

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 1 December 2022

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

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.

Motions

URINARY TRACT INFECTION TREATMENT

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (11:02): I move:

That this house establish a select committee to inquire and report into—

- (a) barriers facing sufferers of urinary tract infections (UTIs) in gaining timely access to treatment;
- (b) the applicability of implementing Queensland's Urinary Tract Infection Community Pharmacy Service in South Australia; and
- (c) any other related matter.

I am seeking the support of this house to establish a select committee into access to urinary tract infection treatment for the hundreds of thousands of South Australian women—and some men—who endure the excruciating and sudden pain of an uncomplicated urinary tract infection, better known to sufferers as a UTI.

This is for women like my mum, women like my friends, women like my colleagues even right here and women like me. Imagine that you are lying in bed, fast asleep and it is 2am. Suddenly you wake up and you can feel that you simply must race to the loo. When you get there you experience a sharp pain shooting through your lower body. It is like a thin metal pin has been shot into you and the more you try to relax, the more it hurts. It is so painful that you find yourself screaming out loud.

Imagine that you are at work. You are in a very important meeting with very important people. The discussion is getting complicated and you are trying to follow the points that are being made. You cannot concentrate. You cannot sit still. You cannot get comfortable. All you want to do is leave, go to the bathroom or maybe just lie down. You are getting stressed that you might just have an accident, but you struggle on, knowing that this is as much a mind game as it is a physical taunt.

Imagine that you are caring for children. You are bouncing on the trampoline in the backyard, you are playing chasey and you are having a great time, but suddenly you feel a familiar discomfort and you know what is coming. You know that pretty soon you are not going to be running around or playing on a trampoline, or even moving much at all.

Imagine that you are on a plane. Everyone has taken their seat and settled in, and you grab your book and try to get comfortable for the three-hour flight ahead. The plane takes off and you find yourself watching for that seatbelt light to flash off so you can get up and go to the toilet. It is that feeling again: this is going to hurt and it is going to be a tough few hours and maybe even a tough few days.

Maybe you are lucky enough to be travelling in a remote part of Australia, and this is what you live for. You are in the back of a four-wheel drive and you are on a rocky road. It should be a beautiful experience, soaking up the wilds of the Flinders. Instead, it is the most painful experience of your life as every bump shoots pain through your body. Miles from a doctor, you know you will be enduring this for many days to come. So much for that adventure.

Experiences like this are shared by so many women and some men too. These particular experiences that I have just shared are my own. I used to be terribly embarrassed and ashamed

about this and, honestly, standing here in front of you all I am just a tiny bit embarrassed again. Let's face it, talking about wee is not the most elegant thing that you can talk about. I have found in recent years, when I have spoken about it with close friends and family, that so many other women endure exactly the same thing as I do and have for many years.

There is, of course, comfort in sharing such experiences, and other sufferers are very supportive, but so many of those conversations I have had end up in a discussion about the long wait for medication and how unnecessary it feels to have to endure such sharp and sudden yet entirely familiar pain as we wait to be able to see a doctor, get a script and go to a pharmacy to get medication.

In this place, we are essentially shiftworkers and the hours can be unpredictable. We have jobs that involve obligation and responsibility and being places when we need to be. We have busy personal lives, too, and that is no different from many other South Australians. This modern lifestyle can make it hard to get to a doctor, and there is no denying that getting a GP can take days or, for some, weeks. In country areas the wait can be long.

Like many others, I have sought detailed medical advice and tried to find a more permanent fix. I have followed the medical advice about how to avoid a UTI, and I have drunk more cranberry juice than anyone should have to in their entire lifetime. When the pain strikes, there is one solution for me and for hundreds of thousands of others, and that is a short course of antibiotics.

Half of all South Australian women will face a UTI at some point in their lives, and one in 20 men will be struck by the painful condition too. A UTI is caused by bacteria in the urethra, bladder and/or the kidneys and is often difficult to predict or prevent. The infection causes intense pain during urination, the constant sensation of needing to urinate and discomfort throughout the period of infection. While alkalising drinks may relieve symptoms for some people, for most sufferers antibiotics are required to address the infection.

Currently, sufferers must book an appointment with a GP to obtain a script for medication and then have that filled at the pharmacy. For many people, this can mean days of pain and discomfort before securing an appointment and the effective treatment. For those in country and remote areas, as I said, the wait can be much longer. If left untreated, or if treatment is delayed too long, the condition can result in admission to hospital for kidney infection or other complications, and that is not unusual.

Queensland has recently allowed specially trained pharmacists to assess patients and provide UTI medication following a successful pilot program that that state ran. The New South Wales government recently announced similar moves to be able to allow pharmacists to provide a wider range of medications, including UTI medication. In Victoria, only last week state Labor made an election commitment, which I expect they will fulfil given their re-election to government, in relation to UTI medication through pharmacies.

While some of these interstate approaches include additional medications other than UTI treatments, it is important to note that what I am proposing with this South Australian select committee is intended to focus only on UTI medication. Many people have said to me, 'Why don't you just legislate the change straightaway and why even hold an inquiry?' That is a fair question. It is an understandable question from sufferers who would like to have access to medication through their pharmacist as quickly as possible.

But the reason for an inquiry is this: I take women's health seriously, Labor takes women's health seriously and I am quite confident that this parliament takes women's health seriously. We owe it to women to carefully and thoroughly examine models of care and treatment that meet their needs in a safe and timely way.

I am well aware that there are divergent opinions between different medical disciplines and indeed differences of opinion between professionals who share the same discipline. There are also valid questions from consumers and practical considerations about the best type of scheme to suit South Australia. This is the purpose of the inquiry I am proposing—to tease out those questions, seek out answers and the most appropriate arrangements to suit patient needs.

I am unashamed that this inquiry is about putting UTI sufferers first, putting the health needs of women first. Of course we must rely on medical evidence to ensure that any scheme is as safe as it can possibly be, but I am really not interested in a turf war. I am interested in what is best for sufferers.

The point has been made and will continue to be made, I am sure, that there is a need for more GPs in order for patients to be able to see a doctor faster. I agree. Just last week the AMA released its report into the GP workforce. I will quote from their own media release:

- Australia is facing a shortage of more than 10,600 GPs by 2031-32, with the supply of GPs not keeping pace with growing community demand.
- In the decade to 2019 demand for doctors' services increased by 58 per cent, that's equivalent to the workload of 10,200 full time GPs.
- In the 5 years to 2021, only the equivalent of 4,200 full time GPs were added to the workforce.
- On average both male and female GPs have been trending towards fewer hours per worker. The combined effect has been a lowering of average hours worked across the GP workforce.

That is worrying. Those are very worrying numbers, and action is absolutely needed. This government is doing what it needs to do to act on those needs.

In reality, in the real world in which we are living, there is not going to be a new flood of GPs within weeks or months. In those weeks and months and years, more women are suffering an uncomplicated UTI that could possibly be treated faster in consultation with their pharmacist. I am interested in their needs in the reality of this world right now.

As I said, the purpose of this inquiry is to investigate—to ask questions, to seek answers and to arrive at useful recommendations to the parliament. Areas the committee may choose to traverse but are not limited to are:

- regional and remote access to UTI treatments and the question of providing access where both pharmacists and doctors are scarce;
- affordability of treatment;
- privacy and confidentiality;
- the training already provided to university-qualified pharmacists and what that training equips them to be able to do currently;
- additional training in relation to any future scheme that might be established;
- the actual model of care itself, with particular reference to the Queensland approach and how that might be improved upon or tailored to suit South Australian needs;
- follow-up contact and collection of data so that we can track outcomes for patients; and
- the periodic review of such a scheme.

I am sure that committee members would also want to look at the usefulness of trials or pilot periods for South Australia and the design of any such scheme. The use of antibiotic resistance will certainly, I think, come up if this committee is established. It is a serious concern, and I am sure the committee would like to have a look at whether that is an issue in relation to pharmacy-based provision of UTI medication.

Current alternatives to GP appointments, including online-based prescription services like InstantScripts, have been raised with me as well in relation to accessing UTI medication. I am sure that there are also many other areas for investigation that will arise in the course of written and verbal submissions, if this parliament agrees to establish the committee.

Although I do not wish to traverse the ins and outs of the Queensland model in detail at this juncture, because I firmly believe in the inquiry process and its capacity to delve deeply into that model in due course, I might just pause to point out an important factor: what we are talking about here is the assessment of uncomplicated UTIs. Under the Queensland model, if a pharmacist identified complicating factors, such as a pre-existing complex medical condition, or the pharmacist

was not convinced that a patient was likely to be suffering a UTI, under the model of care they refer that patient to a GP. I feel that is an important point to make to the parliament and something that I am sure a committee would investigate further.

With the establishment of this committee, I look forward to hearing from all interested parties in the medical professions as well as advocacy groups, but most importantly from UTI sufferers, about their views on how we can make access to timely, effective and safe treatments for UTIs a reality for them. I strongly urge members of this house to support the establishment of this committee. We owe it to sufferers of this very common affliction to investigate any ways that we can make life easier and less painful for them.

Ms PRATT (Frome) (11:16): I rise today on behalf of the opposition to speak on the private member's motion moved by the member for Badcoe, and I thank her for turning her mind to this significant health issue that impacts not just women but men. As the shadow minister for regional health services and aging, I see a natural contribution that I can make to this space.

I think that in her speech the member for Badcoe has laid out for the future select committee a thorough and comprehensive understanding of why this is a significant health issue that seems to have some practical solutions available to us through clinicians, health practitioners and medical experts. It would not be lost on anyone in the chamber who is listening that cranberry juice seems to be the go-to option for most people at the moment.

Again, I reflect on the nursing homes and aged-care facilities I have been visiting and also on family members. I am sure that many in the chamber will know of someone, if not themselves, having a lived experience, if you like, of urinary tract infections. I am optimistic that a select committee can provide some alternatives or add some value to the cranberry juice option.

I note that when the member reflects on a turf war, I would like to think that perhaps she is reflecting on the medical experts and the differing views that we are coming across, particularly out of the Queensland trial, noting that the Australian Medical Association and the Pharmacy Guild are coming at this from different angles. I think the committee is the right course to take to ventilate and tease out some of those expert views. I have certainly been interacting with these groups naturally, from a regional health and aging point of view, and I think that the committee is going to learn a lot from taking evidence from all of these groups.

I would also take an opportunity to introduce a group that I hope the committee may take evidence from. It stems back to funding allocated by the former federal Liberal Coalition government to Flinders University based at Tonsley, to Aged Care Research and Industry Innovation Australia (ARIIA). They were allocated \$34 million to explore research and innovation in aged care, and I suspect there are already projects that are being submitted that touch on innovation in this space. This is signalling to the member for Badcoe that the research and the experts are already ahead of the committee and it will be an opportunity for the committee to entice them to report back.

It is expected that this committee will hear varying views on the proposal relating to the provision of treatment for self-declared UTIs from a pharmacy and any other related matters determined by the committee. I want to touch on perhaps this turf war concept that the committee may uncover between warring professions or clinical experts with different views. The member mentioned the challenges that the general practice workforce is experiencing at the moment, and I note that the Pharmacy Guild of Australia have a view that they are, if nothing else, offering solutions to support a workforce and a frontline already under pressure.

I predict that the committee will hear differing views about service delivery from the Australian Medical Association, the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners and the Pharmacy Guild of South Australia. As lawmakers, of course, it is for us to investigate and implement sound policy decisions, particularly in the area of medicine, with the aim to protect and safeguard patients. We are obliged to lift our heads up beyond the walls of this chamber to seek best practice, wherever that may lie, and that may be in our state, interstate or even overseas.

The terms of the committee will review the analysis and outcomes reported from the Queensland trial and reflect on efficacy for both industry and patients and I think that balance is going

to be important. The Liberal opposition supports the motion and, along with the member for Unley, I look forward to the work of the committee ahead. I support the motion.

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (11:21): I want to wholeheartedly thank the opposition for their support and in particular the shadow minister, given her wealth of knowledge in this area. I am very much looking forward to working with her—and also Mr Pisoni—given the relationships she already has across the medical professions and also her focus and experience in regional health and aged care. Already the member has offered a possible line of inquiry in terms of the Tonsley-based Aged Care Research and Industry Innovation centre, which, of course, I will pursue. I would love to hear what they could contribute to the debate and the work they are currently doing. I thank the member very much for contributing so eagerly at this early stage and also overall for the committee's support.

I think that probably brings me to the conclusion of my remarks, other than to say that I am very much looking forward to getting stuck into work on something that I think is an important policy issue and also obviously something that is so incredibly close to my heart and the hearts of many in this place.

Motion carried.

Ms STINSON: I move:

That a committee be appointed consisting of Ms Pratt, the Hon. D.G. Pisoni, S.E. Andrews, Ms Hutchesson and the mover.

Motion carried.

Ms STINSON: I move:

That the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records and to adjourn from place to place and that it report on 8 December 2022.

Motion carried.

Ms STINSON: I move:

That standing order 339 be and remain so far suspended as to enable the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication as it sees fit of any evidence presented to the committee prior to such evidence being reported to the house.

The SPEAKER: An absolute majority is required. With my careful count of the house and an absolute majority not being present, ring the bells.

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

Motion carried.

Ms STINSON: By leave, I move:

That the committee have leave to sit during the sitting of the house today.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Committees

ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE: INQUIRY INTO ABORIGINAL GOVERNANCE

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (11:26): I move:

That the report of the committee, entitled Final Report—Inquiry into Aboriginal Governance, be noted.

The inquiry into Aboriginal governance was referred to the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee by the former Premier in February 2021. The committee received 48 written submissions and the—

Members interjecting:

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

Mr HUGHES: What a rabble. The inquiry had 27 witnesses provide oral evidence. The committee tabled an interim inquiry report on 26 October 2021, which summarised the bulk of the evidence received in the inquiry. I think it would be fair to say that this particular inquiry did generate a degree of controversy, and it was important that the submissions and the people appearing before us were handled in a sensitive manner, given the potential divisions that existed in some communities. I would have to say that the committee and the committee members handled it in a very sensitive fashion.

Throughout this evidence, the committee received consistent submissions detailing concerns about the way in which Aboriginal corporations are currently functioning. Stakeholders submitted that, unless you are a director on the board, it can be difficult to ascertain where money received by those corporations is ending up. The committee heard evidence from community members across a wide range of Aboriginal communities who made similar allegations regarding favouritism and closed dealings within board memberships.

The committee received sufficient concerns across many communities in this state to warrant it making nine recommendations in its interim report, and a further four recommendations in the final report. One important recommendation is in relation to updating the state's trustee legislation. The committee considers this is vital to providing increased accountability and transparency on public moneys making their way into separate trusts established by Aboriginal corporations. These trusts may fall outside the scope of the federal regulator. It is also to ensure that Aboriginal communities can receive and have access to the monetary support they are entitled to.

The committee recently heard from the Western Australian Attorney-General in relation to how their jurisdiction is dealing with this issue. The Western Australian parliament has just passed the new Charitable Trusts Act, and the committee has asked that our Attorney-General consider the act as a potential guide for reforms in our jurisdiction. I think what Western Australia has done is incredibly important and might well take into account the different legislative requirements in different states. It might well be a model when it comes to looking at a way forward.

Western Australia was also faced with a whole range of issues when it came to the expenditure of moneys, when it came to openness and transparency. In common with what had happened in this state, a lot of communities expressed concerns. It would be incredibly worthwhile to look at the implementation of the act in Western Australia to see what it is going to do on the ground to improve our circumstances.

In saying all of this, I know that some Aboriginal people have expressed concerns about the nature of the body of the work that the committee was undertaking. I would be one of those people who looks forward to the day when we have a genuine Voice to the parliament, whereby Aboriginal people themselves can take on board and work through these issues. It has always been a little bit of a concern of mine, even though all the members historically in good faith have acquitted their duties on the standing committee, that essentially you have a whole bunch of Europeans going into Aboriginal communities and making recommendations to this parliament.

A well-constructed Voice to parliament will have a very positive impact. Without pre-empting anything that the parliament will decide in future, I am confident that, given the sheer level of engagement going on at the moment, there will be strong bipartisan support for the ultimate model developed.

When you look at what the federal government has done, as recently as last week, it released its response to the commonwealth parliamentary committee's report into the destruction of Indigenous heritage sites at Juukan Gorge. This response noted governance as an issue currently being considered by the co-design partnership, which has been established to reform First Nations cultural heritage protections. It arises from a recommendation made by the commonwealth parliamentary committee that transparency and accountability requirements on native title prescribed body corporates be increased so that adequate consultation occurs between an Aboriginal corporation and local Aboriginal communities.

Obviously that goes beyond just the heritage issue. When you look at the amounts of money that some of these bodies are handling—and in some cases we are talking about millions of dollars—

it is incredibly important for Aboriginal communities that there is real accountability and real transparency.

In relation to the incorporated associations at a state level, the committee encourages the Attorney-General to reintroduce the proposed amendments to the Associations Incorporation Act 1985, which were before the House of Assembly prior to the 2022 state election. These amendments are crucial for increasing oversight and dispute intervention powers for the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs. The committee also recommended an increase in resources for the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs to provide regular governance training and education to Aboriginal community-controlled associations around their obligations under the Associations Incorporation Act 1985.

This goes further than Aboriginal communities. I have come across a whole range of organisations over the years where there are people who sit on boards not necessarily with the background knowledge and with no understanding of their fiduciary duties and a whole raft of other issues. So it is important that, across the board, we empower people through enhanced knowledge and training.

It was made abundantly clear to the committee that self-determination can be maintained by Aboriginal community-controlled organisations with improved governance practices and greater transparency. The committee heard that it is when this transparency to the community is lost that the majority of disputes may arise. Certainly, as a regional member, from time to time I get people coming into my office expressing serious concerns about what is going on in some of the bodies in my region and further afield.

The committee is sincerely grateful to the individuals and organisations who made submissions to the committee in this inquiry. The committee also thanks the federal regulator, ORIC—they probably need to be better resourced as well given the mountain of work they are expected to deal with—and thanks the state Commissioner for Corporate Affairs for providing it with detailed submissions in the inquiry. All submissions received in the inquiry added substantial value to the conduct of the inquiry.

I would like to take the opportunity to thank the former members of the committee for their contributions to this inquiry, who heard the bulk of the evidence prior to the 2022 state election. I also thank the current members of the committee—from the other place, the Presiding Member, the Hon. Tung Ngo; the Hon. Tammy Franks; and the Hon. Stephen Wade; and from this house, the member for Newland and the member for Heysen—for their contributions and for the manner in which they dealt with what was often very sensitive information. I would also like to thank the current executive research officer, who has done an absolutely fantastic job on all the assistance that she has provided to the committee. I commend the report to the house.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:37): I join in commending the report to the house. I will make some particular reflections in addition to endorsing and adopting all that the member for Giles has just said. I have a somewhat partial role in terms of my contribution to the report as a member of the committee in the Fifty-Fifth Parliament but also as the author to a response in relation to the interim report during the course of the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, and that is on the record and also included as appendix 1 to the final report.

As I did on another occasion recently, I want to highlight in particular the Western Australian experience. The committee heard evidence on 23 September from the Attorney in Western Australia. The evidence, as the member for Giles has indicated, was of particular usefulness because it brought the committee up to date. The Hon. John Quigley MLA talked to the Western Australian experience in that state by the history of the development of trusts legislation there. There are two parallel 1962 acts, or there were until earlier this year when the 2022 Charitable Trusts Act came into force.

It was via the Charitable Trusts Act, the 1962 act in Western Australia, that, over a long period of time, what were often in a number of cases lump sum amounts of money that were to be set aside for these purposes were structured within a charitable trusts environment in circumstances where there is no individual beneficiary and where the mechanism of a charitable trust happened to be a vehicle that was adopted in Western Australia over a long period of time.

That had created difficulties of administration and oversight, and in particular practical difficulties of access, because the charitable trust legislation, the 1962 act in Western Australia, had provided for Attorney-General oversight and recourse to the Supreme Court, which were all very well but were not necessarily practical, because they were expensive and time-consuming and so on. That had led, particularly in the Western Australian context, to some thoughtfulness about how reform might be applied in the updating of that particular act in Western Australia. That has now been done and that now forms the substance, or the reference point, for recommendation 1.

I am quick to highlight in that regard in my response in February this year that it is not without its complications and there is not perhaps only one way of going about it. The member for Giles has adverted to the overlap or continuing relevance of the federal legislation. The Corporations (Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander) Act 2006 is also in the course of a review process and the committee has received correspondence, which is also included in appendix 1, from the then Minister for Indigenous Australians, the Hon. Ken Wyatt, about the stage that that process was at at the time of the interim report.

I will be very interested, as a member of the committee, in hearing from the Attorney, in hearing from the government, in relation to consideration of that Western Australian charitable trusts legislation and indeed reform more broadly that may assist in providing a practical pathway to improved oversight, confidence, access and so forth in relation to the management and governance of not just moneys but governance processes across the board.

Recommendations 2 and 3 have been addressed again. I take this opportunity to highlight that the amending bill to amend the Associations Incorporation Act was indeed before the last parliament. It is included in the government's report. The committee is urging its reintroduction and so we look forward to that occurring. Again, as the member for Giles has adverted, the provision of greater resources to the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs to continue to increase the fluency and capacity of those who are charged with the responsibility for community-controlled associations is called for and can certainly contribute to improvement in governance across the board.

So there are three very practical recommendations. They bring to fruition the results of work substantially conducted in the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, and I look forward to contributing both in the course of the committee's further work and what I anticipate will be work now for the parliament to do in the course of the near future, I hope, to progress in particular the reforms to the Associations Incorporation Act and thoughtful further work in relation to what might be done to reform the trust act in this state informed by the Western Australian experience.

It would be perhaps a suitable opportunity, in concluding my remarks this morning endorsing the final report of the committee in relation to Aboriginal governance, to recognise the very happy occasion just an hour or so ago in the Old Chamber with the unveiling of the portrait of Pastor Sir Douglas Nicholls, the first and so far only Aboriginal person to be Governor of a state of Australia appointed to vice-regal office. Pastor Sir Doug Nicholls served as Governor of South Australia from 1 December 1976 until he resigned due to ill health in April 1977.

He had the most wonderful life, and it is right that we have the opportunity to celebrate his legacy in perpetuity in this parliament. A very happy occasion indeed it was this morning when the parliament gathered here to unveil his portrait. I look forward to that adorning the walls of the parliament for many years to come.

The SPEAKER: Before the member speaks to close debate, I observe that it is in fact the anniversary today of Sir Douglas Nicholls' appointment to vice-regal office.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (11:47): I thank the member for Heysen for his contribution. I have to say that when I referred to the acting executive research officer it was remiss of me not to mention her by name: Lisa Baxter. The work that she does is highly professional, highly competent and makes our committee look better than it really is.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ETHELTON RAILWAY STATION

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:48): I move:

That the 12th report of the committee, entitled 'Ethelton Railway Station platforms replacement project', be noted.

Consideration is being sought from the Department for Infrastructure and Transport for the replacement of two railway platforms at the Ethelton Railway Station located on the Outer Harbor line. One platform services the city-bound track while the other services the Outer Harbor-bound track. The station is the 10th of 20 stations on the Outer Harbor rail line and is located approximately 13 kilometres from the Adelaide Railway Station.

Ethelton is the third highest patronised station on the Outer Harbor rail line with around 60,000 passenger boardings per year. This comprises an average of 200 passenger boardings each weekday and 85 each day on weekends. The station dates back to 1916, with the existing platforms built in 1960 from old railway tracks. The platforms' iron frames have rusted over time and the platform decks have seen concrete break away from the internal reinforcing in several places. The decks are currently supported using timber, plywood and scaffolding. The proposed public works aim to demolish the existing platforms, which have clearly reached the end of their asset life, and replace them using an improved, more inclusive platform design.

The Outer Harbor rail line has a monthly average of 447 assisted boardings, which involve the manual deployment of a ramp. This number is one of the highest on the network. To reduce the need for manual ramp deployment at the station, the new platforms will be wider and raised to a height that aligns with train doors. The platforms will also be fitted with new access ramps. These improvements will provide all commuters with a safer, more dignified access to train services.

The wider platforms will ensure that the station complies with the standards set by the Adelaide Metropolitan Passenger Rail Network, while the new access ramps allow the station to meet the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act 1992. In this regard, these works are expected to support service reliability, with more passengers able to access trains unassisted.

No land acquisition is required for the project, with the works taking place within the existing Outer Harbor rail line corridor on land owned by the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. The total estimated capital costs are \$5.38 million. The costs are expected to be refined as part of the detailed design and procurement stages. Any additional funding will be subject to state approval.

The committee will be notified of any changes to the approved budget once all approvals have been received. Construction is scheduled to commence in early 2023, with completion in late 2023. A tender call for the construct-only contract is anticipated in the first quarter of 2023. The Department for Infrastructure and Transport confirms that procurement will be undertaken in accordance with the state government's procurement management framework and will comply with South Australian government guidelines. The project is expected to support approximately 20 full-time equivalent jobs over the construction period.

In preparation for these works, the department has devised an overarching community and stakeholder engagement strategy. Stakeholders will include residents and landowners impacted by the project, public transport users, nearby businesses, the appropriate state and federal members of parliament, and the City of Port Adelaide Enfield.

Communication plans will be refined as project-specific details and impacts develop. The department confirms that the stakeholder engagement will continue throughout the delivery of the project to keep passengers and the community informed. Once the design is complete and the successful contractor has proposed their construction methodology, steps will be taken to align any required rail closures with other works on the Outer Harbor line to minimise passenger disruptions. When train services are affected, substitute buses will be available.

The department will work in collaboration with local council to implement measures to reduce the impact on motorists. Traffic management plans will be developed by the successful contractor, including the exact timing of when works will be undertaken. This will be monitored throughout construction to ensure traffic delays are minimised as much as practically possible. The project will be assessed and managed in accordance with the department's environment and heritage impact assessment processes and guidelines. The department confirms the appropriate consultation has occurred, including with the Department of Treasury and Finance.

The committee has examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Ethelton Railway Station platform's replacement project. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Brian Roche, Acting Executive Director of Project Delivery, Department for Infrastructure and Transport, and David Waltham, Delivery Manager, Rail Projects, Department for Infrastructure and Transport. On behalf of the committee, I thank the witnesses for their time in presenting the project to the committee.

Based on the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (11:53): We know that the Ethelton Railway Station is, in fact, the 10th of 20 various stations on the Outer Harbor rail line and it is located only about 13 kilometres or so from the Adelaide Railway Station. The existing platforms there are certainly life expired. We saw that the railway iron frame is somewhat rusty and that the concrete is breaking away from the rusted internal reinforcing, which is occurring in several locations along various platforms.

This station is the third highest of the stations on the Outer Harbor rail line in terms of patronage, and that is based on data in August 2022, with around something like 60,000 passenger boardings each and every year. That makes up an average of 200 passenger boardings each weekday and about 85 each day on weekends. This project will definitely improve passenger safety and experience, by replacing what are life-expired platforms with new platforms. The government has committed \$5 million for the Ethelton station platforms replacement project.

As we heard, the project will replace the current railway platforms—these comprise iron frames and also decks made out of concrete—with new steel frames and concrete decks as well. The proposed scope of the works, as we have heard, includes replacing those platforms and also replacing access ramps. This will lead to the platforms meeting the Disability Discrimination Act 1992, which is very important. It is important that we make these things as inclusive and as accessible as possible, and the state will certainly reap the benefits of increased usage across the board.

There will also be a review and an upgrade of LED lighting on the platforms, if required, which is very important from a security point of view as well. It is important that people feel safe when they are using public transport along this stretch. The current station shelters are new and they will be retained.

I thank the committee for its good work. I thank the witnesses for their contributions and all the staff who have been involved, not only in their presentations but also in contributing to this upgrade. I commend the report to the house.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (11:56): I rise to make a very short contribution. I do so as a daily user of the Ethelton train station when parliament is sitting. It is great to see that body of work that is going to happen. It is quite a primitive station, and the access for people with disabilities leaves a lot to be desired. In doing the modifications, it would be great to have some shelter from the rain. There is a shelter there, but it is totally exposed to the prevailing winds. Some shelter from the rain for the people who patiently wait for the train would be absolutely fantastic.

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:57): I would like to thank members for their contribution. I would like to thank the member for Hartley for his words. It is always good to hear from users of our infrastructure, so it was very good to hear from the member for Giles as well. I would like to thank the members of the committee for the way that they considered the particular project. Again, I place on record the fact that this has been a very collegial committee, at least so far, and has functioned extremely well.

An honourable member: Well chaired.

Mr BROWN: I cannot say it is solely due to the Chair; I want to thank the members for the way that they have gone about their work.

An honourable member: Just mostly.

Mr BROWN: Just mostly—okay. Well, perhaps just mostly due to the Chair, but the members are actually making a very good contribution and they are very good members indeed. With that, I recommend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: AUGUSTA HIGHWAY JUNCTION UPGRADE

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:58): I move:

That the 13th report of the committee, entitled Augusta Highway Junction Upgrade (Horrocks Pass Road, Winninowie), be noted.

The Australian and South Australian governments have jointly committed funding of \$190 million to upgrade infrastructure along the Princes Highway corridor in South Australia. This equates to \$38 million for the South Australian government. This investment means we can continue to build new and better roads, intersection bridges, rail and social infrastructure that will benefit current and future generations.

The Department for Infrastructure and Transport works as part of the community, planning efficient transport and valuable social and economic infrastructure. By harnessing the diversity of our state's purpose and people, the department strives to achieve positive outcomes that will improve lifestyles on a daily basis.

The Princes Highway comes under the care, control and management of the Commissioner of Highways. The South Australian section of the Princes Highway runs for approximately 700 kilometres, from the South Australian-Victorian border east of Mount Gambier through to Port Augusta in the state's north. As part of this upgrade, the department has investigated numerous opportunities to improve the road network. Improvements could possibly have included pavement resurfacing, shoulder sealing, junction upgrades and overtaking lanes. The Augusta Highway junction with Horrocks Pass Road was identified as part of that investigation.

The project's scope includes things such as the construction of a north-bound overtaking lane to the south of the junction, improved entry and exit points to the rest area, a dedicated northbound acceleration lane, new pavement construction surfacing, earthworks and vegetation removal, and an upgrade to the existing drainage.

The committee considered evidence on this particular project and I am pleased to say that, based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (12:01): On behalf of the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, I move:

That standing orders and sessional orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable Private Members Business, Other Motions, Notice of Motion in the name of Ms Hood that the Strangers Gallery be renamed the Public Gallery, set down on the *Notice Paper* for Wednesday 7 December 2022, take precedence over Government Business forthwith.

Motion carried.

Motions

STRANGERS GALLERY RENAMING

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (12:01): I move:

That the Strangers Gallery be renamed the Public Gallery and that it continues to be so named unless and until amended or rescinded by the house in this or a subsequent parliament.

They may be too young to vote or to drive, but primary school students still have the power to change the parliament. Prospect Primary School students are in the Strangers Gallery today to try to aim to make history by modernising the House of Assembly viewing gallery to ensure the people's house, their house, is one where they feel welcome. Currently, members of the public are confronted with the words 'Strangers Gallery' when they visit the state parliament viewing galleries.

We know that parliament has many weird and wonderful traditions, from dragging the new Speaker to the chair, to the blood line that runs along the front of the front benches. Some of these traditions date back over many centuries and, while some of them are harmless or interesting reminders of our history, others, like the use of the term 'strangers', can be seen as being out of step with community expectations.

This motion seeks to drop the word 'Strangers' from the doors of the viewing gallery so it instead reads 'Public Gallery'. If this motion is successful today, it will follow changes made some 20 years ago in the United Kingdom and Australian commonwealth parliaments.

This call for change started after a classroom civics lesson with the Hon. Emily Bourke MLC from the other place where students were surprised to learn that the parliament's viewing gallery was called the Strangers Gallery. Students expressed that this outdated term made them feel that parliament was not welcoming and it sparked a passionate response, with the students setting about writing letters to the Speaker, the President, the Governor and the Hon. Emily Bourke MLC.

Today, those very students are watching from the Strangers Gallery. I would like to acknowledge Prospect Primary School students Beatrice Coleman, Swanit More, Jason Overduin-Scrutton and Evelyn Callen, who are here to represent the year 5-6 cohort at Prospect Primary School and who are all the inspiration behind this motion. They are accompanied by Prospect Primary School Principal Karen Duval and Deputy Principal Anita Hall and the student's classroom educator, Louise Comey, along with the formidable Hon. Emily Bourke MLC, who is the driving force as well behind this motion.

I am so incredibly proud to be their voice on the floor of parliament as Prospect Primary School students and the Hon. Emily Bourke MLC aim to make history by changing the name of the parliament's Strangers Gallery to the Public Gallery, so that the people's house is more inclusive and welcoming. As students rightfully raised, members of parliament are elected to be the voice of the people of South Australia, yet it is the very people who choose MPs to be their representatives in this chamber who are referred to as 'strangers'. To quote Beatrice, Swanit, Jason and Evelyn themselves:

We are of the belief that this name disregards the people of South Australia. Parliament House is owned by the members of the public; therefore, the name of the gallery must represent and respect that. Why must we be considered strangers in our own 'house'? It makes no sense and seems disrespectful towards those who view the meetings that take place in parliament, which is why we believe that the name change...is necessary.

They go on to say:

According to the Oxford dictionary, the definition of stranger is 'a person who does not know, or is not known in, a particular place or community'. This is an inappropriate way to refer to the people of South Australia because we are a democracy; all citizens of this state have their say in what happens within it. Furthermore, we are not just members of the public, we are also the owners of Parliament House.

In the parliament of the United Kingdom, what used to be called the Strangers' Gallery is now called the Visitors' Gallery. Yet here in South Australia, our government, which is almost identical to that of the United Kingdom, has not made any change to the name of the Strangers Gallery to show respectful acknowledgement of the public. This demonstrates that we are severely behind other democracies in recognising the place of the people in their state.

They continue:

We must move forward from the inequalities of the past and recognise the people of South Australia as the rightful owners of Parliament House and their power within it. It is only right that this name change takes place, and we look forward to your response to our proposal.

To all South Australians listening today, we want you to know that, no matter what your age, your voice is important in our democracy. We want you to know that you can make change and that you are always welcome here in the parliament, so do not be strangers. I commend the motion to the house.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (12:06): When I was Speaker of the house, like other Speakers before me, we worked very hard to make sure that this house was as inclusive as possible. That is why I am proud to say that it was a Liberal government that fought to make sure we have the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander flags hanging in this chamber and that it was a Liberal government that fought very hard to make sure we had things like Facebook Live, so that people could actually watch question time—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr TARZIA: They are going to care today—and we worked together to make sure we had things like cameras in this chamber so that the outside world could actually see what happens in this chamber. All these things are very, very important. I commend the students for having their say and raising their request with their local member of parliament. Good on them. That is a fantastic thing, and I welcome more feedback.

However, my comments today are directed to the government of the day. It is a sad state of affairs when we have a ramping crisis, we have record levels of ramping not seen before in our history, we have people losing their power on the River Murray as we speak, we have people who cannot find a home and are being kicked out of their home, but the government decides to use precious time, allocating its precious resources, to things like this when these things could have been done another time.

We have record levels of inflation and people uncertain if they are going to be kicked out of their homes because we still do not see a design for the north-south corridor completion. It is a sad state of affairs when this is the priority, to use up precious resources today. With those comments, it will be the will of the house, of course. I commend the students for raising their concerns. I wanted to put those few things on the record because this just shows that the government's priorities are all wrong.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (12:09): I am very pleased that the parliament is finding time to send a clear message not only to young people here in South Australia—some of whom are represented by visitors in the gallery—but to the entire community that parliament is their house. It is open to them and is where they choose their representatives to have their voice heard. It is not just me who thinks that is important. We have had civilisation after civilisation across the world who have fought for representative democracy and here we have it embodied today.

Perhaps this will be instructive for those students who are here today seeing a relatively robust parliamentary debate. We have had the government of the day introduce this as a matter of importance, as something that should be—as democracy has always been fought for—brought before the house and debated strongly between a proud representative of their community, the member for Adelaide, opposed in word if not by vote by a person they probably have not seen or heard of before, who happened to be one of the two short-term Speakers of the previous Liberal government.

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am sorry, am I debating during a debate? Is that the point of order?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The standing orders require members to be referred to in a certain way and the minister is ignoring that intentionally.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sorry, I am not clear on your point of order.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Sir, as the Deputy Speaker you would be familiar with the point of order that members should be referred to by their seat or their title.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I missed that and I apologise for that. Minister, please ensure that you refer to people's titles or their seats.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The member for Hartley is one of two former Speakers of the previous Liberal government. For those who are spectating their first parliamentary debate today, not only were there two short-term Speakers of the former Liberal government but there was a Deputy

Premier who had to stand down in disgrace, three ministers who had to stand down in disgrace, a Government Whip who had to resign in disgrace, a Chair of Committees who had to resign in disgrace.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, sorry. There is a point of order.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Relevance is the standing order relevant to this point, and the minister is not being relevant to the debate.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please! The member for Schubert and the minister will please keep quiet. Member for Morialta, you have indicated relevance. If we are going to rule on relevance, I think the member for Hartley's contribution was not exactly relevant to the actual topic itself.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: On the point of order, sir, that is utterly irrelevant to the point of order that I have raised.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understood you said it was the relevance of the comments.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: No point of order was raised against the member for Hartley, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point I am trying to make is that if you are going to have a consistent standard about relevance, members also have to be relevant as well.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Sir, the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker, as the case may be, may enforce the standing orders at any time they wish, but they are required by the standing orders to respond to a point of order when it is raised.

Mrs Hurn: Absolutely.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Schubert, I actually do not need your guidance yet. When I do, I will ask for it.

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Schubert, you will leave the chamber for 10 minutes.

The honourable member for Schubert having withdrawn from the chamber:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am going to enforce the rules.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister!

Mr Teague interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, I do not need your contribution either at this point in time because you do not have the call. Minister, please get back to the subject matter.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: On those initiatives which are designed to bring greater relevance of this place to the community that it seeks to represent, I think they are important. I think we should make time for them and I think we should celebrate them.

Yes, there have been moves previously in recent times to make this chamber more relevant. I am really pleased to report for those guests that we have in today, those members of the public up in the gallery, that this follows quickly on the heels of a former initiative of a member of parliament, the member for Wright, who brought a school group onto the floor of this chamber and a question was asked by a year 5 student: 'Why isn't the Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander flag raised in this place?' It was the initiative of those schoolchildren that led to—

Mr Tarzia: It was their idea?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, it was their idea for these two flags that we see proudly displayed here today to be in this chamber. The member for Hartley tries to take ownership of this

away from nine-year-old schoolchildren. He thinks that it was his initiative to do it and not the initiative of year 5 schoolchildren. We should all reflect on why a member of parliament would seek to belittle the efforts of schoolchildren to make this place more representative and more contemporary for those people out in the community.

While the member for Hartley might say that raising these two flags in this place was his initiative, it was not. Once again, it was younger members of the community who visited this place and noticed something that had been overlooked for decades in this place. They drew it to our attention, just like the member for Adelaide has raised with us today that, when they visit this place, schoolchildren do not appreciate being referred to as 'strangers', and I think that is important.

It has taken a new member for Adelaide to bring more people from the community into this place and have once again these opportunities to improve this place so that the community feels more at home. I think that is worth celebrating. For the member for Hartley's benefit, Facebook Live was an initiative of Mark Zuckerberg and not him. Let the record stand corrected. I support this motion.

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (12:16): I want to make a small contribution as the Minister for Human Services and as the member for Hurtle Vale. I represent many young people, including within the youth portfolio, and I am absolutely delighted that we are getting young people and children through parliament who are coming up with such great ideas.

As the member for Lee, the Treasurer, previously mentioned, the raising of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander flags came to fruition after the member for Wright in the previous term had children visiting this place asking why those flags were not in here. The member for Hartley cannot rewrite history. It was those children who suggested that. It was not some Liberal initiative. It was a process of parliament that actually got those flags up there following the children suggesting it. I think what we are seeing now, again, is a really fantastic opportunity to change some of the practices here, which will make parliament a much better place, and I thank the kids from Prospect.

Prospect Primary, you have done an outstanding job and you will rewrite history as we make the area in parliament somewhere to visit that does not have a connotation of 'strangers' being present. Not only do the children coming to visit not want to be referred to as strangers but also they do not want to go somewhere where strangers are, and that is not what this place is: it is your house. I hope that one day one of you is sitting down here also addressing children and young people as they bring their terrific ideas to reality.

I support the member for Adelaide with this wonderful initiative, along with the Hon. Emily Bourke in the other place, for making sure that young people and children in our community are having a true, active voice in parliament in the same way that we as members and ministers are trying to make sure that as many people as possible in our community get the opportunity to have direct influence on policy and strategy that dictate what happens in our community through voice to us, such as our advisory councils, such as our round tables, such as the task forces we have launched, a number of which are having direct influence on policy and delivery in our state.

Perhaps if those opposite had done more of that when they were in government, and followed through on things that real people want and understand, they might not be sitting opposite, but who am I to coach? Well done, kids. Thank you so much to you, your parents and your teachers—great job. Well done to the members who brought this forward.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call on the member for Adelaide to close the debate, on behalf of the House of Assembly I would like to formally welcome the students and staff from Prospect Primary School. I also acknowledge the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Emily Bourke from the other place. It is officially on the record.

*Motions***STRANGERS GALLERY RENAMING**

Debate resumed.

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (12:20): I rise to thank the speakers on this motion, in particular the Treasurer and the Minister for Human Services. I also note the comments of the member for Hartley.

On what is potentially the last sitting day of parliament for 2022, there is no greater sign of respect that we can show to young people in our state than giving them a voice on this floor of the parliament. Words matter. Today, what they are aiming to do in changing the name of the Strangers Gallery to the Public Gallery is not insignificant because it shows that our young people do have a voice in this place. On this side of the house, they will always have a voice in this place. I thank them again for their advocacy and I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

*Bills***LIVESTOCK (EMERGENCY ANIMAL DISEASE) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (12:21): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

It gives me great pleasure to speak to this bill and superintend its hopeful passage through this place on behalf of the Hon. Clare Scriven in the other place. This comes to us from the other place: it was considered a couple of weeks ago.

Biosecurity affects the industries that keep our state's economy moving and is a responsibility shared by government, industry and the community. Emergency animal disease threats have increased for Australia in recent months, and preparedness activities are currently underway to ensure South Australia is well placed to respond. The Livestock (Emergency Animal Disease) Amendment Bill 2022 will build on the state's preparedness for an emergency animal disease incursion by strengthening powers within the Livestock Act 1997 to support a comprehensive, rapid and effective emergency response.

The Livestock Act 1997 contains provisions required to control or eradicate livestock diseases. These provisions are utilised regularly for the control or eradication of notifiable endemic animal diseases, such as footrot in sheep. However, the current measures need strengthening to ensure speed of implementation and to enable any response to be agile in the event of an emergency animal disease incursion. It is also important that powers can be exercised without unnecessary administrative burden, given the likely duration of such a response.

Ensuring all required provisions are encompassed within the Livestock Act 1997 will assist South Australia in the effectiveness and the efficiency of the response. Given the increased risk and catastrophic consequences of some emergency animal diseases, the amendments in this bill are critical to ensure South Australia is ready to respond.

Even a small, isolated emergency animal disease outbreak could have a significant short to medium-term impact on trade. For example, a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak would immediately threaten South Australia's exports of livestock products, worth \$954 million in 2020-21, and impact the \$1.3 billion worth of interstate trade. A loss of export markets would also impact domestic prices for meat and meat-related products. It is estimated that a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak could cost Australia \$80 billion to \$100 billion over 10 years.

The effects of an emergency animal disease incursion would be felt beyond the affected livestock and trade impacts, with long-term, wider impacts on human health and wellbeing, tourism, education and research, with regional communities most vulnerable.

The amendments include provisions to improve the timeliness and effectiveness of an emergency response and to improve clarity and enhance powers, noting that the nature of an

emergency response can be difficult to predict. These amendments will allow notices to be published on a website and come into force prior to their publication in the *Gazette*, enabling a more timely and swift response.

These amendments provide the ability to limit the application of a notice to a specified class of persons or a specified class of livestock, livestock products or other property or other specified circumstances and exempt a person or class of persons from a requirement imposed by a notice. They will also allow for conditions to be imposed on any requirement specified by notice.

Provisions to enable inspectors to take action have been amended to ensure that required emergency response measures can be undertaken quickly to minimise the impacts on the state's livestock industries and economy. This will provide inspectors with the ability to take a required action where a person fails to comply with a notice or order in a specified or reasonable time frame.

In the event of destruction of any native animals required as part of an emergency response, the amendments provide flexibility on when consultation with the relevant minister is required and the ability to act without ministerial consultation if urgent circumstances exist.

Amendments to address the potential for conflicts between the Livestock Act 1997 and other acts have also been considered. Except for the Emergency Management Act 2004, the Livestock Act 1997 will prevail over other acts to enable effective action. Other government agencies will still be able to exercise powers under another act if they comply with the emergency response measures put in place under the Livestock Act 1997—for example, restrictions on the movements, property entry requirements or decontamination procedures. These amendments provide the ability to prescribe the kind of property—

There being a disturbance in the Strangers Gallery:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, could you just resume your seat for a second. I remind members of the public gallery that photography is not permitted, particularly flash photography, which interrupts the running of the chamber.

An honourable member: The Speaker is here.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Speaker cannot unilaterally change the rules. I can actually see the cameras flash in my eyes. Minister, can you resume, please?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Back to our cloven-hooved brothers and sisters, sir. The amendments provide the ability to prescribe the kind of property to which an inspector may issue an order, take action or cause an action to be taken for the destruction, demolition or disposal of the property. Some amendments address identified gaps in the current powers that will support emergency response efforts. Where appropriate, these powers may have been limited in their application to emergency responses regarding exotic diseases only.

These powers relate to the use of land, construction, reinforcement or repair of buildings, fences, gates or other structures, disinfection of places and property, possession, supervision of property to support response efforts, and the power to stop work or close any place. By way of example, these powers mean that, in the event of an emergency animal disease outbreak, inspectors will be able to construct or require the construction of a fence to contain livestock, disinfect machinery, take possession of available machinery to assist with livestock disposal activities or stop work or close a place to minimise biosecurity risk or impact.

The amendments will also increase the responsibilities of directors of a body corporate by expanding the definition of a prescribed offence. This recognises the significant role body corporate directors play in ensuring that biosecurity risks and impacts are addressed effectively, especially during animal disease response.

Importantly, where an increased risk of exotic disease has been declared, powers to undertake surveillance and proof of freedom testing have been added for monitoring disease incursions or for market access purposes. These enhanced powers will ensure South Australia can undertake testing to quickly implement any required emergency response measures to limit the rapid spread of disease and to maintain or regain market access, which will be crucial in managing the economic impact to the state.

Finally, to ensure the consistency of the Livestock Act 1997 with other modern legislation, maximum penalty provisions for hindering offences have been revised and statutory immunity for the Crown has been made more explicit and limited, consistent with protections provided in the Emergency Management Act 2004. I am confident the amendments to the Livestock Act 1997 will enhance South Australia's ability to respond to a future emergency animal disease incursion.

I know there has been one amendment filed—I think because it was me. I look forward to the committee stage and the contributions of members in the house. I therefore commend the Livestock (Emergency Animal Disease) Amendment Bill 2022 to the house.

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (12:30): I note the opposition's support for the Livestock (Emergency Animal Disease) Amendment Bill and also note that I am the lead speaker. The opposition supports all the measures that strengthen South Australians' preparedness activities in relation to emergency animal disease outbreaks. In my previous roles in the dairy industry, I spent many years being involved in the preparation for an emergency animal disease outbreak, particularly around foot-and-mouth disease.

All livestock industries across the nation work hard with all the state and federal governments to actually make sure that we are prepared in this space. I certainly must congratulate those leaders of the past, back in the early 2000s, when agreements were signed between all the industries and governments across the country, with the leaders of the organisations and the premiers and the Prime Minister all signing that document to form the Emergency Animal Disease Response Agreement. That agreement very much underpins Australia's response in relation to an emergency animal disease outbreak.

Also, under those agreements there have been many plans prepared, known as AUSVETPLANS, to actually map the path that each industry needs to follow to minimise and protect the industries going forward. In recent times we have certainly seen the increased risk, with Indonesia having outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease, including the popular destination of Bali, and occurring in those parts of Indonesia frequently visited by Australians.

Interestingly, in that time of my involvement it was very much highlighted to me that the two likely hotspots of infection, if there was ever likely to be one, were actually in the Adelaide Hills and the outskirts of Melbourne. The reason for that is the high population of people living in Adelaide and the close proximity to agriculture, as we see in the Adelaide Hills, particularly livestock and intensive livestock, with piggeries being one of the biggest risk-spreading factors out there.

This piece of legislation is certainly going to help improve the ability for us, as industries and government, to respond if there happens to be an outbreak in our state. It is so important that we actually have this preparedness and this ability, and I very much commend the minister, the Hon. Clare Scriven in the other place, for bringing this forward. I also commend the work done by the Department of Primary Industries and Regions, particularly by the chief executive, Professor Mehdi Doroudi, and the Chief Veterinary Officer, Mary Carr. The work that they do in this space is so important to protect the livestock industries here in South Australia.

We saw the trigger for the creation of the EADRA agreement actually implemented following an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in the UK in 2001, where we saw over six million cattle and sheep slaughtered. There were over 2,000 cases of foot-and-mouth disease in the UK in that time. It can happen not only in Third World countries but also in First World countries and certainly we need to protect ourselves from that risk going forward.

It is with those few words that I very much offer opposition support for this important piece of legislation. It is important that we keep our livestock protected and restrict the effects of trade implications. We do not want to see any risk to those trade implications because they will be hard-hitting and long-lived if we happen to have a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak in Australia. Even when there is effectively a rumour of an outbreak, it starts to make our trading partners nervous, and we do not want to see that going forward.

The opposition certainly consulted with key industry bodies in South Australia, including the South Australian Dairyfarmers' Association, Pork SA, Livestock SA and Primary Producers SA, who noted their support of the legislation. With that, I offer the opposition's support.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:35): I thank the member for Finniss for his contribution and in doing so recognise, especially with some people on this side of the house, the heavy involvement they have with primary industries and, in this case, with livestock and that long history of involvement in the dairy industry. Certainly, that is something that will concentrate one's mind when it comes to some of the potential biosecurity threats that we face as a nation. It certainly does concentrate the mind when you have that outbreak in Indonesia and especially the outbreak in Bali, a place that many Australians visit. To have foot-and-mouth disease on our doorstep is seriously concerning.

The member made reference to what happened in the UK in 2001, when six million cattle and sheep had to be destroyed with a devastating impact on farmers in communities in the UK. That impact actually went further because it had a whole range of consequences. For instance, wandering across land in the UK is a bit of a right and in some parts of the country—in Cumbria and other parts of the country—that right was taken away. It had a major impact on the Lake District in the UK, given the number of people who are attracted to hiking in that part of the world. The economic consequences, the social consequences and the consequences in terms of mental health were dire for many people, so we have to do all that we can in this country to ensure that diseases like foot and mouth do not penetrate.

It is a highly contagious viral disease of cloven-hoofed animals. That includes cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, deer, buffalo and camels. Human infections are rare and do not result in serious disease, but of course an outbreak of foot and mouth would affect many humans in this country deeply in economic and social ways. Foot-and-mouth disease has high rates of morbidity in livestock. Mortality rates, particularly in adult animals, are low, but animals can spread the foot-and-mouth disease virus for several days before showing clinical signs of the disease and the virus can remain for long periods after clinical recovery.

The AUSVETPLAN Foot and Mouth Disease Strategy manual details the policy and management responses for emergency animal diseases in Australia. The policy response involves stopping the spread of the disease by imposing animal movement restrictions, stamping out and/or vaccination and minimising the time to acquire foot-and-mouth disease-free status through the implementation of a response plan capable of achieving quick eradication. This would enable a quicker return to overseas market access and reduce the social and financial disruption that would inevitably occur should this disease arrive in Australia.

Sometimes in Australia we get criticisms of foreign aid, but one of the important foreign aid initiatives was what Australia did when it came to the outbreak in Indonesia in terms of providing vaccination and other support to try to address that threat on our doorstep. The National Biosecurity Committee of the Primary Industries Standing Committee has developed a National Foot and Mouth Disease Action Plan to guide collaborative national action and to improve Australia's foot-and-mouth disease preparedness. Of course it is preferred that we implement strong preparedness measures to stop the incursion into Australia in the first place.

When I look at my electorate and the importance of livestock, I have some of the largest pastoral properties possibly in the world, with Anna Creek Station and other very large landholdings, where we have cattle and in other parts we have sheep. One of the concerning things—and I always believe that we do not allocate the resources that we should, and I know it is a real challenge—is that, in my part of the state and in other parts of the state, when it comes to biosecurity, if we ever do get penetrated by some of the more serious livestock diseases there is the potential for a huge reservoir out there with the feral goat and feral camel population.

I know that when there are counts of kangaroos in this state, those surveys also include a goat count. Those numbers can fluctuate widely, depending upon climatic conditions, but we are talking about probably a minimum at any one time of around 300,000 feral goats in this state, often in hard to access areas, so that is a potential reservoir there. In the Far North of the state there is the camel population in the APY lands and elsewhere, and that provides another potential reservoir. So, when it comes to a range of biosecurity threats, when it comes to feral animals and when it comes to some of the botanic plant intrusions, we need to provide more resources because they have a range of benefits.

We know that feral goats do an enormous amount of damage to habitat, but they also act as a reservoir if disease gets into this country. People might know more about feral pigs than I do, but I do not think the penetration in this state is particularly high in comparison with Queensland and New South Wales and some of the other states, and certainly not in my part of the state. In other parts of the state, there are also significant deer numbers, so anything we can do to reduce the numbers of those animals is something we should make a real effort on.

We know that ultimately preparedness is going to be the important element, and I was taken somewhat by surprise that we did not already have this provision in the Livestock Act. I guess sometimes it takes a real threat to concentrate people's minds when it comes to what we need to do. What this amendment does is make it possible for PIRSA to be more responsive, more effective and in a quick manner without having to declare an emergency. That is why it has strong and sensible bipartisan support in this chamber and why industry also wants to see this particular amendment.

Every now and then we get argy-bargy in this house, and sometimes it is on principle and sometimes it is on what I would just call BS, but in this case it is something that is incredibly important. Often with people in the metropolitan area—because they are just getting on with their lives and the rest of it—it does not even cross their minds.

I admit that I come from a heavy industry community and it probably does not cross the minds of a lot of people in the community in which I live, but further afield in my electorate people know this is important. Anything we can do in terms of strengthening the act, so that we can enable officers to do what needs to be done in a quick manner is something that deserves support.

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (12:45): I rise today in support of the Livestock (Emergency Animal Disease) Amendment Bill. I thank the opposition for raising this, and for bringing on the changes, but with concern and wariness. This bill comes at a time of high alert for our livestock industries in South Australia and nationally. The level of high alert follows reports in early July this year of the emergence of the animal disease foot and mouth in our neighbour Bali.

Foot-and-mouth disease has now been detected in 25 of Indonesia's 37 provinces. Foot and mouth is a highly contagious virus that can affect all cloven-hoofed animals, including sheep, cattle, buffalo, camels, alpacas, goats, deer and pigs. It can be spread through the air, via feedlots or in water. The disease can be secreted by animals for up to four days before clinical signs appear. It can be found in meat and dairy products, but the virus can also be carried through soil, on vehicles, on farming equipment, clothing and footwear.

It has been estimated that an outbreak in Australia would cost the livestock industry between \$80 and \$100 billion over 10 years. An outbreak would threaten our export and livestock products, which were worth \$950 million in 2021, and impact the \$1.3 billion worth of interstate trade. The loss of export markets would also impact domestic prices for meat and meat-related products. Clearly, economic implications of an outbreak would be catastrophic, and it would take many years, potentially, for the disease to be contained or eradicated. There is no doubt that keeping this disease out of Australia is vitally important.

The economy of the larger Limestone Coast is particularly susceptible. In 2015-16, the total value of agricultural output in the Limestone Coast region was \$1.123 billion. The largest commodity produced was livestock slaughtering, which accounted for 48.2 per cent of the Limestone Coast's total agricultural output in value terms. ABARE statistics for 2020-21 tell us that the gross value of livestock in the Limestone Coast is \$788 million. This is a vital asset we need to protect.

It is important to understand the implications of the disease arriving in Australia. Potentially, it would have some very direct and devastating impacts for livestock producers. But the impacts would be far wider: impacts would be felt by our local meat processing facilities and their employees, not to mention the stock agents, transport operators and livestock exchanges. There would be long-lasting wider impacts on human health and wellbeing, tourism, education and research, with regional communities being most vulnerable.

Further, there would be serious flow-on implications for our regional, state and national economies. Lumpy skin disease is another disease of concern for our cattle industry, spread primarily by biting insects. Lumpy skin disease was detected in Indonesia in March this year. It is estimated

that the lumpy skin disease outbreak could affect approximately \$7.39 billion worth of exports across 23 countries should an incursion occur.

The consequences of both these diseases for the livestock industry, our communities and our economy are substantial. It is important that all measures necessary to prevent entry of the disease into our country are implemented. At the state level, it is important that we have this bill brought before us. The bill will strengthen measures in the Livestock Act 1997. The act currently contains provisions to control or eradicate livestock diseases. Diseases such as footrot and Johne's are currently controlled through this act.

The bill will support a responsive approach to the management of emergency animal disease incursion. It will provide more tools in our toolkit for the management of emergency disease incursions. I hope—and this is where the fear is—that this amended act, with its timeliness and speed it is meant to introduce to the state so that the primary industries minister and her staff can act with swiftness, is only used for these emergency diseases that are not present in Australia or South Australia already. There are a range of key provisions included in this bill:

- Notices are to be published on a website and come into force prior to their publication in the *Gazette*, enabling a more timely and swift response.
- The amendments provide the ability to limit the application of a notice to a specified class of persons, a specified class of livestock, livestock products or other property or specified circumstances and exempt a person or a class of persons from a requirement imposed by a notice.
- The amendments provide inspectors with the ability to take a required action where a person fails to comply with a notice or order in a specified or reasonable time frame.
- Where there are impacts on any native animals as part of a required emergency response, the amendments provide flexibility on when consultation with the relevant minister is required.
- Except for the Emergency Management Act 2004, the Livestock Act 1997 will prevail over other acts.
- The amendments provide the ability to prescribe the kind of property for which an inspector may issue an order, take action or cause action to be taken for the destruction, demolition or disposal of the property.
- The amendments address identified gaps in current powers that will support emergency response efforts. Where appropriate, these powers have been limited in their application to emergency responses regarding exotic diseases only. These powers relate to the use of land, construction, reinforcement or repair of buildings, fences, gates or other structures, disinfection of places and property, possession and supervision of property to support response efforts, and the power to stop work or close any place.
- When an increased risk of exotic disease has been declared, powers to undertake surveillance and proof of freedom testing have been added for monitoring disease incursions or for market access purposes.
- Maximum penalty provisions for hindering offences have been revised, and statutory immunity for the Crown has been made more explicit and limited, consistent with the protections provided in the Emergency Management Act 2004.

In regard to this swiftness and the concern that we are under threat, that it is probably closer than ever before because of our neighbouring country Indonesia and Bali, I must also recognise that we know there is an opportunity for this disease to come from any foot-and-mouth country around the world, not just Indonesia or Bali. We know it can be carried on footwear, and it certainly can cause a risk. The risk was heightened because Bali is a popular destination for tourists from Australia and South Australia.

The greatest threat was the food products that can be brought in, not declared, maybe not found and taken back to a home. This food product might not have been cooked: it might be cured.

It may then be put into the scrap bucket and fed to animals, like a pet pig or some pigs, on a farm or a property on the outskirts of any city in Australia. That was and still is our greatest risk for foot and mouth coming into this country.

As I have just mentioned, we have the Labor Malinauskas government and the Minister for Primary Industries moving these stronger rules to protect our country. It is most important that we are vigilant and that we all play our part as South Australians and Australians, going overseas but then, coming back, doing our bit to meet the rules and requirements to protect the valuable industries I have highlighted.

I am supportive of the bill, but I would like to put on the record that I, on behalf of my constituents, would like to be better satisfied that our state is ready to respond to the incursion of animal diseases such as foot and mouth and lumpy skin disease. I have written to the Minister for Primary Industries seeking more information about what our state is doing operationally to be prepared for an outbreak, including if we have planned or are planning to conduct operational exercises in partnership with industry to ensure we can effectively operationalise our planned disease response.

I have asked what additional resources have been made available through funding or what contingencies have been put in place to ensure that adequate government veterinarian resources are available to prepare for and respond to an outbreak. I have also sought more information on what has been done to prepare our livestock stakeholders to ensure effective tracing and management should we have an incidence of either disease in Australia.

I ask these questions as the community needs reassurance that we are prepared to ensure South Australia is well placed to respond to emergency disease incursion. This gives me the opportunity to recognise that we have a number of animals in Australia, be they domestic, sheep and cattle, or obviously introduced species like pigs, camels, and deer that roam the countryside not only of South Australia. They are not bound by borders. These animals are not bound by fences. Yes, we have a dog fence, but the dog fence is not meant to stop any movement of these sorts of animals.

We know that once this disease is found in Australia the swiftness with which we respond is absolutely pertinent. We know that the disease has the ability to spread very quickly as well, untraced, and I guess this is why we are actually supportive of such measures. I am also then going to raise that if the discovery of the disease is made very late in its advance around Australia, I hope that consideration is given to a different management strategy.

What do I mean by that? I do not know what that advance means, and I am not sure what it means when I say 'further spread', but obviously a localised issue is a much easier issue to address and respond to than a national issue, where it may have spread well beyond a city, beyond state borders, and it may be affecting many jurisdictions around Australia.

I hope that a measured response on a national basis is found and that we work through all strategies, knowing that there are vaccines out there for this disease and that we may have to give consideration to something other than just wiping out this disease if it well and truly had escaped beyond any sort of local issue that would have been perhaps paramount to an effective control in its early stages.

Another thing I would like to highlight before we run out of time is the export markets and the pristine nature of our meat production in this country, be it lamb, mutton or beef. We are seeing prices right now that make most producers think that all their Christmases have come at once. We have good management and we have good seasonal conditions. Yes, there are some trying ones at the moment. South Australia is just recovering from a three-year drought of about six to 12 months ago, and now we are seeing flooding rains across much of eastern Australia and starting to affect South Australia through the River Murray-Darling system.

Those who are lucky enough to be avoiding these natural climate scenarios at the moment and perhaps in the livestock industry are also marching on through a commodity price boom that we have not seen in my time, and I am very pleased that I am in agriculture for that reason. With that, I hope that with good controls keeping this disease out we can maximise the returns of our premium product that the rest of the world is paying very good money for, recognising the quality that it is.

May I also add the fact that there are trade barriers coming down, evaporating, right out until 2030. Imposed tariffs on our product, like beef into Japan, China, Korea and Taiwan, are evaporating every year we get closer to 2030, which makes our livestock enterprises even more valuable coming into the future and more valuable today.

Finishing up, I congratulate the minister on putting in a piece of legislation that actually protects all that I have explained, the millions that it brings to this country in export, the way that we are all privileged in this country as Australians to have access to and eat some of the best food product, perhaps the most price competitive as well.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Telfer.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Petitions

TUMBY BAY JETTY

Mr TELFER (Flinders): Presented a petition signed by 273 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—Integrity State: Corruption prevention recommendations Report—November 2022

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

Attorney-General's Department—Report of a review of the operations of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption and the Office for Public Integrity—
Report for Period 2021-22

Annual Reports 2021-22—

Coroner's Court
Courts Administration Authority
Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner

By the Minister for Energy and Mining (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Annual Reports 2021-22
Energy and Mining, Department for
Energy Market Commission, Australian
Hydrogen Power South Australia, Office of
Power Line Environment Committee
Technical Regulator, Office of the South Australian

By the Minister for Health and Wellbeing (Hon. C.J. Picton)—

Health Performance Council—Monitoring the performance of the South Australian health system 2018-19 to 2021-22 Report November 2022

By the Minister for Energy and Mining (Hon. A. Koutsantonis) on behalf of the Minister for Education, Training and Skills (Hon B.I. Boyer)—

Annual Reports 2021-22—
Construction Industry Training Board
TAFE SA

Teachers Registration Board

By the Minister for Arts (Hon. A. Michaels)—

Adelaide Film Festival—Annual Report 2021-22

By the Minister for Planning (Hon. N.D. Champion)—

State Planning Commission—Amendment to Annual Report 2021-22

*Ministerial Statement***ESCOSA INQUIRY INTO ELECTRICITY AND GAS**

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:02): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Consumers and businesses in South Australia are concerned that energy companies are or may be making super profits. The Malinauskas government shares these concerns and has therefore established an inquiry into energy costs and pricing. The inquiry will help the development of better protections for consumers and businesses against a predicted surge in energy prices, including penalties for bad corporate behaviour.

Protection measures must be based on accurate, in-depth information about price dynamics in the energy market. The inquiry will be conducted by the Essential Services Commission of South Australia, using its statutory powers to strip back any veils of secrecy being used to conceal profiteering. It is being established under part 7 of the Essential Services Commission Act 2002, which provides for an industry minister by written notice to refer any matter to the Essential Services Commission of South Australia for the commission to conduct an inquiry into the matter.

By virtue of section 14D of the Electricity Act 1996, the electricity industry is a regulated industry for the purposes of part 7 of the act. By virtue of section 18B of the Gas Act 1997, the gas industry is a regulated industry for the purposes of part 7 of the act. As the minister administering the Electricity Act 1996 and the Gas Act 1997, I have instructed the commission to conduct the inquiry. Establishment of the inquiry is one of a raft of measures being instigated by the newly created National Energy Crisis Committee of Cabinet.

The commonwealth has forecast that electricity prices will increase by 56 per cent over two years and gas prices by 20 per cent annually over the same period. The Australian Competition Consumer Commission is concerned the high international prices for gas may flow through to long-term domestic gas contracts. Russia's illegal invasion of Ukraine has disrupted world energy markets and caused prices of coal and gas to spike. However, there is almost no transparency on exactly how the level and timing of those international prices have flowed through to domestic prices paid by South Australian consumers.

To have confidence in the energy system, consumers must know whether rises are justified and whether all possible restraints are being employed. The Essential Services Commission will inquire whether there is any evidence or potential for a party—that is, a retailer, generator, trading entity or other relevant party in the electricity or gas industry—to be earning sustained super profits to the financial detriment of South Australian consumers.

The commission has the power to demand entities reveal relevant information. It will consider costs, terms and conditions of supply and transport of fuels, financial and physical risk management and any other relevant factors. The commission will invite public submissions to the inquiry. The commission may make recommendations about possible changes to regulations to better protect the long-term interest of consumers. Recommendations could include incentives and penalties. A draft report from the inquiry will be provided to the minister—me—on or before 1 May 2023 and a final report within 14 days after the minister responds to the draft.

The Malinauskas government is fully aware of the risks to the economy and the wellbeing of South Australians from predicted energy price rises in this national energy crisis. This government is not afraid to step up and challenge companies which are not performing in the interests of South Australian consumers. We will use all measures at our disposal to rein in the cost of living and penalise any entity using the global turmoil to exploit energy consumers.

ICAC EVALUATION OF THE CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:07): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Yesterday, the Independent Commission Against Corruption released a report regarding its evaluation of the Central Adelaide Local Health Network's complaints processes. The commission announced its intention to conduct the evaluation on 28 April 2022. The commission indicated that the focus of the evaluation would be to assess the practices, policies and procedures of the network regarding the receipt, management, investigation and outcome of complaints.

The government immediately welcomed the investigation and made clear that we would of course provide our full cooperation. The evaluation was a timely opportunity to assess CALHN's policies and procedures around complaint management almost three years on from the release of the commission's 2019 investigation report into CALHN and the health system more broadly, Troubling Ambiguity. Now this new evaluation from the commission reviewed CALHN's receipt, management, investigation and outcomes of complaints made between October 2019 and March 2022—a three-year period marking most of the previous government's tenure.

The report makes 25 recommendations—nine addressed to CALHN and 16 to the Department of Health and Wellbeing—regarding improvements to the complaints management process. The government has accepted all 25 recommendations. As a responsible minister, I have made clear my expectation that both CALHN and the department will ensure that these recommendations are implemented as soon as possible.

The government has also instructed the Commissioner for Public Sector employment, Erma Ranieri, to oversee the implementation of the recommendations. The commissioner will receive regular reports on the progress of the department and CALHN's implementation of all 25 recommendations. I have also written to all governing board chairs of the other local health networks to advise them of the report and asked them to consider the recommendations in the context of their own organisations.

Let's be clear, bullying and harassment should have no place in our hospitals. Our hardworking frontline healthcare workers have the right to feel safe at work and they must be able to raise their concerns without fear of repercussion. The implementation of these recommendations will help to address harassment and bullying in the public health system and ensure that when complaints arise they are managed fairly and appropriately.

SOCEROOS

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) (14:09): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: I rise today to extend my wholehearted congratulations, the congratulations of this place and, I am certain, the congratulations of the other place too, to our beloved Socceroos, who in the early hours of this morning rocked the soccer world by beating Denmark 1-0 and qualifying for the round of 16 at the World Cup in Qatar.

One of the things that brings people together is watching our national teams compete at the highest level. The FIFA Football World Cup is the pinnacle of this sport. It is hard to identify a bigger sporting tournament. This morning showed that football here is alive and well and continues to bring

so much joy. Our Socceroos had to do it the hard way, after losing to France in their first game, but they did it. Many said they could not, but they showed such incredible determination and skill.

I extend my congratulations in particular to the South Australians in the team: Craig Goodwin, Awer Mabil, Riley McGree and Thomas Deng. We should also mention this morning's goal scorer, Matthew Leckie, who, whilst not South Australian, got his first professional contract and made his name at Adelaide United.

I encourage South Australians to make their way to Telstra Plaza on Sunday morning to watch the game live, and I thank the Adelaide Oval Stadium Management Authority for facilitating the screening of the match on the big screens. Argentina awaits—a monumental task—but football is a wonderful and surprising game and all it takes sometimes is one moment to do what may seem impossible. Go Socceroos!

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: Their remarkable efforts add to the excitement that is building as we get ready to host, together with New Zealand, the FIFA Women's World Cup in around eight months. Just as we are all inspired by our incredible Socceroos, we also look forward to cheering on the Matildas in their fight to become the 2023 world champions—and wouldn't it be a dream come true to see them do so on their home soil. Go Matildas!

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call questions without notice, I recognise the presence in the gallery of Mike Tindall MBE, who formed part of England's World Cup winning team in rugby in 2003. I also recognise the presence in the gallery of Ann Ferguson OAM, guest of the member for Playford and myself. Welcome.

Question Time

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier agree with the Women's and Children's Hospital chief executive officer, Lindsey Gough, about the quality of care at the hospital and the government's decision to delay the new Women's and Children's Hospital? Sir, with your leave, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Yesterday, the Women's and Children's Hospital chief executive, Lindsey Gough, was quoted on ABC Radio as saying:

Those issues we felt were manageable when we thought we were moving hospital earlier, but now we are moving to the new site at a later date we know we have to undertake more work on this site to ensure that we can continue to deliver the high-quality care.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:13): I haven't seen the quote that is being alleged, but I will certainly check any particular transcripts. In relation to the new hospital, what we are very clear on is—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —that this is a hospital which has been delayed and delayed and delayed over time. In fact, it was promised by the previous government that it was going to open in 2024; that's only in 13 months' time that we were going to have a new hospital opening—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —on that site. That was completely fanciful. We got to office and the project was in a very serious state, where there were serious issues in terms of the implementation of that hospital. Quite rightly, we are looking at issues in terms of the Paediatric Intensive Care Unit and that was one of the issues raised in relation to the previous government's design of the hospital, that we were going to have a Paediatric Intensive Care Unit that was disconnected from the other important areas of the hospital that it needed to connect to.

We made the decision, the decision for the long term, the decision to put health first, a difficult decision, mind you, that we needed to put that hospital on a larger site to enable a bigger hospital to be built to make sure that we could build the future services that are required on that site.

We looked at the alternative of: do we continue with the previous government's plans for that site? That was still going to be some six years away, the opening of a new hospital on that constrained site. So we would have six years of delay still in opening the new hospital and we would have a hospital that was built—

The Hon. P.B. Malinauskas interjecting:

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

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: We would have a hospital that is built—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Unley! Member for Frome! The Premier is called to order.

The Hon. P.B. Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier knows the standing orders. The minister has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The exchange across the chamber is preventing the minister from being able to answer. The member for Hammond is warned. The member for Florey is warned. The Premier is warned. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: On the old site that was proposed, you would have another six years of no new hospital there and you would eventually have a hospital built that didn't meet the requirements for PICU in the long term. The intensive care specialists were extremely concerned about that and they were raising their concerns very strongly. They have been very, very supportive of our plans to build that new hospital on a new site that means the hot floor services can be combined on that new site and that's exactly what we are delivering.

Of course, whether we went with the previous government's plan or this new plan, we were going to have to look at the existing services in that site. This is something where the previous government, in the previous sustainment works of the hospital, didn't undertake any works in relation to the Paediatric Intensive Care Unit even though they were warned about this issue from the College of Intensive Care Medicine not a few weeks ago, not a few months ago, but back in 2018. Back in 2018, the College—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley! The member for Unley knows better. The minister has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Morialta! The minister has the call. There are 20 seconds remaining.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The College of Intensive Care Medicine raised concerns about the infrastructure then at the site, but there were decisions made about the various sustainment works at that hospital and no investments were made in paediatric intensive care. This government will do that both at the current site and at the new site to build a new hospital that is built for the long term.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:18): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. When was the government first notified about the College of Intensive Care Medicine's matters of concern and what immediate action did the government take to rectify them? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: On 17 October, the college inspection team visited the Women's and Children's Hospital and noted significant concerns, with the most damning and distressing being that sick children who are fighting for their life were being left without a doctor in sight—and that inspection was more than a month ago.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:18): I already answered this question yesterday in that I was informed of—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

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

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —this on Monday and provided a copy of the letter on this Monday.

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned. You have asked the question.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The member for Schubert raises or makes allegations in relation to the care of children overnight. She should be very careful because exactly what she is describing was in place for every single day that the Liberal Party were in government in South Australia. Every single day the Liberal Party were in government there was one registrar—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —doing the overnight coverage.

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Schubert!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Every single day the Liberal Party was in government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —there could be Code Blues—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —where that registrar was called to other emergencies in the hospital. So this is not something that magically happened on 19 March, when there was a change here. Every single day that they were in government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned. Member for Hammond!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —this was exactly the same situation. So if the shadow minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —is so concerned about children being at risk, as she alleges, then that was the situation for every single day that they were in government.

Mrs Hurn: What are you doing about it now?

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is on a final warning.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Now, having received this advice on Monday, we have asked for a plan to be put in place, on my desk within two weeks, of how we will address each of those recommendations that were ignored—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —by the previous government, to make sure—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —that we can address the concerns that were raised by the college—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —and make sure that we can regain the accreditation for training at that unit in the hospital. But the shadow minister—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —should be very careful of what she insinuates.

The Hon. P.B. Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier is warned.

The Hon. P.B. Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier is warned for a second time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I made reference yesterday to previous concerns that were raised with the previous government by over 200 doctors who signed letters to the previous government that were completely ignored—completely ignored. The work that was done by the medicine unit of paediatric medicine across the hospital, of the doctors themselves putting together plans—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Flinders!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —for how additional doctors should be put in place in that hospital, that was completely ignored by the previous government, whereas this government made a commitment at the election to fully implement that plan of 48 additional doctors. We have already hired some. There are a significant number that will be coming online in February next year, and we will deliver that plan in full that was proposed by the doctors, that was ignored by those opposite, and we will make sure that those extra resources go into caring for the kids of this state.

PAEDIATRIC COCHLEAR IMPLANT PROGRAM

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:22): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Is the minister taking action to address concerns relating to the paediatric Cochlear Implant Program of the Women's and Children's audiology department? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: The opposition has been contacted by audiologists speech pathologists and families who have raised serious concerns relating to the programming of cochlear implants provided to young children in the Women's and Children's Hospital. The opposition is also advised that this has been raised directly with the minister and the CEO of the Women's and Children's Hospital and the Premier's office.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:22): Absolutely, and there's been public notification of the fact that there is work underway in terms of reviewing the settings that were made of cochlear implants over a number of years—many years. I think, off the top of my head, we are going back through the last seven years to check those cochlear implants to make sure that those settings were right. That's the appropriate thing to do.

I have met some of the concerned audiologists, who want to make sure that work is done. We want to make sure that for each of those children and patients who had cochlear implants installed those settings are correct. The Women's and Children's Health Network have put out a public notification to that fact. They have contacted the families involved. They are going through the process of making sure that they are checking each and every one of those previous—many years—cases to make sure that those settings are right to take appropriate action if there are issues that are identified.

PAEDIATRIC COCHLEAR IMPLANT PROGRAM

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Were there any delays between the Women's and Children's Hospital network audiology department being advised of these issues in relation to the paediatric Cochlear Implant Program and clients and families being notified and, if so, why did these delays take place? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: The opposition has been advised that the Women's and Children's Hospital network audiology was initially advised of cochlear implant programming concerns by Little Allied Health via phone in March 2022 when these issues were identified but that a letter was only sent to some families in September 2022, some six months later.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:24): As I said, we have been working with the audiologists and it is that particular organisation that has raised a number of those concerns. I will have to check the time line in which the health network was first made contact with by that organisation. But certainly they have, as I have been advised, been contacted in relation to undertaking these checks. I am advised that these checks have been undertaken for a number of months.

I met with Little Allied Health recently and heard an update from the Women's and Children's Health Network and the concerns of Little Allied Health. I want to make sure that every single one of those patients is contacted and the advice I have is that that has occurred.

NURSE STAFFING LEVELS

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (14:25): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. How are the government's nursing and midwifery commitments being delivered and what improvements are being made to nursing care and nursing working conditions?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:25): Thank you very much to the member for Davenport. I thank her for her support of the improvements that are being made to address both the nursing care and the nursing working conditions across South Australia. One of the very key commitments that we made as a government at the election was to hire more nurses. We see nurses and midwives as critical components of our healthcare system and we have heard time and time again how they are significantly overworked in terms of the important work that they do.

We have a very ambitious program in terms of building and operating and opening more beds across the system that will necessitate, in addition, more nurses across the system as well. I am very happy to inform the member for Davenport and the house that we have been making tremendous progress on this already. While figures do bounce around from time to time, I am advised that we had hired, at the end of June since coming to government, at that stage already an additional 266 nurses, excluding the COVID nurses for testing centres and vaccination clinics, etc.

That goes a significant way to addressing that election commitment, but there is significantly more that we can do as well. We know that a lot of the commitments we made were for specific nursing areas where there were identified needs and some of those were in relation to childhood cancer care and also childhood mental health care, where we have committed additional nurses. I am advised that, in those areas, we have already hired 10 of those 12 additional kids' mental health and cancer nurses for those particular areas, so we have gone a long way to implementing that.

I have already informed the house previously of how we are hiring 10 additional palliative care nurses across South Australia with that recruitment process underway. We are also hiring four new Parkinson's nurse specialists, addressing a significant area of gap in helping people stay healthy in the community. We are also hiring three specialist nurses for epilepsy training, which will help to reduce pressure on our hospitals as well, and also a full-time nurse at Arthritis SA to support people living with arthritis and better manage their condition in the community.

Of course that is not all. We need to protect our nurses when they are at work. We have heard time and time again about the working conditions particularly at the Port Lincoln hospital, where nurses were being repeatedly assaulted and no action was being taken in relation to security. We have put in place an additional security guard 24 hours a the day in the Port Lincoln emergency department for the first time ever and that has been a very welcome protection for our nurses.

We are also working with the ANMF in terms of a security review and a 10-point plan for security to keep our nurses safe right across the system. We of course ended the practice of making nurses redundant. We have ended voluntary separations for frontline nurses across our healthcare system. We have recently addressed and voted for a new EB with our nurses across the system, which was supported by 78 per cent of the nursing and midwifery workforce.

We have started the work and established the working group that is working on bringing to this parliament in this term of government a piece of legislation that will enshrine in legislation the nurse to patient ratios so that for each patient there is the appropriate amount of nursing that is provided. We know that nurses are the backbone of our healthcare system. We need more nurses and they need to be supported to appropriately care for their patients.

PAEDIATRIC COCHLEAR IMPLANT PROGRAM

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Has every child who received cochlear implant care through the Women's and Children's Hospital audiology department had an in-person review? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: Parents and clinicians have raised concerns directly with the opposition that these reviews have not been independent and that clinical programming errors have had and will continue to have an impact on their child's development.

The SPEAKER: I am not necessarily certain that an assertion that a statement has been made in general arrives at the level of factual detail necessary to justify its inclusion by leave. I make that observation in view of the fact that this is the last sitting day, or may be the last sitting day. I don't have any better information than anybody else about that as matters stand.

An honourable member: Sure you don't.

The SPEAKER: In fact, I don't. I make that observation in addition to comments I have previously made about seeking leave. I am going to allow the question.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:30): Thank you, sir. As I think I previously said, people are in the process of organising—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: As I previously said, the Women's and Children's, as I am advised, have contacted people over the period of years to make sure that they are advised of the situation and can organise for those checks to take place. They are in the process of conducting those checks. In relation to the other assertions that were made that you have made comment on, sir, I will have to check the details of that.

MEDSTAR

Ms PRATT (Frome) (14:31): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Has the minister been advised that MedSTAR pilots are frequently bypassing the Clare Hospital helipad, and what action will he take—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

Ms PRATT: —to ensure patient safety during these—

The SPEAKER: Member for Frome, there is a point of order from the member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There's a statement of fact in that question, sir, and I would ask the member to rephrase it.

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

The SPEAKER: I will hear the member for Morialta on the point of order.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: There is some history on questions of this nature. If the question is in relation to whether the minister 'has received advice that', there tends to be more scope than if the question were to start with 'does' a certain something happen.

The SPEAKER: That may be, and I see the force of the point that is made by the member for Morialta, except I think it will be possible to recraft the question in a way that will meet the standing orders and I am going to give the member the opportunity.

Ms PRATT: Thank you, Mr Speaker, I will make that attempt. Is the minister aware that MedSTAR pilots are bypassing the Clare Hospital helipad? If so, what action will he take to ensure patient safety during these most critical times? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms PRATT: MedSTAR pilots are increasingly choosing to bypass the Clare Hospital helipad in preference to the Clare aerodrome, which is 15 kilometres away.

The SPEAKER: That question is defective in two parts: the first is that there is an opinion, an argument or a fact introduced in the question, and then there is an assertion about a fact after leave is sought. I am going to rule it out of order. I have given members more than enough opportunity to craft a question appropriately. However, I am going to remain with the opposition's side. Is there another question?

CRITICAL CLIENT INCIDENTS

Ms PRATT (Frome) (14:33): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. Have any critical client incidents been reported to her since the election? If so, have any involved neglect by DHS disability supported accommodation staff or bruising to the client? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms PRATT: Critical client incidents are reports of serious misconduct by DHS accommodation services staff or service providers during the delivery of services to vulnerable people and people with disability.

The SPEAKER: The question is within order.

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (14:34): Yes.

CRITICAL CLIENT INCIDENTS

Ms PRATT (Frome) (14:34): A supplementary question: given the minister's previous answer, can the minister therefore detail the circumstances of these critical client incidents and what steps she has taken to deal with them?

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (14:34): Thank you for the question. I won't discuss individual incidents in here. I haven't had any requests at all for any briefings on any matters. I am happy to discuss things, and I have offered that to many members opposite in relation to a lot of incidents. The basic synopsis is that all critical incidents have been reported to me according to policy and we have met as a team and ensured that the follow-up is being done appropriately and that all the appropriate investigations are happening.

CRITICAL CLIENT INCIDENTS

Ms PRATT (Frome) (14:34): Supplementary: can the minister advise how many CCIs she is referring to?

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (14:35): I will take that on notice.

MINISTERIAL STAFF EXPENSES

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. Has the minister or her office approved reimbursement of any Uber receipts for late-night travel by staff—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: A bit rich coming from you guys.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr COWDREY: —and, if so, is she certain that these trips were work related?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

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

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (14:35): I thank the member for the question. Any reimbursements that have happened via my office for anything at all would be work related.

ELECTION COMMITMENTS

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister inform the house how the state government's election commitments in his portfolios are reducing cost-of-living pressures for South Australians?

An honourable member: Good question!

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

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Standing order 97: the application of the firm rule that you are applying to the parliament should rule that out of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It's not so much a firm rule as the standing orders and the practice for quite some time. I have offered guidance over the last several question times in an effort to assist members. Most members, I understand, have received that advice. However, I am going to give the member the opportunity to recast the question.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Can the minister inform the house how the state government's election commitments may be affecting living pressures on South Australians?

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

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order from the member for Morialta.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The question as framed assumes that the state government's election commitments are having an effect of any nature on cost of living, and that is an inclusion of a suggested argument.

The SPEAKER: It may be. It may be, but that is a very close reading of the question. I'm going to permit the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:37): In opposition, we took to the state election two commitments from the transport portfolio that sought to address cost-of-living pressures. Specifically, what I am talking about are the outer areas registration concession and free public transport for Seniors Card holders—two very important measures. In 2020, members opposite decided to cut the outer areas concession with one fell swoop of the pen. The member for Dunstan, who is not here today—

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens will be seated. I will hear the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Morphett, your colleague is seeking to raise a point of order. I will hear it under 134.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Two points of order: first, in relation to the reference to a member's presence or otherwise in the immediate chamber and, secondly, in his commentary on decisions taken or not taken several years ago under the previous government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —that Speakers rule those out of order as debate.

The SPEAKER: I'm going to uphold the first limb that was raised with me in reference to the presence or otherwise of a member in the chamber.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, I apologise for mentioning that the member for Dunstan is not in the chamber again.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens knows better.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Morialta, I have already addressed the point with the member.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: It's a new point of order: in the member for West Torrens's response to your ruling, he defied your ruling and is obstructing the house.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I gave the member for West Torrens some guidance. The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In 2020, the outer areas concession was changed in one fell swoop, and that was a consequence of raising registration costs by 50 per cent in regional areas, including Kangaroo Island, where they had just faced decimating bushfires. It was a cruel and unnecessary decision that made no sense morally or politically.

It came at a time when South Australians were facing high cost-of-living pressures. These pressures have remained but thankfully the Treasurer in the most recent budget, through the guidance of the Premier, reinstated the concession on 1 July 2022, in no small part due to the advocacy and hard work of the member for Mawson, who was tireless in his advocacy for his constituency who saw that cruel cut occur in 2020.

Since then, we have seen a huge uptake with over 9,000 vehicles registered for this relief. This equates to \$600,000 saved by people in Kangaroo Island, Coober Pedy, Roxby Downs and other remote areas.

This initiative is also supporting local small businesses. I was informed by the member for Mawson, a great advocate for regional South Australia, that a trucking company in his electorate would save up to \$70,000 per year on registration costs. I thank the member for Mawson for his continued advocacy on this issue since 2020. He has been a tireless and lone voice, crying out for regional South Australia, when others were missing in action. He made sure that this government reversed those cuts, and regional South Australia thanks him.

Regarding our commitment to make public transport free for Seniors Card holders at all times, a commitment that we delivered as promised on 1 July, we have seen an astonishing uptake in peak trips.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sorry?

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You should ask.

The SPEAKER: The minister won't respond to interjections. The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Since July, around 650,000 trips have been undertaken by Seniors Card holders in morning and afternoon peak. For comparison, in June, we saw about 80,000 Seniors Card holders take peak trips, each trip costing them between \$2 and \$3 depending on whether they had a Metrocard or opted to pay a paper ticket price.

In October, we saw around 160,000 Seniors Card holders take up peak trips at no cost. Initial estimates by my department are that this has saved seniors between \$1.3 million to \$1.9 million so far—money that is back in their pockets. Seniors have talked with their feet in support of this initiative, an initiative that complemented a suite of other initiatives rolled out by the state government in other portfolios by my ministerial colleagues who actually care about cost-of-living pressures faced by South Australians.

So I again thank the member for Mawson for his tireless advocacy on behalf of the island and on behalf of other regional communities—and, indeed, the member for Stuart, which is the reason why he won every single polling booth in Port Augusta and Port Pirie. That was a remarkable event, taking on the then Deputy Premier who is now no longer a member of this house.

MINISTERIAL STAFF EXPENSES

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:42): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. Does the minister stand by the answer to my previous question? With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain, sir.

Leave granted.

Mr COWDREY: Freedom of information documents have revealed that 21 Uber receipts were approved for reimbursement for staff travel outside standard business hours including travel at 10.07pm—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr COWDREY: —11.06pm, 11.36pm and 12.21am.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (14:43): Thank you for the question. I understand all reimbursements are work-related expenses.

MINISTERIAL STAFF EXPENSES

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:43): Supplementary, sir: can the minister outline the exact nature of these out-of-hours trips, including their work purpose? If not, why were they approved?

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (14:43): Thank you very much for the question. All reimbursements were approved under the previous Liberal government. There were no questions asked.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Colton, you have asked the question and the minister is attempting to answer.

The Hon. N.F. COOK: I am not sure where you are going with this, but if you have an allegation you should make it. All of the—

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N.F. COOK: Beg your pardon?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned for a final time. The minister has the call.

The Hon. N.F. COOK: Actually they are signed off under a number of mechanisms—but anyway, irrespective, as to all reimbursements that have occurred, my understanding is absolutely they are work-related expenses in terms of travel.

Many events, as all members would know, go late into the night quite often. In fact, I believe I will be at one very, very late tomorrow night for the Community Service Awards. Any members who have attended those know that they go very late at night. But, as I understand, all expenses have been signed off under the previous Liberal government as work related.

The SPEAKER: There are two members on the opposition side seeking the call. I give the call to the member for Colton.

MINISTERIAL STAFF EXPENSES

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:44): My question is again to the Minister for Human Services. Has the minister or her office ever approved staff expenditure claims for non work-related purposes? With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr COWDREY: *The Advertiser* reported today:

Convicted child abuse offender Ben Waters, a senior parliamentary adviser prior to his arrest, racked up nearly \$6,000 in expenses.

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (14:45): I thank the member for the question. I will leave the other word out. As far as I'm aware, all expenses were made under work-related activity. These expenses also, as I understand, occurred well before any arrest was made.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens!

The Hon. N.F. COOK: So I stand by my answer: all reimbursements are work related. They were made well before any—

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, please be seated. The member for Florey is on three warnings and will, regrettably, need to depart the chamber under 137A, and the member for Unley will join him for the remainder of question time. The minister has the call.

The Hon. N.F. COOK: I will wait until they leave, I think.

The honourable members for Florey and Unley having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. N.F. COOK: As I said before, all expenses have been made under the rules and guidelines of the act, the electoral guidelines and the EB. They were signed off and approved well before anybody was aware of any offences, any arrests. This person, this sick individual, has been tried and convicted. It has gone through a court of law. None of this was in our understanding; we knew nothing about this well before that. If you have other allegations to make in respect of how these expenses have been signed off or used, you should make them.

FRONTIER SOFTWARE CYBERSECURITY INCIDENT

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (14:47): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer provide an update on what steps have been taken to recover costs and ensure the future security of South Australian government employee information?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (14:47): I'm grateful to the member for Playford for asking this question because it's an important question, and I'm also grateful for the opportunity to be able to make a contribution today. It's an historic day. It's not every day a former Premier is set to announce their retirement from the parliament and the commissioning of a by-election, but we look forward to that later this afternoon.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer has the call and will not engage in digression or personal reflection.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Members may recall that on 10 December last year, just after 2 o'clock on the Friday afternoon of that day, the former Liberal government announced publicly that there had been a cyber attack on Frontier Software, the software provider looking after the majority of the South Australian public sector payroll. As it turned out, more than 80,000 current and former state government employees had their personal details illegally accessed.

I provided an update to the house on this issue on 18 May this year, giving clarity on the actions of both the former government, in trying to rush this extraordinary information out late on a Friday afternoon towards the end of the week, but particularly the impact on the affected people, the level of data illegally accessed and the actions of the Department of Treasury and Finance dealing with the issue.

I am pleased to report that all affected employees identified as having suffered a data breach from Frontier have been directly notified now and they have had assistance provided to them. The Department of Treasury and Finance has also worked with key third parties, including the Australian Taxation Office and Super SA to mitigate the resultant identity risks.

As of Monday this week, agreement was reached with Frontier Software on a compensation amount of approximately \$1.75 million to the state government from Frontier. This compensation is in recognition of the ongoing consequences and impacts of the cybersecurity incident in late 2021. It also includes the recovery of direct third-party costs incurred by the department in responding to the cyber incident in the previous financial year.

Some of this amount will be received by the state in a lump sum before the end of the calendar year, and the rest will be progressively recouped contractually through reduction in fees charged by Frontier for the provision of payroll software and services until 30 June 2024.

I am pleased to report that, since November, Frontier has made significant investment in improving its cybersecurity capability, over the last 12 months. This is including implementing 15 improvement recommendations made by CyberCX, which was engaged by Frontier in an advisory capacity following the incident.

The Department of Treasury and Finance is also working closely with Frontier to implement a number of other cybersecurity enhancements recommended by PricewaterhouseCoopers following the independent review into the data breach. These enhancements can be summarised as the eight key recommendations made by PwC requiring action by Frontier.

It is important for me to report that five of these recommendations have been addressed, including the secure deletion of all South Australian government personal information previously held on Frontier's corporate network. It is important to remind the house that this was a breach of Frontier's network not a breach of the South Australian government's payroll systems. The three remaining recommendations are expected to be resolved by the end of this calendar year.

Importantly, there are still no confirmed cases of any impacted individual suffering the consequences of identity theft or fraud as a consequence of this 2021 cyber incident.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:52): My question is to the Premier. Has any child received a rapid welfare check since 9 November and, if so, how many?

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) (14:52): I thank the member for the question. Can I also say in relation to that question, thank you to SAPOL, the Department for Child Protection and the Department of Human Services and other departments that are working very, very closely and in a very coordinated way to ensure that those checks are conducted.

I am advised that as of 29 November, 37 per cent of the assessments have been completed. Of those that are not complete, another 13 per cent are underway. SAPOL continues to do an outstanding job coordinating the effort, and all agencies are certainly working very, very closely together to progress those assessments.

Of the visits that have been entirely completed—the 37 per cent I spoke about—there have been a variety of intervention pathways depending on the circumstances and the particular context for that family. As we have spoken about in this place before, a number of families deal with very complex and deeply interconnected issues. Often families grapple with intergenerational trauma, with poverty, with domestic violence, with substance misuse and with mental ill-health. So, depending on the particular circumstances for any of those families, a variety of intervention pathways have been pursued.

Where an intensive family preservation service is involved, such a service has continued to work with the family to address any ongoing concerns. For other children, family group conferencing may have been initiated and safety plans may have been implemented—again, depending on the circumstances of the particular family—and, of course, referrals to other appropriate services may

have been made. Of course, ongoing DCP assessment continues for those particular families, again, taking account of their particular circumstance.

As the shadow minister and the member would appreciate, we cannot provide details about the outcomes of those assessments for individual children; it would be inappropriate to do so. Certainly, I am very pleased to provide that update, that report.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:55): Supplementary, in light of the minister's answer: of that 37 per cent, how many are new to the department and how many of them have already had previous contact?

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) (14:55): As I said, I am not going to go into the details of individual families or individual children, but what I can say again is that in that 37 per cent figure, as at 29 November—and I am receiving very regular updates; I have sought those updates on an extremely regular basis—37 per cent of the assessments have been completed in their entirety across the entire group of families. Of course, as we have spoken about publicly before, a number of those children and families were in the purview of the department.

SA WATER

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water. Can the minister update the house about the South Australian branch of the Australian Water Association's Organisational Excellence Award, and will she publicly congratulate the winner? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: On 18 November, the Australian Water Association posted on their LinkedIn page that SA Water took out the Organisational Excellence Award that night for the activating of South Australia's reservoir reserves for recreation, and I quote:

Underpinned by the best-available science and supported by leading-edge technologies, opening South Australian reservoir reserves for recreational access has proven that drinking water utilities can play an even broader role supporting the health, sustainability, and prosperity of our community.

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) (14:57): I am struggling to see quite what the question was there, but SA Water is a very fine institution and I am always happy to congratulate them on their work.

ELECTION COMMITMENTS

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Trade and Investment. Has the delivery of the government's election commitments garnered any positive international attention?

The SPEAKER: That is a very broad question.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Planning) (14:58): Thanks to the member for Elizabeth for his question. Of course, he would have witnessed the great damage done by the previous government in June 2019 when they abolished funding for Brand SA.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, please be seated. I anticipate that the point of order will be 98.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Yes, sir, standing order 98. The minister may be new, he may be arrogant, but he's got to obey the standing orders.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Morialta, you, too, must refrain from personal reflections. The minister has the call. I remind the minister that he must respond to the substance of the question.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I was just trying to give a bit of context to the fact that this government is bringing back Brand SA. Of course, Brand SA was backed by 8,000 registered businesses. They all wanted to participate in Brand SA. Of course, the previous government, led by Banquo's ghost up the back there, abolished the funding for that. Why was Brand SA backed by South Australian business? Because it involved pride in SA, investment in SA, jobs in SA, consumer support for business in SA. Why would any government known to man back out of such a thing? Why would you defund such a fine institution? Of course, that's why we made an election commitment to bring Brand SA back.

Mr Patterson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morphett!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: That's why we have invested \$6 million—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: —in our first budget to bring back Brand SA.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morphett!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: That's why the department has recently—

Mr Patterson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett is called to order and warned.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: —appointed Jessica Douglas. It's good to see I've charged him up. He hasn't made a noise up until now.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: That's why the department has recently appointed Jessica Douglas as manager for Brand SA. Ms Douglas' first task will be to rebuild this very fine institution. Her previous role was with the University of Adelaide and involved leading the Make History campaign. I am really confident that Ms Douglas and the department actually have the experience and skills to rebuild what is a very fine institution.

We have recently seen the Brand SA logo make international headlines when it was on the back of the 36ers' shorts as they made history by beating an NBA team, a historic victory, beating the Suns in Phoenix, Arizona. That's a really, really important initiative by Brand SA. It was a really important moment for South Australia.

We are working with the department to bring back a Brand SA advisory board. I look forward in the future to being able to announce the members of that board. That new board will be about liaising with industry, bringing additional expertise to Brand SA to elevate our state's produce and encourage South Australians, along with everybody else across the globe, to back our products, to choose SA, to back Brand SA and to promote exports. We have also established Invest SA—another election commitment fulfilled.

Mr Patterson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett knows better.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: We never hear from the member opposite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: —but I've got his attention now. The department has recently appointed Mr Chris Wood—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, please be seated. Member for Morphett, your contributions are contrary to the standing orders; however, it being the last sitting day, I am not going to exercise 137A. The minister has the call.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: It's the first time ever that an opposition has criticised a government for meeting its commitments, for meeting its election commitments, and in our first year. Like all my colleagues—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: —this is a government that—

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Flinders!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: —does what it says: bringing back the race, bringing back confidence—

Mr Patterson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett knows better.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: —bringing back economic growth, bringing back Brand SA—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: —bringing back Invest SA. That's what we are all about: promoting the state.

The SPEAKER: The member for Flinders is warned. He well knows the standing orders. He certainly does after yesterday. The leader has the call.

MYPONGA RESERVOIR

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water. Did the minister axe \$1 million in funding from the CABN accommodation nature-based tourism project in the Myponga Reservoir Reserve and, if so, why? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: On 30 January 2022, the previous Liberal government announced a \$1 million grant for the CABN project for a range of cabins, tours and experiences around the Myponga Reservoir Reserve that would transform the region for visitors and surrounding businesses. The opposition has been aware that the grant money was withdrawn and that this project is unable to go ahead.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Mawson! The leader is called to order. Member for Cheltenham! The leader is called to order and warned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members, this is not an episode of *Summer Heights High*. There are 10 minutes remaining. It is, it would appear, the last question time of the year. There's a good deal of vigour in the room. The Deputy Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (15:03): The brief answer for me to be able to give would be no, but in the spirit of generosity, and I know how concerned the leader is about anything that touches anything to do with what he regards as his legacy, I will give a more fulsome answer.

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

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

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The funding was not axed by me. The funding sat, indeed, under the PIRSA account for funding such projects. What happened was that the SA Water Board received the application in more detail from the organisation that wanted to have overnight accommodation in a reservoir area in land that is planted by ForestrySA. The SA Water Board determined that they weren't satisfied that the water security measures the company were proposing were sufficient and therefore declined to support it.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES RECIDIVISM TARGET

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:04): My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Can the minister inform the house about the Department for Correctional Services' new recidivism target?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:05): I certainly can, and I thank member for her question and note her strong interest in this matter. In informing the house today of this government's new recidivism target, I note the strong foundations set by the 10by20 target. The 10by20 target was launched by the then correctional services minister, who just happens to now be the Premier, someone I commend personally for his strong commitment to reducing offending in South Australia and his longstanding commitment to rehabilitation and therapy not only to reduce offending but to make our communities safer.

When this was launched in 2016, the 10by20 strategy was addressing then high rates of reoffending. At that stage, the reoffending rate in South Australia was 46.1 per cent. That was used as a baseline measure, which led to a target of 10 per cent reduction. That 10 per cent reduction would, if met, mean a reduction in a reoffending rate of 41.4 per cent. Of course, setting a target is one thing but delivering on it is another, and the strategy and methodology behind doing so are to be commended.

It is the work of not only the former Minister for Correctional Services but also the Department for Correctional Services themselves. I note that, notwithstanding the cuts made to the Department for Correctional Services by the former government, there has been excellent work undertaken throughout the dark ages and the dark period of the former government to continue to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: —implement these services. No amount—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: No amount of privatisation of our prisons could stop the commitment that this state had towards reducing reoffending. To strategically—

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am enjoying the member for Hartley's interjections, sir.

The SPEAKER: That may be, but you won't respond to them.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: No, certainly not, sir. Not only was this target ambitious but it was one that we were firmly committed to delivering. I can very proudly inform the house today that not only was this target of reducing reoffending by 10 per cent met but we exceeded the target by 50 per cent. South Australia now has—and it is something we should all be very proud of—the lowest rate of reoffending in the nation.

This success is a reflection of the programs that achieve this at scale, evidence-based programs that were firmly dedicated towards reducing offending and equipping prisoners—those who found themselves in custody—with the skills necessary to do basic things: find a job, integrate into the community and fundamentally return and give back to the community that they had offended against.

It is with great pride that I can inform this house that that target alone was not enough. Just last week, the government announced a new target to reduce offending by 20 per cent by 2026. We simply won't rest on being the best in the nation. We will maintain being the best in the nation because if we reduce offending we get better communities and more people giving back to it.

WHALERS WAY ORBITAL LAUNCH COMPLEX

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (15:09): My question is to the Minister for Defence and Space Industries and Minister for Climate, Environment and Water. Does the minister support the Southern Launch Whalers Way Orbital Launch Complex facility? With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PATTERSON: On 4 November 2020, the now Minister for Defence and Space Industries said, and I quote:

I have serious concerns about the impact of this development on rare species and valuable habitat, and the risks it may pose for fire and damage to adjacent marine life.

I urge the government to consider alternative locations which do not involve compromising environmental values and overriding existing protections.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (15:09): I thank the member for his question. I remain of the same view. I am not a decision-maker, I would point out. The Minister for Planning will be making a decision about whether or not that development is approved, but both as shadow minister and as—

Mr Patterson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Am I not answering the question sufficiently clearly for you?

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Both as shadow minister and as Minister for Climate, Environment and Water and also for Defence and Space Industries, I remain concerned that every development that's undertaken in South Australia is done so in a way that is as environmentally sustainable as possible.

It is, in my view, regrettable that there is a proposal to have a launch site which is adjacent to where osprey are known to nest and where there is a heritage agreement over the native vegetation. I have raised those questions and I have said those to the company as well. That doesn't mean that I am not supportive of having a launch site, and I also recognise that I am not the decision-maker.

SMALL AND FAMILY BUSINESS

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:11): My question is to the Minister for Small and Family Business. Can the minister provide an update on the government's achievements relevant to her portfolio of small and family business.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (15:11): I am pleased to be able to answer the last question of the year—potentially. I want to thank the member for Light for his question and thank him for his support for his local business community. It was a pleasure to be out there earlier this year in Gawler speaking to businesses in the area, listening to what they want from the Labor Malinauskas government.

From the feedback I have received not only then but in various other conversations, what I am hearing is that the business community is pleased that we are actually taking action in this space. I contrast the actions of the past government, who have clearly ignored the needs of small business. What we learnt through COVID, the bushfire and now—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The minister is out of order on standing order 98.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: What we have learnt through COVID, the bushfires and now what we are seeing in the Riverland is that government does play an important role in supporting small businesses when times are tough. That's why the Premier committed to creating a small and family business portfolio. I think it was genuinely a portfolio that was sorely missed in the last government. It's not my intention to put government in the way of small business but for government to walk side by side and provide a hand to assist smoothing the way forward.

We came into government with small business struggling, particularly in certain sectors, and we have done a lot to help improve those areas. We have not only established the portfolio, but we also took this further by establishing the Office for Small and Family Business, which has been well received by small business owners. As I have previously said in this place, it's a one-stop shop for South Australian businesses to find easy access to information and support from across government.

The Office for Small and Family Business is collaborating with service providers to create an ever-evolving suite of resources and programs that are accessible and relevant to small and family business owners across all industries and, of course, across the regions. The effectiveness of that new office is on full display at the moment, with residents and business owners along the River Murray at risk of rising water levels. There are Office for Small and Family Business representatives at the relief centres assisting local business owners as we speak.

The Malinauskas government was quick to respond to the needs of small business in the Riverland. The Premier and the rest of cabinet have been on the ground, and I will be heading out there tomorrow. We quickly put a package together to assist small businesses. Many of those small businesses have already been affected and there are many that will be affected in the coming weeks. The Business Early Closure Grants have already opened, and there are a number of businesses that have had their applications already approved.

The Business Early Closure Grants provide up to \$20,000 for employing businesses and \$10,000 for non-employing businesses. As of last night, I know that the Office for Small and Family Business spoke to at least eight businesses to let them know that their grants had been processed and approved. My heart goes out to these businesses, and I am looking forward to doing everything we can to help them rebound from the hardship that they are going to face over the coming weeks and months.

The businesses that have had their Business Early Closure grants approved are also being spoken to about a number of other measures, including the generator grant, which is another key

part of our assistance package, subsidising the purchase of generators for businesses for up to \$4,000. They are just two of the grants available. A financial counselling support package is also being implemented at the moment as quickly as we possibly can. At each step, the Office for Small and Family Business, which we established earlier this year, has provided and will continue to provide support and advice to impacted businesses.

Grievance Debate

BIRDWOOD AMBULANCE STATION

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:15): On Saturday 19 November, something very exciting happened in Birdwood, in my electorate of Schubert. It was a day of enormous pride for my community, and it was a day of enormous pride for so many who had worked so hard for so long.

The community gathered on the outskirts of Birdwood in the Main Street to celebrate the official opening of the South Australian Ambulance Service Birdwood station—Birdwood's first ever purpose-built SA Ambulance station. It is a modern facility that represents a \$2.2 million investment injection into our community, into our region, and it delivers a new ambulance base to really support the Adelaide Hills community during their time of need and during those desperate periods when they need to call an ambulance.

Not only is this about supporting our local community when they need urgent care but it is about ensuring that our hardworking and dedicated ambulance crews have the first-class facility that they deserve. That is exactly what this investment is all about. It is a bigger station with capacity to hold over more than 50 volunteer ambulance staff and three vehicles. It has sleeping spaces and training spaces, and the volunteers and our local community could not be more excited.

We know through many of the volunteer ambulance paramedics in our community that demand in the Adelaide Hills for this emergency service has absolutely soared over not only the last couple of years with COVID but the last two decades. So this investment is absolutely critical, and I genuinely believe that this is a positive but small step forward towards really alleviating some of the ramping pressure that we are seeing in metropolitan Adelaide.

This is an initiative of the former Liberal government of course, and an initiative that I was so pleased to be talking about throughout the election campaign and one that I am so pleased can be delivered for my local community. It is not just me who was proud and excited about this investment, Mr Speaker. I note that you, too, were very pleased with this fantastic investment and this initiative of the former Liberal government.

I spoke to local paramedics on the day, including volunteer paramedics Amy and Lyndsey Martin. Not only is Lyndsey the principal at the Gumeracha Primary School but she also spends so much of her time throughout the week volunteering as a paramedic. I think that is absolutely outstanding and what community service is all about. I spoke to people like Chris and Vickie, who is the volunteer team leader in the local area, and they are absolutely ecstatic that this investment has finally come on board.

Of course, it does mean that the Mount Pleasant Ambulance Station, which was small, downgraded and not in good condition, has now closed but they have moved to a much bigger and better facility that I genuinely believe will provide fantastic care for the people of my electorate. The significance of this really cannot be understated.

It is particularly important, given the fact that we have the emergency departments that are closed in two of my local hospitals—not only in Gumeracha but also in Mount Pleasant. I feel that this will be an added level of assurance for my local community that, when they need help, someone will be there, hopefully in a timely manner, to get them where they need to go.

We know, of course, that health care was one of the most critical elements of the state election campaign and we will absolutely keep holding this new government to account for the promises they made to the people of South Australia—their promise to fix ramping in our state and their promise to ensure that South Australians have better access to health services.

What we know though is that, when we look back over the track record of the government so far, unfortunately they are presiding over the worst ramping results in South Australia's history.

They are delaying critical health infrastructure right across the board, from the city to the country, for places like the Lyell McEwin Hospital. Their ED expansion has been pushed off into the slow lane. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital stage 3 upgrade has been pushed off into the slow lane and so too has the Flinders Medical Centre upgrade. There are many more that I could name, but I am so pleased that we have seen the Birdwood Ambulance Station delivered.

In closing, it was a fantastic day. I would like to sincerely thank all the volunteers in the South Australian Ambulance Service who were involved in pulling this fantastic day together. I am sure that this will be a wonderful investment for many generations to come.

Ministerial Statement

APPOINTMENT OF INSPECTOR UNDER THE ICAC ACT

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (15:21): I table a ministerial statement made by the Attorney-General in the other place.

Grievance Debate

FISHER, MS E.M.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:21): I rise today to speak about the life of a South Australian trailblazer who committed herself across her entire lifetime to secure and advance the rights of women and girls in our state. Elizabeth 'Betty' Mary Fisher AM sadly passed away on 23 November 2022 leaving a remarkable legacy that will continue to inspire girls and women and indeed all people for a very long time to come.

On behalf of our government, I pass on our sincere condolences to Betty's friends, family and all who loved her. In offering love and condolences, I also recognise a number of people who were both inspiring to and inspired by Betty, people who absolutely loved and respected her: former member of this place, the Hon. Steph Key; the member for Badcoe, who I understand will also pay tribute to Betty in this place; and many, many others. As they and all who connected with Betty knew, Betty was a person of remarkable strength, integrity and commitment to further the many causes that could make a difference in people's lives, causes where she saw the need to raise her voice and raise her voice she certainly did.

Betty Fisher was born on 8 September 1925 in Yorkshire and arrived in South Australia in 1927 on the SS *Benalla*. For Betty's entire life, she was a proud and outspoken feminist and advocate for the rights and recognition of women and girls, Aboriginal rights and environmental conservation. In each of these passions, Betty lived the mantra of doing everything she could in the time she had to further these causes and she did so with peace, kindness and determination.

Betty thrived in encouraging future generations to continue this work and, encouraged by Betty's incredible commitment, determination and hard work, many of us in here and many beyond will indeed continue that work and continue to find our voices and empower the voices of others strong in the knowledge that we stand on Betty's shoulders, a giant of relentless advocacy for fairness and equality.

Serving as the very first woman president of the Conservation Council of South Australia, Betty was such a strong advocate for our state's environment and for preserving it for future generations. Later in life, this passion and ongoing work for conservation earned her the Lifetime Achievement Award in the South Australian Environment Awards.

Betty led the way as a foundation member of the Women's Electoral Lobby South Australia and was the original newsletter editor for the Women's Electoral Lobby here in SA. Her passion for championing the breaking down of any barriers for women and girls was central to all that Betty contributed to and was equal to her passion for showcasing the achievements of girls and women.

Betty was a member of the Women's Suffrage Centenary Committee and for eight years diligently served as the International Women's Day Committee President. The International Women's Day Committee, authored by Betty, released a women's roll of honour to acknowledge and celebrate the achievements of over 2,000 South Australian women. This role is a perfect representation of Betty's ongoing work to publicly acknowledge the role of women in our community.

Betty was the first woman to become Printing and Kindred Industries Union delegate to the South Australian Trades and Labour Council. Prior to this service, she was delegate for the South Australian Railways Union. Amongst these and many other roles, Betty was involved with the National Fitness Council of South Australia and was the secretary for the Women's Creative Arts and Crafts Groups.

As recognition for her work and passion, Betty received both a Bicentenary Medal and Flinders University Medal for services to women. Betty received Netball South Australia life membership and life membership of the Australian Labor Party (South Australia Branch). Betty's advocacy for Aboriginal rights and the environment came into the spotlight during the Hindmarsh Island royal commission where she produced notes from the 1960s in support of secret women's business.

Thank you, Betty, for your remarkable lifelong dedication to advancing the interests of others and the sustainability of our environment. You will continue to be a shining light to so many of us and will continue to strengthen our words, our action and our resolve. Vale, Betty. May you rest in peace.

BLACK ELECTORATE

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (15:26): It is a great pleasure to rise today to talk for a moment at the end of the parliamentary sitting year about the electorate that I represent. I have the incredibly privileged position of Leader of the Liberal Party in South Australia, but first and foremost I am only a member of this place because a community elects me to represent them, like all 47 members of the House of Assembly.

It is a community that means a huge amount to me. It is a community that I have lived in for the last 20 years and one day, and it is a community that I feel a great sense of gratitude towards. It is a community that has welcomed me and my family, that has given us great opportunity and inspired us to contribute towards that community and certainly has inspired me to first run for council and then enter this place in 2014.

But a community is only as good as the people who come together in various groups and organisations—sometimes as individuals, sometimes as family, sometimes as groups of like-minded people, sometimes as groups of people who are not like-minded—to contribute to the fabric of what makes our streets, our suburbs, our neighbourhoods, our localities, our towns and cities that make up this state great. In the case of my electorate, I want to highlight some of those organisations that I really connect with on a regular basis and think are ultimately a key part of the fabric of what makes that part of the coastline of the southern suburbs that I represent so great.

Take our public schools. I am a product of public education and I cannot speak highly enough of what our public schools contribute to our community, whether it is Hallett Cove R-12 School, a school that I have so much to do with and the principal there, Tony Hall and his team. They reach out to the community constantly, engage with it and create opportunities for the community to be part of that school and for the school to be part of the community.

Hallett Cove South and Hallett Cove East schools, Seacliff Primary School, Seaview Downs Primary School, Sheidow Park Primary School and Woodend Primary School are great public schools within the boundaries of the electorate that I represent that are doing so much for our young people—educating them and creating opportunities for parents, caregivers and community members to be involved along the way.

There is the Lions Club of Hallett Cove, just a phenomenal group that raises over \$50,000 a year from its shed on Quailo Avenue in Hallett Cove and continues to hand money back to good causes within the community. To Jill Kimber, the president this year, and to other members—including Jill's husband, Tom—and others like Rocky Stone and well-known Hallett Cove identity

Graeme Botting: thank you for the contribution you make through the Lions Club to our community. I have just mentioned a few names, but there are so many more that I could run through.

The Seacliff Surf Life Saving Club was club of the year 2022, backing up club of the year 2021, which they were awarded as well. Jacinta Day and her team at that club do so much to keep Seacliff beach safe and also to build a sense of community in that part of the world. Thank you to Seacliff Surf Life Saving Club for all you do and thanks for keeping our beaches safe as we go into that busy time of year over the holidays.

There are many other organisations I could refer to in the short period of time I have today. I want to thank our Friends groups who look after our national parks: Friends of O'Halloran Hill, Friends of Glenthorne, Friends of the Lower Field River, Friends of the Upper Field River, Friends of Hallett Cove Conservation Park and Friends of Marino Conservation Park, active groups supporting our National Parks and Wildlife Service, and local councils in some cases as well, to nurture and invest in our natural world.

The Marino Residents Association and the Marino Community Hall board of management, which keeps that vital community asset up and running; the Marino Rocks Social, a new organisation which has saved Marino Rocks cafe restaurant and created lots of opportunity for the community to get involved there; and the many sporting clubs that so many people are involved with as well—these organisations are what make my community tick. At the end of this parliamentary year, as we come up to Christmas I want to thank them for what they do and wish each and every one of their members a very merry Christmas.

FISHER, MS E.M.

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:31): Betty Fisher was such a giant among us she deserves two speeches today. Betty Fisher AM described herself as a feminist, an environmentalist, a trade unionist and a socialist. To me, Betty was a friend, a supporter, a constituent, a Labor sub-branch member, a role model and an inspiration. But the truth is that Betty was so many things to so many people across a century.

As her local MP, I was so grateful to have Betty's support at the most recent election. Undoubtedly among the pages of generous endorsements from local people in my community in my election flyer, Betty's face and kind words meant the most to me. Why? Because she was a person I deeply respected. She was a fierce fighter who stood by her beliefs and spoke out for those who could not. She epitomises what it is to be an active and engaged citizen. Betty showed a strength of character and conviction on so many progressive causes that was quite rare in its intensity and its duration.

For many years, up until her passing last Wednesday, Betty was a resident of Bucklands Residential Care at Plympton. It was a place she loved. She loved the Boral Wing, the residents and the staff who cared for her, and she enjoyed frequent visitors too. Betty was particularly happy that many of the workers in her wing are proud members of their union.

Betty was a feminist to her core, fiercely dedicated to women's empowerment in word and deed. She fought for women and she supported women. Betty was an activist and leader in the women's lib movement and never ceased her passion for women's equality, whether that was supporting women into parliament—like Steph Key and myself—or arguing for the basic rights and freedoms that all women deserve.

The Women's Electoral Lobby this year celebrated its 50th anniversary. Betty was there right at the start of WEL and remained a supporter and inspiration to others at WEL throughout her life. Betty served as an International Women's Day president for eight years and received a Flinders University Medal for services to women. In 2001, as an author Betty chronicled the achievements of over 2,000 South Australian change-making women in conjunction with the International Women's Day committee.

Betty was a big fan of Australia becoming a republic, but she also had a huge respect for Queen Elizabeth II. Betty lived to see the Queen's entire reign and the Queen's entire life, as Betty was born just a year earlier. Sadly, a republic has not yet materialised.

Betty was a proud Port supporter—go Port!—and if it is possible she became an even greater fan when they formed a women's team. Way back in 1925, I wonder whether a young Betty might have even imagined how much change there would be for women in sport, and I am so glad that she got to see the women of Port take the field.

Betty was an ally and an advocate for Aboriginal people. Her advocacy for Aboriginal people came into the spotlight during the 1995 Hindmarsh Island Royal Commission where she produced notes and tape recordings from the 1960s, which confirmed secret women's business. Those recordings had been entrusted to her care decades earlier by Aboriginal people who knew their worth and knew Betty's trustworthiness and integrity.

Betty was well known as an environmentalist. She was the first woman president of the Conservation Council of SA in the 1970s and was later inducted into its Hall of Fame. Conservation Council chief executive, Craig Wilkins, said last week:

Betty Fisher was a pioneer..[her] contribution to the protection of our environment cannot be overstated...Her remarkable legacy will endure long into the future.

At so many junctures in this speech I could have mentioned one more very important person in Betty's life, but I have saved the best for last. Steph Key, herself a feminist, environmentalist and unionist, was a valuable supporter and protector to Betty and a loyal friend, and that continues today as she works with Betty's family to ensure her fitting farewell.

I want to take this chance to thank Steph for the incredible and enduring friendship that she has shared with Betty and for all that she has done to assist Betty in her senior years. Everyone should be so lucky to have a friend like Steph, especially in their more vulnerable years. I also thank Steph for her assistance in preparing this address today.

For all Betty's activism and advocacy there was a driving factor: the welfare of others, including those close to her. Betty adored her many friends and family and in turn was loved deeply by them. She was particularly proud of her nephews and nieces, great nephews and nieces, daughters-in-law, Tanya and Beth, and three grandchildren, Patrick, Georgia and Evie. Our hearts are with them at this sad time.

Betty was a Labor woman through and through and truly beat a path for those of us here lucky enough to follow. A giant of a person, Betty's absence leaves a hole in our community and in our hearts, but there is no doubt that every day of her life improved our world for the better. Thank you, Betty.

WALTERS, MS E.M.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (15:36): Today, I rise to speak about an incredibly strong woman, a survivor of domestic violence. Her name is Emma Walters. She is the estranged wife of militant CFMEU leader, John Setka, a man with a shocking history when it comes to the treatment of women who was in fact convicted of harassing Emma, with a magistrate slamming him as 'misogynistic and nasty'. John Setka is not a man we should be looking up to, yet he is hard to miss in Adelaide at the moment, with a huge photo of him emblazoned across a government-owned tram as part of an CFMEU advertising campaign.

Emma Walters fled Victoria with her two children to South Australia, where she grew up, to seek refuge and to get further away from the man who had caused her so much pain and anguish. She told us that when she first learnt that her perpetrator's picture had been blown up and splashed all over the side of a tram she immediately felt a sense of complete despair and was overwhelmed with abject fear. She does not have a car and relies on public transport for herself and her children but says that she will not now.

Emma has a nationally recognised intervention order to protect her from her ex-husband, but right now she feels as though the government is not protecting her. She is a survivor of domestic violence. She wants to know why the Premier and his Labor government are, instead, embracing and defending John Setka. Emma knows this man better than most and believes that this ad was designed to intimidate her in a city where she is trying to create a safe, happy life for herself and her children.

She says that John Setka will stop at nothing to traumatise her and now, because of this ad, she does not feel safe. The transport minister has admitted that this kind of advertising by the CFMEU is prohibited on our trams but, despite this, the Premier is refusing to take it down. Emma says that this shows that they have no consideration for the emotional and psychological damage this has on a victim. She told us, and I quote:

This is a government supporting a very powerful man with significant resources behind him—CFMEU funds, members' money—to unlawfully intimidate the victims and the government is condoning it.

These are not my words: these are the words of Emma Walters. The Premier handed back a \$125,000 donation from John Setka's CFMEU because of their inappropriate behaviour and the public backlash, but now it seems the Premier has no worries that the CFMEU is spending its unexpected windfall aggressively promoting John Setka across Adelaide with paid advertising. It really is disgraceful.

Emma believes in freedom of speech but says a giant poster of John Setka goes against the principles of unionism and the union, as unions should be about its members not one power-hungry man. We asked Emma what she would say to the Premier if she could stand here and speak in this chamber today. She said that she would ask him if he acknowledges the impact this is having on her as a victim and her family, that she would ask him what steps he is going to take to make sure victims of domestic and family violence feel protected by this government and that she would urge him to take all necessary steps to remove this poster from the government-owned tram.

Our government is not meant to participate in instilling fear in victims of domestic violence. Premier, do the right thing: tear these distressing ads down from government-owned infrastructure and make sure something like this never, ever happens again. Premier, it takes a man to stand up to a man to stop domestic violence.

WOMEN IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (15:40): I rise to pay tribute to three extraordinary women who not only played a significant role in the recent local government elections but also shone a guiding light on my path into this chamber—namely, our new Lord Mayor, the Hon. Dr Jane Lomax-Smith; Mayor of the City of Salisbury, Gillian Aldridge OAM; and Ann Ferguson OAM, the former Mayor of Mount Barker. All have been trailblazers in local government for decades and extremely supportive of young people, which at one point in my life included me. I have much to be grateful for for all that they are, and I hope these short words go some way in showing my appreciation.

I will begin with the new Lord Mayor or Jane, as so many of us know her. In 2008, with no job and after a dedicated and maybe misguided stint as the ALP's Mayo campaign manager, Jane took me on as her adviser for school infrastructure and for the City of Adelaide. For two years, she showed me the ropes, made me laugh and impressed me with her compassion to constituents and commitment to key issues like heritage and Parklands preservation.

Along the way, she achieved so much good, including the return of the Thebarton SA Water depot to Parklands, six new schools under Education Works, the new SACE and the Trade Schools for the Future program. Her time in parliament was cut short, but for someone with so much fire in her belly the results show something that I have always known: that she has so much more to give. While Jane would never expect you to agree with her all the time, this never mattered. As so many of us know, she always gives 110 per cent as a fierce advocate for her community. For this, I could not be happier that Jane, version 2.0, is back.

Also returned, as Mayor of the City of Salisbury, is Gillian Aldridge OAM. While I have not had the pleasure of knowing her for as long, her recent support for me and commitment to getting the best for community have been appreciated. For me, 1988 was a momentous year. As an eight year old, I remember the Bicentenary and being invested as a Cub Scout. Unbeknown to me at the time, it coincided with Gillian first being elected to council. Her level of service to the north is second to none, having served as Deputy Mayor to Tony Zappia from 2000 before an unbroken and ongoing run as mayor since 2008.

Always lovingly supported by her husband, Robin, and family, Gillian's tenure has seen significant change in Salisbury. This has included the attraction of widespread major investments,

while also enshrining our community as a progressive multicultural beacon for others to follow. It is no surprise that her service has been deservedly recognised with an OAM.

Also a very worthy recipient of the same accolade is the amazing Ann Ferguson, and I am pleased that she was my guest today in the chamber. I have known Ann since 2006, when I stood to be a councillor in Mount Barker and when she first became the district's mayor. She forgave me for naively backing the wrong mayoral candidate and we have been friends ever since.

It was in 2010 that I mounted my first tilt at state politics as the then Labor candidate for Kavel. Ann never played partisan politics; it just mattered to her that candidates were working hard to ensure that her community was heard. For that, I was extremely grateful, and looking back I really appreciate the numerous speaking opportunities, briefings, introductions and events that she afforded to me as a new candidate. Knowing the welfare of council staff was front and centre of her priorities, she can be proud of shifting them out of the old chambers, which they had long outgrown.

Ann showed that you never stopped being a nurse and that desire to care is always there. Her fight to get the best for her community is well documented and, while Labor governments were at times in her sights, she was always fair, constructive and stuck to her guns.

With friends on both sides of politics, Ann played the bipartisan card beautifully. I know that the current members for Kavel and Flinders speak very fondly of her. Truly independent, we will miss the flair, smiles and common sense she brought to the role as mayor. I end by reiterating my thanks and appreciation for all that she has achieved.

The SPEAKER: I am also particularly grateful to Ann Ferguson for her service to our community.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (15:45): I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 7 February 2023 at 11am.

Motion carried.

Bills

LIVESTOCK (EMERGENCY ANIMAL DISEASE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (15:46): I am very pleased to speak to the Livestock (Emergency Animal Disease) Amendment Bill 2022. Biosecurity affects the industries that keep our state's economy moving and is a responsibility shared by government, industry and community. As members would be aware, emergency animal diseases and the threats posed by them have increased for Australia in recent months and years and preparedness activities continue to ensure that South Australia is well placed to respond.

We know that an incursion of foot and mouth into Australia would potentially result in over \$80 billion in estimated revenue losses to the industry over a 10-year period and that does not include second-hand impacts that we would see around regional towns and cities that would arguably be hit hardest. Not only would this affect the agriculture industries but it would have significant ramifications on regional towns and cities in many other ways. Agriculture is at the heart and soul of every country town in our state and these amendments are designed to further protect this critical industry.

The Livestock (Emergency Animal Disease) Amendment Bill will build on the state's preparedness for an emergency animal disease incursion by strengthening powers within the Livestock Act to support a comprehensive, rapid and effective emergency response. The Livestock Act contains provisions required to control or eradicate livestock diseases. These provisions are utilised regularly for the control or eradication of notifiable endemic animal diseases such as footrot

in sheep. However, the current measures need strengthening to ensure the speed of implementation and to enable any response to be agile in the event of an emergency animal disease incursion.

It is also important that powers can be exercised without unnecessary administrative burden, given the likely duration of such a response if an incursion does occur. It is important that the appropriate authorities have the ability to act and respond as quickly as possible. Ensuring that all required provisions are encompassed within the Livestock Act will assist South Australia to provide an effective and efficient response. Given the increased risk and catastrophic consequences of some emergency animal diseases, the amendments in the bill are critical to ensure South Australia is ready to respond quickly.

Even a small, isolated emergency animal disease outbreak could have a significant short to medium-term impact on trade. For example, a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak would immediately threaten South Australia's export of livestock products, which were worth \$954 million in 2020-21, and also impact \$1.3 million worth of interstate trade. A loss of export markets would also impact domestic prices for meat and meat-related products.

As I mentioned earlier, it is estimated that a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak could cost Australia \$80 billion over 10 years, which would have catastrophic consequences for our state. The effects of an emergency animal disease incursion would be felt beyond the affected livestock and trade impacts, with long-lasting wider impacts on human health and wellbeing, tourism and education, with regional communities being the most vulnerable. This is yet another reason why we, as a government, must do everything we can to prevent a potential animal-related disease coming into our country.

The amendments include provisions to improve the timeliness and effectiveness of an emergency response and to improve clarity and enhance powers, noting that the nature of an emergency response can be difficult to predict. The amendments will allow notices to be published on a website and come into force prior to their publication in the *Gazette*, enabling a more timely and swift response.

The amendments provide the ability to limit the application of a notice to a specified class of persons, a specified class of livestock, livestock products or other property or specified circumstances. They also exempt a person or a class of persons from any requirement imposed by notice and allow for conditions to be imposed on any requirement specified by the notice. Provisions to enable inspectors to take action have been proposed to be amended to ensure that required emergency response measures can be undertaken quickly to minimise impacts on the state's livestock industries and economy. This will provide inspectors with the ability to take a required action where a person fails to comply with a notice or order in a specified or reasonable time frame.

Another amendment addresses the impacts on any native animals as part of the required emergency response. The amendments provide flexibility on when consultation with the relevant minister is required. Amendments to address the potential for conflicts between the Livestock Act and other acts have also been considered. Except for the Emergency Management Act 2004, the Livestock Act 1997 will prevail over other acts to enable effective action. Government agencies will still be able to exercise powers under another act if they comply with the emergency response measures put in place under the Livestock Act—for example, restrictions on movements, property entry requirements or decontamination procedures.

The amendments provide for the ability to prescribe the kind of property for which an inspector may issue an order, take action or cause action to be taken for the destruction, demolition or disposal of the property. Some amendments address identified gaps in current powers that will support emergency response efforts. Where appropriate, these powers have been limited in their application to emergency responses regarding exotic diseases only. These powers relate to the use of land, construction, reinforcement or repair of buildings, fences, gates or other structures, disinfection of places and property, possession and supervision of property to support response efforts, and the power to stop work or close any place.

The amendments also increase responsibilities of directors of a body corporate by expanding the definition of a prescribed offence. This recognises the significant role body corporate directors play in ensuring biosecurity risks and impacts are addressed effectively, especially during an animal

disease response. Importantly, when an increased risk of exotic disease has been declared, powers to undertake surveillance and proof of freedom testing have been added for monitoring disease incursions or for market access purposes.

These enhanced powers will ensure South Australia can undertake testing to quickly implement any required emergency response measures, to limit the rapid spread of disease and to maintain or regain market access, which will be crucial in managing the economic impact to the state. I understand the amendments have been drafted to ensure consistency of the Livestock Act 1997 with other modern legislation and to revise maximum penalty provisions for hindering offences, and statutory immunity for the Crown has been made more explicit and limited, consistent with the protections provided in the Emergency Management Act 2004.

In the event of an animal-related disease outbreak, critical staff need the ability to respond as quickly as possible, which is why the fine for hindering a response has been increased from \$5,000 to \$15,000. I am confident these amendments will enhance South Australia's ability to respond to a future emergency animal disease incursion. I commend the Livestock (Emergency Animal Disease) Amendment Bill 2022 to the house and I look forward to further debate.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:53): I rise to speak about the Livestock (Emergency Animal Disease) Amendment Bill 2022. This bill has come about because of what we need to do in response to risk factors and the potential for foot-and-mouth disease and lumpy skin disease to come to Australia. Both diseases will cause more than major problems; it will be an absolute disaster for our livestock industries. As has been indicated, over a period of 10 years the loss could be in the range of \$80 billion to \$100 billion to livestock industries right across Australia.

It was not that many years ago that we saw the devastation in England where herds of cattle were impacted by foot and mouth, getting burnt in funeral pyres. It is a terrible thing to see as a livestock owner (before I leased my property out) and for all farmers. You cannot help but think of what those livestock owners would have gone through when thinking of those terrible outcomes.

These are diseases that have to be controlled. I look at what was done by the former federal Liberal government: getting vaccines into Indonesia where there were outbreaks right across much of Indonesia, including Bali. I think it was at least \$14 million and I think there might have been some more afterwards to assist with the vaccination program. That work was highly commended because we had a huge amount of self-interest in making sure that we got as many stock as possible vaccinated in Indonesia.

I note the quarantine efforts made at Australian airports in regard to people going to Indonesia. Initially, we were all very concerned and questioned whether we should stop flights altogether or whether the risks could be managed. Obviously with COVID slowing down a bit, flights had only recently resumed, not just interstate travel but also international travel, and that service was kept going but with very, very strict controls in place.

I certainly had personal experience. I think it was in August or whenever the winter break was that I did go to Bali. It was my first trip to Bali and it was good living in a country where there is not much regulation. It was fantastic, actually, for a few days, and then you come back to a place like Australia. I understand why we have so much regulation. People often say to me, 'You guys should sit more often,' and I say, 'Well, we only take your freedoms away while we are in parliament.' That is exactly what we do, and I will attribute that phrase to its rightful owner: Patrick Secker, the former member for Barker.

That is exactly what we do, so it was a liberating experience for those few days. But in the back of my mind I was only too aware of the potential of a problem for anyone coming back from Indonesia, and there were many hundreds of thousands of people who were participating in that. There were plenty of warnings on the planes about the protocols, which is absolutely right. I drummed into the five other people I was travelling with that you stick absolutely to the protocols. If you are not prepared to clean any of the shoes that you had while you were away, throw them out, and you will have to do something else for footwear on your way home.

Like a lot of people who go there, I certainly enjoyed activities like whitewater rafting and four-wheel motorbike ATV riding and it was great. I must say, I made sure that everyone in the group

got tubs of water and old toothbrushes and cleaned those shoes with disinfectant within an inch of their lives. I think I dug out of my sandals some small bits of gravel that probably went all the way from Coomandook and they have been left forever in Indonesia.

It was excellent on the way home to see the huge pull-up banners in Denpasar airport showing us the strict regulations on flying back to Australia. All carry-on luggage was inspected by the Indonesian authorities, and we were certainly told what could happen on entry to Australia. There was no doubt left in anyone's mind.

Antiseptic foot mats had been put in place at Adelaide Airport. When we got back to Adelaide Airport, there were random inspections of baggage and we were pulled up as a group three times and questioned. I was very pleased that happened. If I had to, I was happy to get my bags out and open them up, as were the whole group. I think the protocols that were in place were very good. That was essentially to help combat foot-and-mouth disease.

Lumpy skin disease is another matter. That could come over with high cyclonic winds—maybe not even cyclonic—those wind paths and bring that disease straight into Australia no matter what the quarantine efforts. It is great that there are those protocols in place at Australian and Indonesian airports to do all that we can to manage the potential for those insurrections of foot and mouth or lumpy skin disease, so I support this legislation.

The bill will strengthen powers within the Livestock Act and contains provisions required to control or eradicate livestock diseases. These provisions are already utilised regularly for the control or eradication of notifiable livestock diseases. These measures will be strengthened with this new bill to ensure speed of implementation and will enable any response to be agile in the event of an emergency animal disease incursion.

Certainly many constituents were worried about what the exclusion zones would be and what would happen in an outbreak. I said that it would depend where it was and how many properties were involved. Rules were put in place, and we had a briefing, and the minister from the other place, the Hon. Clare Scriven, and PIRSA representatives, such as Mehdi Doroudi, were there. We were told it would depend on a whole range of factors whether the exclusion zone would be a few square kilometres or many square kilometres. People were asking me what compensation there would be and so on.

The bigger picture was that a foot-and-mouth incursion especially, and lumpy skin disease, would be such a massive detriment to our industry—it would basically shut it down—that those initial incursion zones pale into insignificance on what could happen not just on the state scale but on the national scale. We have to be vigilant all the time in these matters, and Australia has stepped up its biosecurity measures.

On top of what I have already said, it includes risk profiling from travellers going to Indonesia and the disinfectant foot mats at airports. I have indicated the quantum of the outbreak. It would immediately threaten South Australia's exports of livestock products, which were worth \$954 million, just short of \$1 billion, in 2020-21. It would also impact the \$1.3 billion worth of interstate trade. A loss of export markets would also impact domestic prices for meat and meat-related products. An outbreak of lumpy skin disease would affect approximately \$7.39 billion worth of exports across 23 countries.

Certainly, the effects go further than just the meat industry itself. The incursion would have long-lasting wider impacts on the tourism industry, trade, health, wellbeing, education and research. Regional communities, where quite a few of us in this place come from, would be the most vulnerable.

This legislation was consulted on with the South Australian Dairyfarmers' Association, Pork SA, Livestock SA and Primary Producers SA. They indicated that they are all supportive of the bill. Some of these amendments include that notices would be published on websites prior to the publication in the *Gazette*, enabling a more timely and efficient response. They will provide the ability to limit the application of a notice to a specified class of persons, a specified class of livestock, livestock products or other property or specified circumstances, and exempt a person or a class of persons from a requirement imposed by a notice.

They will provide inspectors with the ability to take a required action where a person fails to comply with a notice in an order in a specified or reasonable time frame. Where there are impacts on any native animals as part of a required emergency response, the amendments provide flexibility on when consultation with the relevant minister is required. They will also provide the ability to provide the kind of property for which an inspector may issue an order, take action or cause action to be taken for the destruction, demolition or disposal of property. This shows how seriously this bill is taking the potential of these incursions—any incursions—into the animal industry in South Australia and Australia overall in the longer term.

They will address identified gaps in current powers that will support emergency response efforts. Where appropriate, these powers have been limited in their application to emergency responses regarding exotic diseases only. These powers relate to the use of land; construction, reinforcement or repair of buildings, fences, gates or other structures; disinfection of places and property; possession and supervision of property to support response efforts; and the power to stop work or close any place.

When an increased risk of exotic disease has been declared, powers to undertake surveillance and proof of freedom testing have been added for monitoring disease incursions or for market access purposes. Maximum penalty provisions for hindering offences have been revised, and statutory immunity for the Crown has been made more explicit and limited, consistent with the protections provided in the Emergency Management Act 2004.

The simple fact is that any incursions of these exotic diseases, especially foot and mouth and lumpy skin disease, would cause problems not just for one season, not just for two seasons, but it could be 10 to 15 years before we would get full clearance from these diseases to get both intrastate and export licensing back for our products to be traded.

It would have a massive impact on prices for goods. We would see meat prices go through the roof, if you could get meat that was clean, and it would create so many expensive issues in the supply chain because things would have to be disinfected more and there would be more checks, and I can tell you from history that these costs always come back to industry. They always come back to the farmer, who would bear the brunt of these costs.

I had a little bit to do with stock many years ago. We had Hereford cattle, and dad was a very good breeder of Hereford cattle. The only reason he did not have a stud was that he could not be bothered with the paperwork. We put Hereford bulls throughout the Mallee and the Upper South-East. The last breeder we bought came out of Urrbrae High School—Urrbrae Crinkly Chips—(not much of a stud name, but that was his name), and he sired quite a few good calves. We also had merino breeding sheep over time and also Polwarths.

Being involved in the sheep industry at shearing level, I know they can get a disease called scabby mouth, which is a bit ugly and where sheep have a lot of lesions around the face. When you are a shearer you really do not want to shear them, not that you are going to catch scabby mouth but you try to find a bag or a rag to put over their head so that you can shear them.

I must commend farmers for what they do in trying times. We have been blessed in the last few years and even now with good prices for stock, but it has been a long time coming. In the last few years, they have been prices for stock that have not been seen. But if you look at price for stock—and compared it to input and, dare I say it, real wage growth—we are probably still a long way behind. That is another good reason we must do everything we can to make sure we keep our livestock clean to support our producers and the families and the families of the workers who work on our properties and support the industry into the future. So I certainly commend this bill.

We need to do all we can into the future to make sure we look after our livestock industries. We have various levels of biosecurity here already getting initiated. We have property identification codes. We have electronic identification, which is not too bad on cattle, but the tags are about \$1.50 each. Trying to implement that into the sheep sector is obviously worth many tens of millions of dollars just in South Australia alone, and I know there are ongoing discussions with Livestock SA about where that lands.

But what that tells me, apart from being a bit horrified about the cost of it, is that the industry and farmers are having a good look at keeping their flocks safe and making sure that with anything that crops up as a biosecurity threat at any local level, at the farm level—and that is intrastate trade here with livestock or interstate—people can see where they have come from and where they are going.

Sheep travel around in different environments. You get northern station sheep, West Coast sheep and some of those might get traded into the Lower South-East and suddenly they find out they are living in wet feet. I can remember many years ago shearing some sheep that had not grown out too well, and once sheep have stunted a bit they never come good, and you would get them down to the South-East and the wool was stuck on, but that is another matter.

In regard to this legislation, we need to do whatever we can. I think there are a couple of amendments to be dealt with at the committee stage. We do need to support our livestock industry into the future, especially when I think about what is happening with processing soon in my electorate with the Thomas Foods beef plant opening up early next year so that we can get that new beef chain operating, and then hopefully the small stock one with the sheep plant getting built soon after that. I commend the bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Hammond. I look forward to hearing more reproductive successes on your farm.

Mrs PEARCE (King) (16:13): With what we saw earlier this year, it is understandable that there is a strong desire within farming communities to protect our livestock and a desire to have positive practical measures put in place to achieve that. I can appreciate why. Experts fear that an exotic livestock disease could cost the economy billions should it ever make its way into our country, and this year we saw how close that came to be.

I remember the devastation that was caused a little over 20 years ago by foot-and-mouth disease, seeing the damage it caused and watching each night on the evening news as farmers broke down when they learned they then had to cull their whole herd and worrying about what would happen if it made it here. As a country girl myself, I worried about what it would mean for our animals and our local community.

Our farm was not a huge one, only a couple of hundred acres with a few Murray Greys and a couple of chicken coops. The concern was mainly for my neighbours whose lives relied upon their livestock as much as they did their crops. Times were tough as it was with the droughts we had been experiencing. A blow to the livestock side of things would be too much for many to handle. Fortunately, a crisis was averted, but it does not mean that we should not remain vigilant and be prepared. Only this year, we were once again reminded how quickly things can change.

That is why I am pleased that we have introduced the Livestock (Emergency Animal Disease) Amendment Bill 2022, to help build on the state's preparedness for an emergency animal disease incursion such as foot-and-mouth disease. The amendments will then strengthen powers within the Livestock Act 1997 to support a comprehensive, rapid and effective emergency response to ensure maximum efficiency.

The amendments include practical provisions to improve the time lines and effectiveness of an emergency response in the event of an emergency animal disease outbreak by giving inspectors the power to construct or require the construction of a fence to contain livestock, disinfect machinery, take possession of available machinery to assist with livestock disposal activities, or stop work or close a place to minimise a biosecurity risk or impact.

Furthermore, where an increased risk of exotic disease has been declared, inspectors will also have the power to undertake surveillance and testing to prove freedom from disease. This is incredibly important for monitoring disease incursions or for market access purposes. Given the increased risk and catastrophic consequences of some emergency animal diseases, it is essential that our state is ready to respond quickly because the consequence of not acting quickly is detrimental in many ways. It could threaten the meat industry, and jobs all across our state would be at risk. It would also threaten tourism, as we have seen in other places that locations become limited as a measure to help stop the spread.

As the minister stated in the other place, even a small isolated emergency animal disease outbreak could have a significant short to medium-term impact on trade. For example, a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak would immediately threaten South Australia's exports of livestock products, which were worth \$954 million in 2020-21, and also impact the \$1.3 billion worth of interstate trade. A loss of export markets would also impact domestic prices for meat and meat-related products. It is estimated that a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak could cost Australia \$80 billion to \$100 billion over 10 years.

It is our regional communities who would be most hurt by such an outbreak. It is important to note that the proposed extended powers will only be used in the event of an outbreak or a declaration of significant risk. During these times, they will help to improve the timeliness and effectiveness of an emergency response and to improve clarity and enhance powers. Additionally, the amendments will allow notices to be published on a website and come into force prior to their publication in the *Gazette*, enabling a more timely and swift response.

Importantly, when an increased risk of exotic disease has been declared, powers to undertake surveillance and proof of freedom testing have been added for monitoring disease incursions or for market access purposes. These enhanced powers will ensure South Australia can undertake testing to quickly implement any required emergency response measures, to limit the rapid spread of disease and to maintain or regain market access, which will be crucial in managing the economic impact to the state. We are being proactive and doing what we can to support and protect this industry. With that, I commend the bill to the house.

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (16:18): I rise to speak in support of this very important amendment, the Livestock (Emergency Animal Disease) Amendment Bill 2022, and reflect on a lot of the discussion there has been in this place already. The importance of having a robust and vigorous biosecurity system in South Australia should not be underestimated. Our livestock industry put so much into our state's economy, but it is so much more than that.

The opposition has been thankful to work closely with the government throughout the challenging times we have had over the last few months, when we saw the high alert the industry has been on because of the detection of both lumpy skin disease in Indonesia, in March this year, and foot-and-mouth disease across the archipelago in May. It really did highlight to us the challenges that would be faced if there were an incursion from either of these diseases or any other like diseases that could very easily decimate our livestock industry.

This industry contributes so much in exports, and we have already heard in this place that it would affect approximately \$7.39 billion worth of exports across 23 countries. We also have to keep in mind that there would be an incredible domestic impact for consumers here in Australia.

If we were to have an outbreak of one of these diseases and suddenly there was going to have to be a mass slaughter of a number of infected animals, indeed the supply and demand impacts would mean either there would be no opportunity for people to enjoy the high-quality produce that we produce here in South Australia or the price would be completely out of reach for most people in such a challenging time.

We know that foot-and-mouth disease in particular has been detected in 25 of the 37 provinces of Indonesia, and we heard earlier that includes the popular tourism destination of Bali. That is why the opposition has been so strident in its support for all measures that strengthen South Australia's preparedness activities, surveillance work and efforts to plan, prepare for, mitigate and respond to any emergency animal disease incursion. It is so important, and I reflect the words of the member for Giles, that this sort of measure is something that is bipartisan in recognition of the importance of this industry, the livestock industry, not only for the South Australian economy but also for the South Australian community as a whole.

In terms of the risks of a potential outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Australia, the estimates that we have seen or heard about already would potentially be between \$80 billion and \$100 billion. Those sorts of numbers we cannot really fathom, because it is not just about the economic impact but also about the ongoing, long-term impact that these incursions would have. As has been seen in decades previous, the UK went through its own struggles with foot-and-mouth disease. It basically wiped out the industry for years if not decades.

Between the livestock and the trade impacts, an emergency animal incursion would also have long-lasting impacts on human health and wellbeing, tourism as we have heard, education and research as well as very significant impacts on regional communities. As someone who is a livestock producer and well understands the livestock industry, I can only begin to fathom the sorts of measures that would have to be put in place if there were an incursion of these diseases and what that would mean for producers on the ground and what that would mean for regional communities across South Australia.

I am not going to regale the house with detailed stories like the member for Hammond of some of my previous experience in dealing with different occurrences within the livestock industry, but I will highlight that our regional communities rely so much on the agricultural turnout of the businesses that are within our regional communities, and the livestock industry in particular is not an insignificant part of that.

We do also know that not just livestock would be affected. The likes of an FMD outbreak in South Australia would mean the potential for some of the feral populations of the cloven-footed animals that we know are across South Australia would potentially be a pool for ongoing disease challenges when it comes to management. We know that further to the north of our state in the dry climate there is a significant camel population, and if an incursion were to come into that population there would be no way of controlling it, and likewise within the feral goat population.

Further south, we know that in the higher rainfall areas there are challenges that are faced at the moment with feral pigs or feral deer. If a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak was to occur in Australia and in South Australia, we know that the potential to get into the feral population would mean that not only is the impact going to be on our livestock industry for the time it would take them to recover but also the risk is that the mitigation that would be needed for the feral population would be unable to be achieved, and it would be something that would continually have to be managed.

It is important that the activities that are being enabled by this piece of legislation are sufficiently resourced. The challenge is going to be not just in the mitigation but also in the planning for any outbreak that may happen. We need to make sure that South Australia is well placed to respond to an emergency animal disease incursion. We need to put steps in place and this bill, these changes are a really important step. That is why the opposition has been so strident in partnering in a bipartisan way in this place because the economy of South Australia, the communities of South Australia and South Australia as a whole would be completely undermined if there were a biosecurity challenge as is envisioned if we have a lumpy skin disease or a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak in South Australia.

On this side, we have really appreciated the opportunity to consult with key industry bodies. We have had discussions with the South Australian Dairyfarmers' Association, Pork SA, Livestock SA and Primary Producers SA and they have all noted their support for this legislation. As I said, it is recognised across the board that we need to get the measures in place every step along the way to prevent this. We need to put measures in place to make sure that we mitigate any sort of risk and also put plans in place so that if there is an incursion, if we do have an outbreak of one of these incredibly damaging diseases, the measures, the officers, the plans are all there so we can try to nullify that risk as soon as possible.

In South Australia or Australia as a whole, we cannot afford to have a livestock industry that is not profitable, non-existent. As a community in Australia as a whole, we would be incredibly undermined and put at risk if something like this was to occur. I commend the bill, what it is trying to achieve for us in South Australia, and reiterate the support of the opposition for its progress through this place.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (16:26): I also rise briefly to add my support to this amendment bill. If we go back to the 1850s in this place, both sides of parliament have worked closely together on biosecurity issues, and I am talking about the phylloxera act, which has helped South Australia remain one of the few jurisdictions anywhere in the world to keep phylloxera out.

In terms of fruit fly, again, we have done a good job of keeping that out of South Australia when we are surrounded by other states and territories that do have fruit fly. We have a proud record in South Australia of both sides working together. With this added threat of diseases that could spread

throughout our livestock, herds and flocks, it is really important that we work together, that we show that agility to toughen existing laws or make a new laws and pass them through this place where necessary and show the agriculture sector that we are listening to them, we are aware of their concerns and that biosecurity is at the base of everything this parliament should be doing to help them.

I remind everyone again to look at the carpet, at its grapes and its wheat. These are the founding bases of this state. The agriculture sector employs almost one in five working South Australians. It is so important to us that the engine room of this state is outside the metropolitan area with those people who toil so hard on the land to produce all sorts of agricultural products and then to value add to them, not only sustaining the Australian population but also exporting these wonderful products. As I said, I just wanted to rise briefly to confirm my support for this amendment bill.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (16:28): I am grateful for the contributions from other members. What I know about livestock management would not fill a Weber Q guide, I have to say.

Mr Pederick: I hope you are ready for committee.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, that is right. I always enjoy the contributions of more learned members, particularly the member for Finniss—and I know I will not get this right but I will try—who I think had at least a decade-long career as an industry representative as the national president of dairy farmers, was it?

Of course, other members—the member for MacKillop, the member for Hammond—have extensive farming experience. I am grateful for their contributions because it is through these sorts of debates that those of us with a relatively sheltered rural experience might pick up some wisdom. I am glad for their confirmation that they support the measures in this bill.

As every contributor to the debate has said, this is something where governments of either persuasion over many years and decades have sought to support primary producers, particularly farmers, in dealing with livestock management. I will not carry on with my comments any further. I think we have a brief amendment to deal with in the committee stage. I thank the members and again commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 14 passed.

Clause 15.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Treasurer–1]—

Page 8, line 10 [clause 15(4), inserted subparagraph (vii)]—Delete 'or eradication' and substitute:

, eradication or decontamination

This is a brief amendment to include an additional term following one of the definitions. I understand it has been communicated to the opposition, but I am happy to take any questions if necessary.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (16:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (DOG THEFT) AMENDMENT 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) (16:33): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the Summary Offences (Dog Theft) Amendment Bill 2022, which implements the election commitment made by the government to increase penalties to deter dog theft. The bill amends the Summary Offences Act 1953 to insert a new summary offence of dog theft into section 47A. The offence has a maximum penalty of \$50,000 or imprisonment for two years.

In recent times, reports in the news and media have suggested that the cost of dogs, and purebred and designer breeds in particular, has increased considerably due to increases in demand and a reduction in the supply in the context of the pandemic. This, in turn, has created the possibility that offenders will seek to take advantage of these circumstances and make improper financial gains from stealing or selling dogs.

Dogs have a special place in the family home and need to be protected from being taken away from their loved ones. While the theft of a dog can currently be dealt with under the general theft offence in section 134 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, this offence does not explicitly provide for a fine. A new summary offence for dog theft in the bill introduces a substantial financial penalty of \$50,000, which acts as a strong deterrent against would-be offenders, adding another level of protection for families and their dogs. This can be particularly relevant to families with high-value dog breeds.

A new offence is similar to approaches adopted in New South Wales and the Northern Territory, which both provide for a separate summary offence for stealing a dog. To clarify, I note that in South Australia dog theft can still be prosecuted under the general theft offence under the CLCA if needed, as police may choose to charge this offence where it is appropriate, having regard to the particular nature and extent of the offending, strength of the available evidence and the appropriate sentence.

For example, where an offender uses violence against a person to steal a dog, it may be appropriate to charge theft under this CLCA to make out the offence of robbery under section 137 of the CLCA. As serious imprisonment penalties already apply for the offence of theft under the CLCA, the bill creates a simple summary offence with a new significant financial penalty. A new summary offence sends a clear signal that anyone who steals a dog will face serious consequences. It also acknowledges that dogs are not simply property but are deeply loved members of the family which cannot easily be replaced.

I would also like to address a number of important questions about this bill that were raised in the other place, and I provide the following information in response to those queries. Noting that the bill is among a suite of issues relating to animal protection, questions were raised about the status of other reforms that government is progressing with regard to puppy farms. I am pleased to inform the house that the government has made changes to regulations under the Dog and Cat Management Act 1995 to limit the number of dogs that registered breeders can have on their properties, which means that since 1 September this year new breeders in South Australia are prohibited from owning more than 50 breeding females for the purpose of breeding and selling puppies.

In addition, a legislative review of the Dog and Cat Management Act 1995 is currently underway and is due to be completed by the end of the year. It is intended that a further delivery of our election commitments in this area will follow the completion of this review. A question was raised about the definition of 'dog' for the purposes of this new summary offence. I can confirm that as 'dog' is not defined for the purpose of a new summary dog theft offence, the word takes on its ordinary meaning. For clarity, I note that the *Macquarie Dictionary* defines dog as:

...a domesticated carnivore, *Canis familiaris*, descended from the grey wolf; bred in a great many varieties and commonly kept as a pet.

There was some concern raised that the definition of 'dog' may be interpreted to not include greyhounds, noting that there has been discussion in previous years about this in the context of animal welfare and dog and cat management laws. I confirm that the bill was developed with the intention of covering all domestic dogs, which includes greyhounds, and the ordinary meaning of 'dog' is considered appropriate to use for the purposes of the new summary offence.

South Australia Police was consulted for the purposes of developing the bill and also provided feedback on the operational impacts of creating a new summary dog theft offence. Before the last state election, the Labor Party undertook extensive consultation on our policy platforms, including our animal welfare policy, with stakeholders from across the South Australian community. Community and local member feedback, especially in the northern suburbs, was that dog theft was on the rise and that current laws are not enough of a deterrent.

Dog theft has been the subject of various high-profile news media reports over the last few years. However, I am advised there are no police or court systems which currently capture the actual incidence of dog theft in South Australia. I also understand that Cats and Dogs Online, which is the mandatory database for registration of dogs and cats, breeders, microchip and desexing information, takes reports of dog theft on an ad hoc basis but does not keep a specific database on stolen dogs. I note that introducing a new standalone summary offence for dog theft through the bill may help to improve records of incidents of dog theft.

Consideration was given to whether the new summary offence should be extended to other species of animals that may have significant financial value. However, it was decided that the offence be limited to the dog on the basis of observations that dog theft is on the rise; that with spiralling dog prices, a readily accessible black market for dogs, theft of a dog is likely to be more common; and the need to deter opportunistic conduct in particular, which might involve, for example, taking a dog from the front of a shop, a suburban yard or a dog park less likely to apply to situations involving other animals. 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 *Summary Offences Act 1953*

3—Insertion of section 47A

This clause inserts section 47A into the principal Act.

47A—Dog theft

This provision establishes an offence of dog theft. It provides that a person who steals a dog, or has unlawfully in their possession a stolen dog knowing that the dog has been stolen, is guilty of an offence.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (16:39): I rise to indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition, and I indicate the opposition's support for the bill. I flag that it may be convenient to deal with these questions at the committee stage. I flag them in the course of this debate in case it might be convenient for the minister to deal with them in summing up the debate.

The nature of my consideration is twofold, I suppose, and it is partly in the light of the house's recent revisiting of the Animal Welfare Act. The new section 47A provision that is going to provide specifically for dog theft will be contained as a new summary offence and with a substantial penalty that almost, but not quite, replicates the section 14(1) offence in the Animal Welfare Act for engaging in a prohibited activity.

The penalty in section 14(1) of the Animal Welfare Act is \$50,000 or four years' imprisonment as a maximum penalty, whereas we are here seeing a new summary offence with \$50,000 or two years, so no quibbling about the difference in maximum period of imprisonment, but they are

somewhat analogous. A query, therefore, is what consideration had been given to whether this might better fit being described as an additional 'prohibited activity', bearing in mind that, as we understand, one of the practical purposes for which dogs are being stolen that has a monetary value attached is for the subsection (5)(a) purpose, that is, a longstanding prohibited activity engaging in animal fights.

Of course if somebody steals a dog and engages in an animal fight, then they are offending in those two different ways, but in a sense that lines up in an animal welfare context: clearly whether one focuses on the intrinsic value of the animal both in and of itself and to those in whose households dogs reside and form part of the family, or whether one focuses on the financial value of dogs and we have a significant penalty applied to disincentivise the stealing of them. There is no doubt cruelty involved in the act of stealing and in the act of retaining a dog that has been stolen. I just ask the question about the proper place of the new offence.

In the same way, I focus for a moment on the longstanding summary offence in section 47, which relates, of course, to interference with homing pigeons. We have the longstanding offence in section 47 of the Summary Offences Act that makes it an offence to interfere with a homing pigeon. There is a defence to that offence: if the homing pigeon entered onto the land, then there might be grounds for a defence to that offence. Two things are important in terms of section 47; one is that the penalty attached in section 47—and this will sit right alongside it—is \$250.

The second point—and this is a matter of substance—is there is no amendment on file. Bearing in mind that the activity of homing pigeons is one that involves human connection and relationship on the homing pigeon side, there is a monetary value attached in terms of compensation, whereas there is not here because we are simply talking about the theft and penalty.

Not only does section 47(2) provide for what is a relatively minor amount of penalty—\$250—but it also then goes on to provide in a way that really might serve the practical purpose in this case for a civil remedy for the owner. Section 47(2) provides, as is well known:

(2) Upon the conviction of a person for an offence against subsection (1)—

that is the interference, including killing or injuring the homing pigeon—

the court may order the convicted person to pay to the owner of the pigeon [who contravenes] that subsection a sum equal to the value of the pigeon.

It then goes on with the defence that is set out in subsection (3). New section 47A sits alongside that provision but without the civil remedy attached; that is, without the capacity for the court to turn around and say, 'Alright, there is a significant value attached.' In this case, as we know—and not just in COVID times but for a variety of reasons—we have seen really quite dramatically increasing values of pets for sale.

Clearly, one of the reasons to impose a very significant financial maximum penalty is a disincentive for not just stealing dogs for the purposes of engaging in fights, but stealing dogs for the purposes of resale where individual puppies might cost upwards of \$5,000. It is a significant disincentive if there is a penalty that is associated that is a multiple of that, but that is cold comfort on its own to the person who has purchased the dog, and the penalty having been applied may not then translate in terms of that civil remedy, or compensation at least, directly pursuant to the subsection.

The first point to highlight in terms of understanding where this will now fit in the statute book is, as I have described, in terms of the possibility that there would have been—to send a clear signal—the theft of a dog is an animal welfare matter and might properly be included among those prohibited activities, particularly in the context of the purpose for which some dogs we are told are being stolen. Secondly, the possibility for there to be a direct provision along the lines that are set out in section 47, it might fit neatly given that we are here contemplating adding to that body of offences in that part of the Summary Offences Act.

In terms of belts and braces, while we are on it, I do not know, as I have not reminded myself, how recently the maximum penalty in section 47 had been revisited, but it seems to be by comparison, should this find its way onto the statute book alongside section 47, that there is clearly a relatively stark contrast. Those are the matters that I flag in terms of both the penalty and the place within the legislation that this sits.

I otherwise take the opportunity to acknowledge that this was a commitment by the government and, as I understand it, an election commitment—at least that is my recollection—and that ought to be noted in terms of the consideration of the house when it comes to the implementation of it, if not the particular way in which the government has elected to go about it.

I certainly adopt and would emphasise those observations of the Deputy Premier in relation to the important place in homes and families that dogs have. While we are perhaps in some possibility of jeopardy when we single out individual animals for this sort of treatment, there is no doubt that dogs have a special place. It may be that, if this is successful in seeing a reduction in this sort of activity, the offence might be rolled out more widely to apply not only to dogs but to other domestic animals. I do not flag any in particular, but it is acknowledged that dogs are given a special place for the purposes of this particular legislation.

The other aspect that has been referred to is that there is what appears to be both a newfound monetary value and a propensity for dogs to be misappropriated for those fights that would also attract the attention of offending pursuant to section 14(1) of the Animal Welfare Act.

It is with those brief words that I indicate that the opposition supports the passage of the bill. I would certainly invite any response to those particular matters that I have raised about the way in which this is to be legislated, but otherwise I commend the bill to the house.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (16:53): I rise to speak in support of the Summary Offences (Dog Theft) Amendment Bill. This bill may be short, but it is important to the thousands of families who own a dog in South Australia and the 315,550 dogs, including our family dog, Freya, who are registered in South Australia as at 30 June 2022. This number includes 13,390 working dogs, 1,125 racing greyhounds and 314 assistance dogs, including Australian Lions Hearing and Medical Alert dogs, guide dogs, PTSD dogs for veterans, autism therapy dogs, and dogs for health and education facilities all through See Differently, formerly the Royal Society for the Blind.

It does not matter whether the dog is a working dog, assistance dog, racing dog or family pet. They are all loved by their owners and an important part of their family. I would be devastated if Freya was stolen and so would my community. This is why I am pleased to be speaking on this bill which delivers on the Labor government's election commitment to increase penalties to deter dog theft, recognising how important dogs are to their human families and the threat of dog-napping in South Australia.

The bill amends the Summary Offences Act 1953 to insert a new summary offence of dog theft in section 47A. This is important as a dog is not like a piece of furniture or a car. They are a living being that is sadly vulnerable to theft. The offence has a maximum penalty of \$50,000 or imprisonment for two years. It is intended that the steep maximum penalty for the new offence will have a strong deterrent effect on potential offenders and keep Freya and her canine friends safe.

Freya is not just a beloved family pet. She is an official park sniffer at Oaklands parkrun and children across Gibson are currently colouring in pictures of her as part of my Christmas colouring competition to win passes to the State Aquatic and Leisure Centre. She might not yet be as famous as Dusty, but she is just as loved.

The theft of a dog can currently be dealt with under the general theft offence in section 134 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, and this bill does not take away that option from South Australia Police if they believe that is the more appropriate offence based on factual circumstances, the strength of the available evidence and the appropriate sentence. The new offence is similar to approaches adopted in New South Wales and the Northern Territory which both provide for a separate summary offence for stealing a dog.

I understand that the cost of dogs—purebred and designer breeds, in particular—has risen considerably due to increased demand and a reduction in supply over the course of the pandemic. Sadly, this has created the opening for offenders to opportunistically take advantage of these circumstances and make improper financial gains from stealing and selling dogs.

We saw earlier this year how owners of seven pit bull puppies were devastated when they were brazenly stolen at Christies Beach. Sweet Pea, a six-year-old labrador, was stolen in a

carjacking in the city in September. Simba, a Staffordshire bull terrier labrador cross, was stolen from Chinatown in 2020.

In 2019, the chihuahua companion of a *Big Issue* vendor was stolen in Rundle Mall. These are just four examples of the dog thefts that happen across South Australia each year, leaving families without their paw friend. I remind all South Australians to ensure that their dogs are microchipped so that they can be quickly returned to them if they are stolen or escape.

The 2021-22 annual report of the Dog and Cat Management Board shows that only 93.2 per cent of dogs at home belonging to an owner were microchipped and, further, only 70.4 per cent of these dogs were desexed. I urge dog owners to desex their family pet and ensure that their dogs are secured in their home or a fenced backyard and, as summer is finally here, never leave them in a car. Freya and all of her paw friends commend this bill to the house.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (16:58): I am pleased to be able to speak on this bill. Obviously, what happens when one is provided a bill by a member in the other place, a minister in the other place, is that a second reading speech has been written and one duly gives that second reading speech, but I think this closing speech gives me the opportunity to also say a little bit more about what I think about this bill.

In thanking the contribution that has been made by the other two members, I am very grateful and I am aware that there were a couple of others who might have liked to have had an opportunity to speak, but we would like to get this piece of legislation through this session of parliament if possible.

I was the person who pulled together this election policy for animal welfare, amongst various other policies, and I included this on the request of one of our members who was concerned at the number of reports he was reading about dog thefts occurring, particularly in the northern suburbs. Bear in mind this was a time during COVID when people were increasingly confined to barracks, not able to travel, often not even able to go to work as freely as they had wanted to or to study, and people being at home realised just how important it was to have a non-human companion with them, a companion animal.

I am not a cat person, but I know that people do love cats. There are people who love cats; I acknowledge this and in no way wish to show any disrespect for those who do. In fact, as generally regarded as an animal lover, in a sense I love all animals equally. However, I do not love all animals equally because I am very much a dog person, and I am allergic to cats so I have never really got to know a cat.

There is something about a house with a dog that changes it into a home instantly, regardless of who else is part of that family. A dog connects with humans. They are, after all, *Canis familiaris* because they have been bred over multiple generations alongside humans to no longer be the wolves that try to attack us and bring us down in the wild, if any of you have seen some of those truly horrifying films that describes those occurrences. In fact, they are animals that have lived alongside us, hunted alongside us, kept us warm at night and kept us in companionship.

That was something I think most people have known since time immemorial, but it particularly became something that people were aware of during COVID—to bring myself back to the timing of this election commitment. As that occurred, the supply therefore was under pressure and, unsurprisingly to those who understand economics, the prices went up, particularly for those curious crossbreeds that get the names that used to be associated with celebrity couples and are now associated with celebrity dog breeds, where you jam the two words together and create a new one.

That is not the kind of dog I have ever had. The dogs I have always had have just had bits of various breeds, some of which are not able to be defined. My current dog, my darling dog that we got from the RSPCA about 10 years ago, looks largely like a cavalier. She has the round head, so she is definitely a cavalier, but she has the most enormous and disproportionately large feet, so clearly another breed has made its way in there somewhere and we will never know what.

As prices went up, the kinds of breeds that people find attractive became harder to get hold of. People were desperate to have a dog to walk to get some fresh air during COVID and a companion at home for the children or just for themselves, so we did see this spiralling—at least reporting and, no doubt, truthfully—of these animals being stolen.

The members asked a number of questions relating to this bill, and I do hope that we are able to avoid going into committee by having my answer to the best of my ability during this response. One of them relates to whether this is really an offence that belonged more in the Animal Welfare Act, being analogous, at least in fine if not in time potentially in jail, to section 14(1) of the Animal Welfare Act. My view is that the Attorney-General has got it right in putting it in Summary Offences.

Although I have just waxed lyrical about how these animals are, in fact, members of the family, nonetheless this crime relates to their theft as a property rather than cruelty to them, which could indeed be separately and additionally charged should cruelty occur. Although stealing a much-loved long-term family pet from a family might well be regarded as cruel in itself, in the form of emotional cruelty, the theft of a puppy might not be regarded as cruel, yet nonetheless has done the damage that we are seeking to avoid.

So I think the right place for this is to create a new location in the Summary Offences Act that specifically designates that there is a particular crime that has taken place when you steal a dog from a family, as opposed to any other piece of property, but does not amount to something that would be, I think, able to justified in all cases to exist under the Animal Welfare Act.

Perhaps if I leap to the third point that was raised of the three by the shadow attorney, the question of stealing in the context of dog fights. I am not sure if it was quite articulated as a question but, indeed, should that occur there are separate and additional offences that exist for fighting dogs, as there absolutely should be. That would also be the case should a dog be stolen and then treated cruelly in a way that the RSPCA or the inspector is able to prove and wishes to prosecute. I think that is, as has been demonstrated in the other two jurisdictions, New South Wales and the Northern Territory, existing as a separate offence and is the right one under the Summary Offences Act.

There was then a very interesting discussion from the shadow attorney about homing pigeons. I must admit, not being in fact the Attorney-General, I had not familiarised myself with that section of the act and did not realise that existed as a separate offence already. It is an interesting one, given the peripatetic nature of homing pigeons, although eventually the idea, I presume, is that they home.

In order to home, they have to depart and might spend some time in other locations. The question of at which point you have stolen that pigeon would be an interesting one, and I am not sure whether there have been many cases that have been taken, or any, in fact. That would be interesting for me to inquire about on my own time. However, this exists as a deterrent presumably where, if you find a homing pigeon, you try to put it in an aviary and keep it.

How recently it has been set at \$250 and whether there is any appetite in this parliament to increase it is not something that needs to be resolved through this dog theft offence act, I believe. Whether that is sufficient, whether it has ever been tested, I literally have no idea, but it is a question that having been asked may at some point be answered.

What was, I think, probably more to the point was the honourable member's question about the civil remedy component of that section of the act. It was of interest to me that a decision has been made by this parliament at some point that that might constitute a deterrent and presumably also that there might be the need for a civil remedy. I do not understand the world of homing pigeons. I think probably I am most familiar through the film *On the Waterfront*, which is really old and based in another country, but he had homing pigeons when he was contemplating being a—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: That's true. Does that relate to homing pigeons? That was quite a fantasy film. Anyway, I am being distracted because it is the last day, but this is nonetheless a serious matter and the Premier has arrived.

As to the question of civil remedy, I do not know much about the case of homing pigeons, but whether we are talking about is in fact pigeon fanciers stealing each others pigeons and therefore the necessity to make good on stealing a particularly good pigeon might make sense of a civil penalty. I am not sure a civil penalty necessarily makes sense generally in theft. We do not have it as something that is generally the case, that if you steal from somebody the judge can not only charge you with a crime and impose a penalty but also might then impose a civil penalty.

Because that is not generally something that exists within the Summary Offences Act—I am assuming that is the case; a civil penalty with stealing is not generally something that exists—then we had not contemplated having it exist with this particular offence. I am not sure that it would create an additional deterrent on top of the \$50,000 and the threat of imprisonment. I am also not sure how realistic it is that any civil penalty would in fact be recoverable. That is not a path we have chosen to go down in bringing forward this piece of legislation. Of course, any member is entitled, but I hope does not in order to get this legislation through, to bring in an amendment. With those words, I commend this bill to the chamber.

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) (17:08): I move:

That this bill be read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Adjournment Debate

VALEDICTORIES

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (17:09): I rise to speak on indulgence. I thank the members of the house for the opportunity to contemplate the fact that we are fast approaching the end of the year in a parliamentary context. I would like to take this opportunity to reflect on those in our community who enable the parliament to function in such a way that is relatively smooth and just acknowledge the contribution of a few people more broadly.

Obviously, this year was an election year and, first and foremost, I want to thank the people of South Australia for participating in our democratic processes, our democratic rituals, in a way that I think best accords with the tradition in South Australia of being a great democracy. I thank the people of South Australia for investing their confidence in me and my team in electing a new government. Changing governments does not happen very often, so it is not lost on me that it is a significant event. I want to thank people for their confidence in electing me, along with every other MP in this place, which they have done rather smoothly.

I do want to take this opportunity to thank my parliamentary colleagues. The simple fact is that in our system of government, those of us who are in leadership positions—whether it is the Leader of the Opposition or the Premier, or in our case the entirety of the frontbench—are elected by our parliamentary colleagues. I feel very blessed to have the support of my team, which is just a highly capable and committed group of individuals. Again, they chose after the 2018 election loss to invest their confidence in me and it is a great privilege. I try to honour their support of me every day by working as hard as I can. Between the South Australian public and my whole team here, I cannot possibly overstate my gratitude for their support.

I also want to acknowledge the chair of the caucus, who is the member for Mawson. He brings our caucus together and convenes over that on a frequent basis and also accepts his responsibility of ensuring that the really healthy culture that we have in the caucus is maintained and committed to a whole range of principles that are really important to those on this side of the house.

I do also want to thank the cabinet. Whenever you have a transition to a new government, it is a big exercise. We have some cabinet ministers who are fortunate enough to have a breadth of cabinet experience, but others are really new to the exercise and that creates a healthy blend I think, but each and every one of them has acted and worked really diligently. I want to thank them for that.

I would also like to thank the Public Service. The Public Service do not always get the credit they deserve. I think there are some elements of the Public Service that are quite rightly lionised and frequently recognised for their contribution. We think about our emergency services a lot. We talk about people working in our health system a lot, and that is very appropriate and something that should continue forever more.

But there are a lot of other people in our public sector who just simply do not get any recognition at all. They might not necessarily be in forward-facing roles in the way that South Australians are accustomed to, but they are nonetheless equally as diligent and committed to the service of the people of our state. Right from the chief executive level all the way through to the public sector, I want to thank them for their professionalism.

They are the support of the government I lead and actively facilitated a relatively smooth transition to government for us and give us all the advice and information that we rely on so frequently. Sometimes, we do not necessarily accept that advice or, occasionally, we might choose to go down a different path from that advice, but that does not change the fact that we are very grateful for it.

The parliament is a very unique place in every respect. At its best, the parliament is capable of really demonstrating all the best elements of humankind and, at its worst, it can go down a different path. Regardless of the functioning of the parliament in terms of the political context, the parliament is only able to operate and function because of the extraordinary efforts and commitment that we see from the people who work within this place to make it all tick.

In the case of our house, sir, of course that is under your leadership as the Speaker, but I know that you are ably assisted by an extraordinary group of people. I want to take the opportunity to acknowledge Rick and David, as the Clerk and the Deputy Clerk; the Clerk and Black Rod in the Legislative Council, Chris and Guy; and the entire house team here who make it all operate so smoothly.

There are a lot of others I would like to acknowledge too. There is the dedicated team in Hansard. I will come back to Hansard in a moment. There is the building manager, David Woolman, and the library, with John and his staff, who do an amazing job. When you are in opposition you really gain another level of appreciation for the work that the parliamentary library are capable of.

There is the catering team led by Creon. I want to acknowledge the Blue Room staff: Karen, Nicky, Belinda, Casey and Kiley. I certainly say to Nicky that every time she turns the music on too loud I still curse her name because of her relative close proximity to my home but, nonetheless, the whole of Bowden and Brompton was cheering Nicky on in *My Kitchen Rules*, along with everyone in the parliament, I would have thought.

I want to acknowledge everyone else who works in the building. When you start jotting down a few notes, the list of people is really quite extensive. There is the whole team in PNSG, the people who clean the building, the Procedures Office, the switchboard staff, the camera operators, the maintenance team, security, SAPOL protective security officers and everybody who puts work in. I probably should give a shout-out to Ben in the cellar. Why is he so popular? Because he is in the cellar.

The Hansard team, as I have said before and I am more than happy to say it again, I do not know if they are inspired by all of us or the opposite but, nonetheless, the record that is kept is really important and it is actually really useful for all of us. The fact that you, in particular, have to suffer us every moment of every sitting is worthy of recognition, to say the least.

I mentioned, Mr Speaker, you and your staff. Changes were made in the last parliament to the law, to the law of the land indeed, to elevate the role of the Speakership and ensure that it is truly independent in the truest possible sense of the word. I think, Mr Speaker, you have done a very good job of that. In government, we might not always agree with your rulings, and no doubt the opposition would feel the same way, which is probably a demonstration of your independence in the way that you conduct yourself, sir. I acknowledge that and thank you for it.

I want to thank the whips in this place, both in the opposition and particularly the Government Whip. The member for Elizabeth has demonstrated himself to be an absolutely outstanding whip. It

is an important job that again rarely gets recognised, so I want to thank the member for Elizabeth for his effort.

Can I thank my EO staff? It is a frustrating reality, as I am sure the Leader of the Opposition appreciates, that ultimately we are here first and foremost to serve our own constituencies. I try to do that as best I can but when you are in the position of leadership you get drawn in other places and the value of your EO staff could not possibly be overstated. I want to thank Peter Gonis, Gayle and Suzie and also a new trainee, Sophia, for the work that they do in the EO. We have our sub-branch AGM next week and I look forward to thanking them in person.

Can I thank all of my team in the Premier's Office. It grows; it is a bit bigger than it was. Obviously, I want to acknowledge John Bistrovic, my Chief of Staff; Cheyne Rich, my deputy chief of staff; and I give a special shout-out to Ann Duff, my EA, who just makes it all work, but God only knows how. To the whole team—I do not want to list everybody. I just cannot thank them enough because they are as dedicated as I could possibly hope for.

I do want to take the chance to acknowledge those members who are not with us today who would have hoped to have been at the beginning of the year. There have obviously been a few MPs who have changed hands from all sides of politics. Can I acknowledge each and every one of them. This is a really tough business. It is so hard-edged and competitive, and it can be ruthless on occasions and unforgiving. The price that is paid by MPs and candidates who miss out, often just miss out, even on occasions, dare I say, not necessarily through any fault of their own. It is not easy.

For the 47 of us who are elected to be here, it is probably worthwhile reflecting at the end of the year, particularly at the end of an election year, just how fortunate we are because there is no shortage of other people, including highly capable people, who would do a lot to have the opportunity that has been afforded to each and every one of us. To that end, I want to acknowledge the opposition and the Leader of the Opposition in the spirit of good faith and generosity during the festive season.

Opposition is really tricky. I hope not to experience it again anytime soon. It is really hard. You learn a lot during the journey of opposition, including just how hard it is. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition is in receipt of no shortage of advice from all quarters. I remember getting a lot of advice from people who themselves had not spent one day in opposition, and it is a different beast from government. I do want to wish each and every member of the opposition a safe and merry Christmas and every blessing at this time of the year because it is an important function and it deserves to be recognised.

To the broader Labor family, I would like to think that we are utilising the opportunity that we have been given. We have a big agenda and we are seeking to get through it as expeditiously as possible. We are only able to do that as a result of a close-knit team effort. I think, as time evolves, the challenges do not diminish; they will continue to come our way. Who knows what the next month, let alone the next year, let alone the next three and a bit years bring, but I just invite each and every one of us to remain as dedicated and as diligent as you have been throughout the entirety of the journey. I cannot thank you enough for that.

Finally, on the weekend we are about to experience something pretty special, with the Adelaide 500, and that will go into the cricket and the festive season. I really hope that as many people as possible in our state are able to enjoy that. But it is also true that there are a not insignificant number of people within our community who simply do not have the ability or are not in a position to be able to enjoy \$10 beers at the cricket or tickets to the Clipsal or, even more tragically than that, who will compromise on gifts they give their own children at Christmas, particularly when the cost of living is getting higher.

Regardless of what your views are and what your connection is to Christmas in terms of faith or otherwise, in our country this is a time of year when we stop and we reflect. It is important that people in positions of leadership, as everyone in this place is, try to have the courage, thoughtfulness and compassion to think of those who are far less fortunate than we are, more often than not through no fault of their own.

If each of us does that and commits ourselves to trying to address that injustice then we have every prospect of ensuring that South Australia is the kind-hearted place that it has always been into

the future. On that note, I want to sincerely wish everybody in this place the merriest of Christmases and an incredibly prosperous 2023. God bless, and I hope everyone gets the chance to enjoy some time with their family and friends.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (17:25): On indulgence, I also rise to make some remarks at this concluding time for the parliamentary year of 2022. What a fascinating year it has been at a democratic level in this state: a change of government both at state and federal levels and the Liberal Party losing office in both of those elections. That obviously poses very significant challenges, perhaps a sense of grief and great disappointment not only for my colleagues but also for the wider Liberal Party membership and the family of supporters that wraps itself around any political party.

It has been a difficult year, a complex year and a challenging year for members on this side of the house. I think we have to see it as both a great opportunity for renewal, reinvigoration, a change of direction potentially for our party and certainly a change of leadership. We also have to reflect on how great a society, how great a democracy we live in that the baton can be passed from one side of this house to the other, from one party to another, with no guns in the street, no-one fearing for their lives, no-one having to flee the state or country to live in exile somewhere else where they feel safer.

It happens with almost boring success—not boring for those participating on either side of this place but in a broader sense in the community. It just works and that is what we saw at both the state and the federal level this year. Of course, a change of government comes with a lot of things that happen in the background in this building and in the Public Service.

I think of my former role in the Cabinet Office. I want to play tribute to the Cabinet Office staff who write the blue books and the red books and prepare the incoming government briefs and arrange the process of the change of government so that it does occur smoothly and within the expectations of elected members and also within the expectations of the community. I want to pay tribute to those people in leadership within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and particularly Alison Lloyd-Wright in her role as the head of the Cabinet Office at the time of the change of government.

The Premier reflected on people who put up their hand for elections and did not get across the line, people who may or may not have formally been part of this place and people who lost their seats. There is a humanity in political activity. We are more than names on the ballot paper. We are more than a tallying of votes that gets one person across the line.

There are people with livelihoods, friends, family members who go to hell and back to seek to represent their community in the lead-up to elections. They put their financial resources on the line. They put their careers on the line. They put their family lives on the line, in some cases, and some do not make it. That is the nature of democracy. I do want to name a few people on our side of the house who were here when we rose for the summer recess last year and who did not return when we resumed to parliament in May 2022.

Those are Paula Luethen, Rachel Sanderson, Dan van Holst Pellekaan, Steve Murray and Richard Harvey and, in particular, two people who were very close personal friends of mine: Carolyn Power and Corey Wingard. I have many friends here, but I am that bit lonelier because those people who had geographical proximity to my part of the world do not join me now. I do not see them at community events and our paths do not cross quite as much. At this time of year, it is worth thinking and reflecting on those people whose careers did not perhaps get to last as long as they had hoped.

I want to take the opportunity to thank my leadership team. As leader of the Liberal Party, I am supported by the deputy leader, the member for Morialta, in the lower house and in the party more broadly and, in the upper house, the Legislative Council leadership team of Nicola Centofanti MLC and Jing Lee MLC, the leader and the deputy leader. It is a great group, it is a unified group and we have a big job to do. I am so grateful for the work they do to support me and also the broader shadow cabinet and the entire parliamentary team—all 24 Liberal Party members in both the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council who support the Liberal Party in this place.

I want to thank in particular my staff as leader of the party but also as a former minister. Most of my staff came with me to the leader's office, particularly my former Chief of Staff, who is still with

me in the leader's office, Ken Ross; Stuart Peevor, Pia George, Lucy Huxter and Ryan Smith—previously my media adviser and now my Chief of Staff. I love the continuity of our team and the fact that we are still largely working together. I also want to particularly thank Rosemary Shultz, who retired in July but served for four years as my executive assistant when I was minister. That followed on from a 30-plus year career in South Australia's Public Service.

I want to thank some additional people now working in the leader's office, including Natalie Duenn, Alycia Martin, Patrick Moller, Elise Baker, Ben Harvy, Julian Robertson, Samuel Murison and also our team of trainees who come and go across our party. The role of trainee and the leg-up it gives people, the exposure into working life often for the first time, should not go unrecognised. I want to particularly thank Tianrun Lin, Oliver Hale, Matthew Clemow, Zarima Shikova, Lachlan Quinn, Tomer Sitrin and Nicholas Shortland for their contribution across the Legislative Council and in the leader's office as trainees.

The Premier alluded to the leadership role and the challenge that can present in terms of being present in one's electorate. I do feel that pressure. I try very hard to be in the electorate whenever possible, but there is a team there headed by Jana Kranixfeld and supported by Ben Freeman and Rachel Koch and, for part of the year, Stuart Brennan, who now works for the whip. They hold the electorate office together down there in Hallett Cove. We have actually had three trainees this year—not because they have been treated badly or anything but just the sort of weird timing. I have had Nathan Howse, then for a little while I picked up Corey Wingard's trainee, Stuart Brennan, who I spoke about a moment ago who now works for the whip, and for the last couple of weeks I have had Jaya Diercks as the trainee in the electorate office as well.

It takes a lot to keep an electorate office going, and it takes a lot to ensure a leader's office functions effectively, so I think it is really worthwhile paying tribute to the work they do. They go above and beyond, they work extra hours and they are contributing to our state's democracy and the representation of the 30,000-odd people who live in the seat of Black in the southern suburbs.

One of the most significant events in many ways to happen for decades, but certainly this year, was not election wins or losses but the passing of Her Majesty The Queen. We saw an example of parliament coming together in a highly symbolic way during that time. There are many ways of parliament and democracy working at its best to deliver laws and create change in this state, but the passing of the Queen really saw an elevation of the role of this place with condolences for Her Majesty, paying tribute to that long life and great service, and also the proclamation of the King. It was a pleasure to be able to work alongside the Premier at that time and particularly see the role of the Governor of South Australia come to the fore.

I am exceptionally proud of the Governor of South Australia. I think she is a class act, for want of a better phrase. She is currently representing this state overseas. Her Excellency Frances Adamson AC is someone who brings dignity, intellect and a level of deep public service to that role. We saw that absolutely exemplified when the Queen passed away and with the proclamation of the King. I am sure the government, particularly the Premier and his ministries, and certainly when I was a minister and now opposition leader, sees that up close and personal. I see the contribution that the sovereign's representative in our state makes. I think it is worthy of recognition, particularly given the emphasis that was put on her role in September this year.

Parliament House—our two chambers, the dining rooms, the canteens, the library and the many things that bring this place together to make it function—is the sort of complex hierarchy and world that I do not pretend to understand, and do not necessarily want to, but it works. With a change of government and a new ministry, there is a change of emphasis, a change of direction, and the continual expectation that this place modernises while also cleaves onto its traditions. That happens not because of us because, let's face it, very few of us, apart from perhaps the deputy leader and the member for West Torrens, really know what goes on here, but there are lots and lots of people who support us to do our job.

In this house, there are Rick Crump and David and his team and the clerks and advisers who sit behind Rick and David. In the Legislative Council, there is Chris Schwarz and his team. These are people who have decades and decades of knowledge, holding this place up and holding it together, to be honest. We have Hansard, with Andrew Cole and his team. As the Premier mentioned,

they sit there and listen to us, and sometimes who knows what they think—we would not even want to know.

John Weste and his team in the library provide an exemplar service around research and support, particularly to the opposition in a way that you do not quite need as much of in government. We are so grateful for the role of John and his team.

There is Creon Grantham and the catering team. Someone once said to me that in South Australia you have the Opposition Leader and the Premier and the Governor and then you have Creon. I think there is some truth in that, having organised a couple of events here in the last few weeks. But it all works, doesn't it? Of course, we have the Blue Room team as well and Nicky with her celebrity status now having appeared on *MasterChef*. We have IT with Martin Barbary and his team—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: *My Kitchen Rules*.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Did I get the wrong one? Sorry, Nicky. *My Kitchen Rules*—they are one and the same. They are just on different channels. I have really stuffed this up now. I cannot clip this and put it on Facebook now. Anyway, Martin Barbary and his team at PNSG hold together the IT and cyber side of this, which is becoming increasingly complicated with cybersecurity needs. We also have David Woolman and John and their team with building services. They are all people who keep this place ticking over.

For every aspect, whether it is the car park or whether it is the cleaning of the building, there is a whole army of people, many of whom work after hours when we do not see them, to ensure that Parliament House and the buildings that uphold the democracy of our state function effectively and in a way that we can be proud of.

I would like to pay tribute to the government and the role that they have, and particularly the Premier. The Premier said, on the night that he won the election, that we are not enemies but we are adversaries, and that really struck me. It is something that I want to work with the Premier and his team to uphold because I think it is a fundamental principle of what we are all about here.

Often—and I mentioned this at an event that I was at with the Premier not long ago—people apologise to me: 'We had to put you at the same table as the Premier.' I do not mind that; in fact, it happens a couple of times every week, and we have had lunch together today. The Premier and I, just because of the amount of time we spend together at events, see each other a lot. I have immense respect for anyone who leads a political party and anyone who reaches the office of Premier of the state. I think it should not be forgotten that we are not enemies, not close to it.

I want to conclude now by thanking each and every member of parliament in the Legislative Council, in the government, on the crossbench and in the opposition. It is an incredible privilege to be able to represent one's community, and it is an incredible privilege to be able to hold high office in this state. As we conclude the parliamentary year and look to 2023, I think each and every one of us knows and appreciates the unique office that we are honoured to be able to hold.

Christmas can be a challenging time for many people. It is a time when there are more incidents of mental health concern. It is a time when more people contemplate suicide. It is a time when loneliness is magnified, more than at any other time of the year, as people think of things in their past which may no longer be there anymore. It is a time to look in on our neighbours, it is a time to reach out to people we think can be that bit more vulnerable and it is probably a time to say, 'Are you okay?', which is even more important to do than on R U OK? Day because it can be a tough time of year.

But it can also be a really good time of year and, in a state like this, when the weather is getting better there is a great opportunity to get out and about, enjoy each other's company, enjoy the great outdoors and celebrate South Australia and all the things that come with calling this place home. There are a few challenges on the horizon around Christmas in the Riverland, and our hearts go out to those people, but I am sure that community has the resilience and the support to get through it in the coming weeks. People from both sides of parliament will be there to provide them with support at this time.

To everyone, merry Christmas. Stay safe, enjoy time with your friends and families and look in on those who are vulnerable. I look forward to catching up again in 2023.

The SPEAKER (17:42): Before we rise, I add briefly to the very generous remarks that have been made and take this opportunity to thank and amplify those remarks that have been made in relation to the staff who assist us. We have a secure and safe democracy. That is not something that necessarily will continue without the expert assistance of all those around us or without the care that we take to ensure that we are respectful of each other and also of a long tradition that has brought us to this place.

It is not right for me to name people individually. Some have been named, and that is right in the context of the remarks that have been made. But can I say that our executive house staff and Legislative Council executive staff are particularly diligent, thoughtful and skilful and always have an eye to good judgement. Their advice to me is deeply appreciated, and I know their advice to you is deeply appreciated too.

House attendants, you seem to be able to predict matters that need resolving before even any of us have contemplated those matters. It probably reflects your dedication and passion for a unique and discrete part of the Public Service. Your commitment to this building is more than your presence here; it is a commitment to our democracy. We are very grateful.

To Hansard, even just this morning you had already predicted a matter that I had in mind. Your care and skill are remarkable. We are very grateful for your service too.

To the Blue Room, the engine room of this building, we are particularly grateful for your assistance, good humour, encouragement, reflection and also, I might say, your political advice from time to time. It has always been apt; I hope to always take it. To the dining room and kitchen staff, thank you. We spend a good deal of time in this building, it is a second home for many of us and I am sure that will continue throughout our careers. We really enjoy your company. We are grateful for all the support that you offer to us. You have become an extended part of our family, as I say, and as all members here are cognisant of.

To committee staff, you assist us through the cycles of political life and your expertise is greatly appreciated. To building services, thank you for keeping this beautiful but sometimes creaking building going. It is a genuine pleasure for all of us to work in this place. It is a place of deep history and significance. It is a parliament but also a working museum.

Can I extend my thanks, too, to the library. We have much more than a library in this place. It is a record-keeping facility, it is an archive for all of our democratic history and, of course, in the way that it is being run at the moment it is also an absolute jewel in our crown, an opportunity for us to bring in dignitaries and diplomats, representatives from elsewhere and share a little of South Australia, of our history and our democratic culture. Long may that be the case at a time when perhaps libraries are not quite as widely embraced as they have been in earlier years. Ours remains absolutely essential to all the functions that we perform in this place.

I think it is right for me to say, too, that I have a good deal to do with the whips from time to time—in fact, mostly at all times. I am very grateful for their good humour. Can I say to members on both sides, thank you for your grace and good humour. There is very little rancour and discord in this place.

If we look to other similar democracies, what becomes clear is that we have something unique in South Australia. It really is remarkable, and it depends on each of us, all of us living in each other's pockets as we do—perhaps in a similar style to Old Parliament House in Canberra, I am told, in this building. It requires us all to maintain a degree of goodwill, and, as the leader has rightly identified, for us to reflect on what it is we are doing and on the fact that of course we are not enemies but we have different opinions and different directions and trajectories, and different things that we want to focus on in our time in politics.

Can I thank again all staff in this place and can I wish you all a happy, safe and restful Christmas.

Bills

**TOBACCO AND E-CIGARETTE PRODUCTS (TOBACCO PRODUCT PROHIBITIONS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

LIVESTOCK (EMERGENCY ANIMAL DISEASE) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the amendment made by the House of Assembly without any amendment.

At 17:48 the house adjourned until Tuesday 7 February 2023 at 11:00.