifications received each year under section 84(2) of the Voluntary Assisted Dying Act 2021 in the State Coroner's annual report. This will

ensure that notifications which are received under section 84(2) are reported on with appropriate transparency and oversight.

Part 3 of the bill amends the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 to delete section 63A(3) of the act, which has become obsolete following the commencement of the Statutes Amendment (Child Sex Offences) Act 2022. The Statutes Amendment (Child Sex Offences) Act 2022 passed parliament earlier this year on 7 July 2022 and received royal assent on 14 July 2022. The Statutes Amendment (Child Sex Offences) Act 2022 made amendments to various acts and fulfilled a number of this government's election commitments in relation to child sex offences.

In particular, section 14 of that act made important changes to section 63A(1) of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 to apply one standard maximum penalty for offences relating to the possession of child exploitation materials, thereby removing the current penalty differentiation for first and subsequent offences. Section 14 of the act commenced on 1 October 2022. Despite this, section 63A(3) continues to refer to the distinction between the first and subsequent offences for possession of child exploitation material. As this provision no longer has any work to do, the bill deletes this section to avoid any potential confusion regarding the intended operation of section 63A(3).

While this bill contains a small number of measures, it implements a range of important reforms which will improve the efficiency and functioning of our justice system. I commend the bill to the house and seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses into *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 *Coroners Act 2003*

3—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

Subclause (1) makes a consequential amendment. Subclause (2) removes a provision that inserts into the definition of *reportable death* a death that occurs as a result of the administration of a voluntary assisted dying substance to a person in accordance with the *Voluntary Assisted Dying Act 2021*. Subclause (3) inserts a provision into the interpretation provisions in the Act to make clear that the death of a person in such circumstances is not reportable.

4—Amendment of section 39—Annual report

This clause amends the annual reporting provisions in the Act to require the annual report to contain the number of notifications received by the State Coroner under section 84(2) of the *Voluntary Assisted Dying Act 2021*.

Part 3—Amendment of *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*

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

This amendment removes subsection (3) which refers to various penalty provisions which were deleted from subsection (1) in a previous amendment Act.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (17:25): I rise to indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition and also to indicate the opposition's support for the bill. The part 3 amendment has been ably described by the Deputy Premier, and I will not add to those words except to endorse them. As to part 2 of the bill, really the observation that ought perhaps be emphasised is that, following the passage of the Voluntary Assisted Dying Act 2021, there is now a thoroughgoing regime in relation to the consideration of deaths that occur in accord with that act; therefore, there is no cause for duplication of a workload that would otherwise remain for the Coroner.

Secondly, I make the observation that this will provide in clause 4 for the capacity for communication between the two acts so far as reporting is concerned in respect of those notifications that will be received, if any, by the State Coroner under section 84(2) of that act. Yes, brief it is, it renders coherent the relevant provisions of the Coroners Act in circumstances of the passage of the

Voluntary Assisted Dying Act and otherwise does away with the redundant references in section 63A(3), the result of the removal of the distinction between basic and aggravated offences in that part by the passage of recent legislation. The bill is supported, and I certainly seek its speedy passage through 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) (17:28): I appreciate the support from the opposition, the shadow attorney-general, 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) (17:28): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (STEALTHING AND CONSENT) BILL

Second Reading

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) (17:29): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise as the lead speaker for the government on the Statutes Amendment (Stealthing and Consent) Bill 2022, introduced by the Hon. Connie Bonaros in the other place, and indicate that the government will be supporting this bill. In speaking to this, I place on record my wholehearted gratitude for the work of the Hon. Connie Bonaros on this bill and for her steadfast commitment to driving change to tackle gender inequality and sexual and other violence against women. It is a commitment that I and many others in this place share.

It is a commitment certainly shared by the member for Elder, who absolutely has an interest in what we can do together in this place to review laws about consent to sexual activity and who certainly has an interest in this particular issue in relation to stealthing and consent. I thank her for her particular interest and advocacy in this regard.

As I said, it is a commitment that I share, a commitment that has spanned most of my life and that has inspired an enduring movement that continues to grow as, year after year, we face a horrific and deeply unacceptable prevalence of sexual, domestic and family violence. This bill is an important step we can and must take forward in our quest to address this violence. The bill proposes various improvements to the operation of laws around sexual offences and consent to sexual activity, including amendments to:

- section 46 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to put beyond doubt that stealthing, whereby a person deliberately and without consent does not use, damages or removes a condom before or during sexual activity, is unlawful conduct;
- section 124(8) of the Criminal Procedure Act to require the disclosure of experts' reports to the prosecution where the expert evidence relates to topics that are dealt with in section 34N of the Evidence Act 1929; and
- section 34N(1) of the Evidence Act to broaden the jury directions that must be given in cases involving a sexual offence where consent is in issue and to allow for the admission of expert evidence to address certain misconceptions about non-consensual sexual activity.

Just last year, I had a young woman come to see me about her experience of stealthing. We, of course, connected her with Yarrow Place and SAPOL to get the support and access to justice she

needed and deserved and to have the perpetrator dealt with. We also, of course, deeply listened to her. Her utter bewilderment, sadness, fear and worry about how she could get the support she needed was heartbreaking, particularly given that the law did not have provisions to specifically criminalise stealthing. If this bill passes, women like this one can seek the justice they deserve.

The bill is identical to the Statutes Amendment (Stealthing and Consent) Bill 2021 that was introduced to parliament last year. Unfortunately, that bill, like many other important pieces of legislation, did not pass before the end of the parliamentary sitting time under the hand of the former government. I am so pleased that this bill, and a range of other bills that we have introduced and will introduce, will now be debated and hopefully progress as they absolutely should.

It is incumbent on us as parliamentarians to advance legislation that focuses both on addressing the gender inequality that drives violence against women and on progressing measures that deal with perpetrators and empowers women on their journey to healing and to recovery. Over recent years, we have seen revelations of alleged rape, sexual assault and harassment—including in the highest offices in the land—come to the forefront of our community discourse, showing just how much we still have to do before women in this country feel and are safe, secure and respected.

Stealthing is an insidious crime where a perpetrator deliberately and without consent damages, removes or does not use a condom before or during sexual activity. Stealthing as a form of abuse which can have significant impacts for victim survivors. Stealthing is a form of abuse which carries a risk of transmission of sexually transmitted infections, may result in unplanned pregnancy and may be used as a form of coercive control—sometimes referred to as 'reproductive coercion'. It can cause serious psychological harm to the victim survivor amongst emotional distress, trauma, guilt and shame.

The existing laws around stealthing are unclear. Any lack of clarity whatsoever must be addressed. That is what this bill does. The government wholeheartedly agrees that the introduction of an express provision that addresses stealthing would put it beyond doubt that such conduct is unlawful. Chanel Contos, who is the founder of the Teach.Us.Consent. campaign, has long been a staunch advocate for positive sex education in Australia, including awareness raising around stealthing. Chanel's extraordinary leadership has empowered and amplified the voices of a number of young women about their experiences of sexual assault.

In a recent meeting with our Attorney-General, Chanel and her colleagues made clear that, as well as making the law expressly clear, a critical part of this explicit legislation is to educate people on what stealthing is. Only 3 per cent of over 2,000 respondents in an Australian youth study said that school taught them about stealthing. In Australia, one in three women and one in five men who took part in research within Monash University in 2018 said they had experienced stealthing. This represents both a shocking prevalence of stealthing and a call to action to address it. This bill does.

More broadly, our laws on consent and the education that surrounds them are outdated and in need of review. In addition to the reforms proposed by this bill, this government has separately committed to a broader review of legislation pertaining to consent to sexual activity. This review is currently underway, and I look forward to considering the findings of this review alongside the Attorney-General in due course.

I again thank Chanel Contos and all advocates in this space for their extraordinary courage and conviction in raising their voices to stand up and say 'no more', leading a unifying cry that enough is enough, to ensure that this shining of a light onto gendered violence against women will continue to burn brighter and will be a relentless call and an eventual catalyst for change. The magnificent and courageous young women who have recently led calls for change have inspired their peers and older generations of women to draw a line in the sand—a line from which we will not retreat until women in our community are no longer subject to rape, sexual assault, sexual harassment, disrespect or discrimination.

Through each of their bravery, women and girls across Australia have found their voices, and we as lawmakers must listen to these voices and act. Again, I am proud that through this bill we are. Finally, I again thank the Hon. Connie Bonaros for her longstanding support and advocacy in this area, and I am pleased to be supporting this honourable member's bill today.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (17:38): I indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition. I indicate the opposition's support for the bill and seek its passage through the house. I, too, recognise the important work of the Hon. Connie Bonaros MLC in another place in bringing a form of this bill first to the other place last year. As the minister has indicated, the bill presently before the house replicates in its entirety and without amendment the bill that was subsequently brought to the house by the former Liberal government. I recognise the former Attorney-General, the Hon. Vickie Chapman, for her work in that regard.

Taking the form of the bill presented by the Hon. Connie Bonaros and expanding upon it coherently reflects what we know about the possibility of a gap in the law for the purposes of section 46(3) in relation to the absence of consent. As importantly, but perhaps not quite so obviously in terms of the description of the bill and the focus that might otherwise be placed on the direct provision for stealthing as being one of those indicators expressly of the absence of consent, the bill also provides for the expansion of the directions that are given in relation to consent in certain sexual cases

In turn, that reflects the work back in 2020 of the New South Wales Law Reform Commission, which made recommendations in relation to how juries are directed about the circumstances in which there is an absence of consent. It might pay to repeat them here because they are new and they are now to be included in those directions. First, there is no typical or normal response to non-consensual sexual activity. Secondly, non-consensual activity can occur in many different circumstances and is not always perpetrated by a stranger in a public place.

Thirdly, non-consensual sexual activity can occur between different kinds of people, including people who are married or in an established relationship with one another. Fourthly, the presence or absence of emotional distress when giving evidence does not necessarily mean that a person is not telling the truth about an alleged sexual offence. Fifthly, it should not be assumed that a person consented to sexual activity because the person wore particular clothing or had a particular appearance, consumed alcohol or drugs or was present at a particular location, either generally or at a particular time.

Relevantly, the bill provides for the exchange, firstly, for the admissibility of expert evidence in that regard, something that up until now and presently is a matter within the discretion of the trial judge. Coupled with the recognition of the admissibility of such evidence, the bill introduces an obligation for the exchange of that expert evidence in the event that either party is intending to rely upon it. That is an obligation that the prosecution already has. It will apply also to the defendant as the result of the passage of this bill.

I indicate again that I adopt the sentiments of the minister to that extent. Wherever there is a gap or a possibility of a lack of clarity in this regard, then taking steps to ensure that there is clarity is a step that ought to be taken so as to provide confidence that victims of abuse and abuse of the most serious kind are not in circumstances of any uncertainty.

I stress as well that those provisions that are the subject of section 46(3) remain non-exhaustive; it is not a matter of codification in this respect. The bill now adds to the list of those examples of circumstances in which a person does not consent. I just take this occasion to indicate that consent is the touchstone and it should not be somehow a matter for exhaustive codification. Where there is occasion to more expressly set out circumstances in which consent is not present, and that is of assistance as is the case here, then we ought to do that.

However, for those following the debate and those who are otherwise in need of the reassurance of the provisions of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, I just do highlight that consent is the touchstone and that ought to be borne squarely in mind. This work is important work. It does not become set in time as a result of the passage of this bill but this bill contains those positive steps. I commend the bill to the house.

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (17:46): I rise today in support of the Statutes Amendment (Stealthing and Consent) Bill 2022 to improve our laws regarding sexual offences and consent to sexual activity. I also want to thank the Hon. Connie Bonaros for her leadership in introducing this bill to the other place and the guidance of the Hon. Kyam Maher and the member for Reynell for their work in ensuring this important reform can finally be considered by our parliament. It would be remiss of me

to not also reflect on the important contributions of former Attorney-General Vickie Chapman in introducing a similar bill in the previous session of parliament.

There are a number of legislative reforms included in this bill to improve our laws' understanding of sexual offences and consent to sexual activity in contemporary South Australia. I would like to start by highlighting the particularly distressing act of stealthing that this bill seeks to criminalise. Amendments proposed in this bill to section 46 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 will finally ensure that stealthing is considered as unlawful conduct. Stealthing is where someone deliberately and without consent does not use, damages or removes a condom before or during sexual activity.

This intricate form of sexual violence is particularly distressing as, by its very definition, it is perpetrated by those who have received consent based on a lie. Consent is not simply a matter of a yes at the beginning. It should be something all parties are conscious of throughout the experience. Consent can be withdrawn at any point and, if consent is given on the basis of the sex being with a working condom, the consent does not apply if there is not a working condom. This type of conduct has now been explicitly criminalised in the ACT, New South Wales, Tasmania and Victoria. As our peers in Queensland and Western Australia look to follow the lead of other jurisdictions, I am glad South Australia is getting on board.

A study at Monash University in 2018 found that one in three women and one in five men who attended a local sexual health clinic reported having sex with someone engaged in stealthing. This study also found that women sex workers were three times more likely to have experienced stealthing. Like all forms of sexual violence, stealthing can have lasting and significant impacts on those it is perpetrated against. It carries a risk of transmission of sexually transmitted infections or unplanned pregnancy and can be used to control a partner. This is an issue of consent, safety and control.

Criminalising this activity reflects the majority view of the communities that elected us to this place; however, we must continue to reform our laws and improve consent education to ensure that all South Australians understand that sexually violent acts, such as stealthing, are assault.

We can and must do more to better educate the community on practising safe and consensual sex. We also need to change the way we talk about consent. I wish I knew who said it in the first place—and please let me know if you do—but if it is not a 'hell, yes', it is a 'no'. I have had conversations with male friends who would never in a million years think they have had sex that was not consensual, but they have also admitted, when we have really dug down, that they have convinced someone to sleep with them. While they might think they made a convincing argument to gain consent, I disagree.

It can be exhausting, particularly when you are young, though absolutely not just when you are young, to say no over and over again, while also trying to be polite because we would not want to upset anybody or be labelled a prude or frigid or whatever derogatory term is now being used to put people down who want to decide who touches their body and when and how. Sometimes people get to the point of giving in and just waiting for it to be over because it feels like the easiest option. That is clearly not enthusiastic consent and, when it comes to sex, if consent is not given enthusiastically, can we really call it consent at all?

I do know that this is a very challenging way to look at consent for some and I completely understand that it makes some people feel uncomfortable as they reflect on their previous experiences, but I think that discomfort is important if we have any hope of changing the way our children learn about and think about consent. I commend the bill to the house.

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) (17:51): First of all, I say thank you again to the Hon. Connie Bonaros. Thank you to the shadow attorney-general for his contribution and thank you so much to the member for Elder, who articulated very well why this legislation is so important both for the conduct that it will ensure is unlawful and in terms of the education journey that our community is still on in relation to stealthing and in relation to affirmative or enthusiastic consent. Thank you very much to those speakers. Thank you to the Attorney-General for his work. Again, I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

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) (17:53): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (USE OF DEVICES IN VEHICLES) BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 17:54 the house adjourned until Thursday 1 December 2022 at 11:00.