

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 21 February 2023

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.

Bills

ADVANCE CARE DIRECTIVES (REVIEW) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 February 2023.)

The SPEAKER: Minister, if you speak you close debate.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (11:01): I think I already have, but in any case I thank all members for their contributions.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

New clause 5A.

Ms PRATT: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Pratt-1]—

Page 4, after line 8—Insert:

5A—Amendment of section 15—Requirements for witnessing advance care directives

Section 15—after subsection (1) insert:

- (1a) Without otherwise limiting the requirements that may be set out in regulations made under this section relating to witnessing an advance care directive, the regulations—
- (a) cannot require an advance care directive to be signed or witnessed in a particular order; and
 - (b) cannot require a substitute decision-maker appointed under the advance care directive to have completed a part of an advance care directive form before the advance care directive can be witnessed.

I rise to move an amendment to section 15 of the act, which prescribes the requirements of the witnessing of advance care directives. The order of signing in an advance care directive is different from other legal documents such as a will or enduring power of attorney. Currently, the Advance Care Directives Regulations 2014 (SA) require a substitute decision-maker to complete and sign the relevant part of an ACD form prior to an ACD being executed by the person making the appointment.

The rationale is that this sequence of signing will ensure that the person making the appointment is able to inform the substitute decision-maker about their values. However, in our view, the rigid order of signing provisions provide little additional assurance that substitute decision-makers

(SDMs) understand their roles and responsibilities. On the other hand, they significantly increase the risk that an ACD will not be signed by the principal in time for when it is needed.

Following fresh consultation on the bill and in particular with the Law Society, the opposition has decided to move an amendment to remove the order of signing provisions currently required under the act. The society has raised concerns that the current order of signing causes unnecessary delay in the finalisation of an ACD, where the person making the appointment is extremely ill or becoming increasingly forgetful and may lose capacity.

They also highlight the difficulties for practitioners and clients living in rural, regional and remote areas in getting ACDs finalised on short notice. I am also advised by the legal profession that measures such as digital signatures will not be adequate in addressing these concerns, as often elderly clients face a number of barriers in accessing technology.

The order of signing of ACDs has been an ongoing issue for the Law Society. They recently put forward a petition signed by nearly 900 of its members seeking the order of signing requirements to simply be removed.

I move this amendment to section 21(3) of the act to expedite completion of ACDs and to protect the validity of an appointment of a substitute decision-maker (SDM), no matter the order of signature by the signatories. To our knowledge, no other jurisdiction, state or territory imposes such onerous order of signing provisions with respect to advance care directives. The opposition moves this amendment to ensure that ACDs are as accessible as possible to all South Australians.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I indicate that the government is opposing this amendment. Safeguards have been put in place to protect South Australians who choose to record their wishes in an advance care directive. If this amendment is passed, those safeguards would be removed and, I am advised, potentially place the community at increased risk of coercion.

In line with the requirements of regulations 7 and 8 of the Advance Care Directives Regulations 2014, by signing last, the authorised witness is required to certify that (a) substitute decision-maker or decision-makers have completed the relevant parts of the advance care directive form; (b) substitute decision-makers accept being appointed; and (c) they have read and understood its associated substitute decision-maker guidelines. These objectives would not be met if the document was witnessed before the substitute decision-maker had signed.

It is acknowledged that the order of signing an advance care directive is different from other legal documents such as a will or an enduring power of attorney. However, this approach allows an authorised witness to satisfy their legal obligations by making sure that the advance care directive maker understands the nature and effect of their advance care directive, including the appointment of substitute decision-maker or decision-makers, and strengthens the process to ensure that there is no coercion involved in making it.

The Law Society of South Australia has been advocating for regulations 7 and 8 to be revoked since 2015. They believe that an advance care directive form should be signed by the substitute decision-maker after it has been signed by the person to whom an advance care directive relates—that is, after the advance care directive has been witnessed. This would enable the person making their advance care directive to potentially complete it in one sitting with their lawyer. The act, regulations and education material developed to assist the completion of an advance care directive are intended to support people to write their own advance care directive.

Now, some people may choose to use a lawyer; however, this is not a legal requirement. It is not always an affordable option. It is encouraged that an advance care directive be thoughtfully considered, which can take time, and should involve conversations with family, friends and a substitute decision-maker or makers about the person's wishes and preferences when it comes to all aspects of an advance care directive. It is not intended to be a process to complete in one sitting with a lawyer.

Furthermore, ensuring the wishes of the advance care directive maker are known and discussed with their substitute decision-makers before the creation of a legal document that grants them responsibility increases the likelihood that those wishes will be respected and properly acted upon when required. The Advance Care Directives Act 2013, the regulations and subsequent forms

and website were developed in 2014 through a comprehensive consultation process with many stakeholders, which included the Law Society of South Australia.

In 2019, under the previous Marshall Liberal government, Professor Wendy Lacey undertook a review of the act, and her findings were tabled in parliament on 1 August 2019. Professor Lacey looked extensively into the signing process in her report, concluding—as stated in Finding 8—'There is no practical or legal basis for changing the order of signing with regard to ACDs', and consequently made no recommendation in relation to this matter.

Additionally, in 2021, the Department for Health and Wellbeing conducted a consultation process via YourSAy about the proposed changes to the act. In 2022, a further YourSAy consultation was conducted about an advance care directive form and DIY guide redesign project. No feedback regarding this matter has been received from the community or any other organisation, apart from the Law Society of South Australia.

The Department for Health and Wellbeing has previously sought advice regarding the concerns raised by the Law Society of SA from the Legal Services Commission of South Australia and the Office of the Public Advocate. Neither of these organisations support the proposal to change the order of signing. Furthermore, during her second reading speech, the member for Frome raised concerns about the potential risks that an advance care directive will not be signed by the principal in time for when it is needed if the order of signing is not changed.

The Department for Health and Wellbeing has not received any feedback from the general public indicating that this situation is occurring. However, if this should occur that an advance care directive has not been validly completed before capacity is lost, information recorded by an individual about their wishes can still help in guiding the decisions made on their behalf. These decisions will, however, be made by the person responsible as defined in section 14(1) of the Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Act 1995.

I stress the importance of having early conversations with any potential substitute decision-maker or makers and obtaining their acceptance and signature on the form before it is appropriately signed and witnessed. To further support timeliness in completing an advance care directive, especially when a substitute decision-maker is living interstate or internationally, the Department for Health and Wellbeing is currently exploring the use of digital signatures, which will help facilitate a timelier approach to obtaining signatures. Therefore, the government is opposing the amendment as moved, which would revoke the order of signing as stipulated in the regulations.

Amendment negatived.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

FAIR WORK (FAMILY AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE LEAVE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 February 2023.)

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (11:14): I rise today in support of the Fair Work (Family and Domestic Violence Leave) Amendment Bill 2022 to amend the Fair Work Act 1994. I was proud to stand as a member of the Malinauskas Labor team during the state election, presenting a suite of progressive policies to make South Australia a better place. I, like the many other Labor women running for parliament, was grateful that within my team I had the leadership and guidance of our then shadow minister for women and the other compassionate women leaders already in our parliament, including our steadfast then deputy opposition leader.

This bill is fundamental to the commitment to women that we took to the election—a commitment focused on advancing gender equality and employing the power of government to bring an end to domestic violence. By introducing a new minimum employment condition for public sector and local government employees of 15 paid days of family and domestic violence leave each year, we are taking an important step toward fulfilling that commitment.

Currently, state system employees' entitlement to family and domestic violence leave is governed by an inconsistent set of policies, procedures and industrial instruments. Public sector employees are entitled to some paid leave through a determination of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment, and local government employees are entitled to unpaid leave under their awards. This simply is not good enough. At their most vulnerable time, South Australians experiencing domestic and family violence should not be worried about their income. Workers experiencing domestic and family violence should not be made to choose between their safety and their financial security and the support they need. They should have both, they deserve both, and the successful passage of this bill will go a long way in ending that choice for many South Australians forever.

It is reforms such as these that make me proud to be Labor and proud to be union. We must pay credit to the tireless work of the Australian Services Union and the Australian Workers' Union for organising and campaigning to bring about this policy shift. Our movement is at its best when our party not only hears but listens to and actions the calls of the union movement. Our friends in the ASU and AWU have been calling for this reform for 15 years, leading the charge for family and domestic violence leave in the local government sector. I thank the members, organisers and officials of these unions, including Abbie Spencer and Peter Lamps, and indeed the broader union movement who have tirelessly advocated for this change.

I am proud to stand here as a member of the Malinauskas Labor government seeking to legislate that change. Legislating paid family and domestic violence leave empowers victims and survivors to seek the support they need and put in place any safeguards they may need. Family and domestic violence leave can be used for any purpose relating to a worker experiencing family and domestic violence. Such reasons could include, but are not limited to, seeking health care, legal or court proceedings, receiving legal advice, or finding alternative living arrangements. No-one should be made to choose between the safety and security these services provide and the economic security of work.

It is important to also point out that workers should not be punished for accessing these entitlements. That is why, unlike other leave entitlements, family and domestic violence leave will be calculated including any penalty rates or overtime payment that that worker would ordinarily receive, and this leave is available to all public sector and local government workers, whether they be full-time, part-time or casual.

This bill also provides additional protections for workers taking family and domestic violence leave. The last thing victim survivors need is a boss making life more challenging than it already is. Our amendments to the Fair Work Act include robust confidentiality requirements so that workers can rest assured that their personal information will be treated appropriately. Neither bosses nor human resources can copy or retain evidence provided by their workers to support a leave claim. Employers would also be prohibited under this reform from requesting information from an employee about the nature and extent of the domestic and family violence they are experiencing. This bill makes it a criminal offence for an employer to disclose information obtained through these processes without the consent of the employee to whom the information relates.

Enshrining a minimum 15 days of family and domestic violence leave each year for public sector and local government workers sends a clear message to the business sector, the labour market and local communities across our state. South Australia's biggest employers, the public sector and local government sector, do not and will not tolerate family and domestic violence.

As of this month, private sector workers are also entitled to 10 days of paid family and domestic violence leave, thanks to legislation passed by the Albanese Labor government last year. It comes as no real surprise that it took a Labor government federally to also introduce this reform. With a look across the chamber today, it is abundantly clear that the Labor Party is not only the party for working people and families but also the party for women. While anyone can experience domestic and family violence, it is overwhelmingly women who do.

The Australian Bureau of Statistics tells us that one in four women have experienced intimate partner violence since the age of 15. One in four women have experienced emotional abuse by a current or former partner since the age of 15 and, on average, a woman is killed by a current or

former intimate partner every 10 days. This cannot just be seen as a women's issue. We must all play a role in ending domestic and family violence. We must all continue to challenge attitudes and behaviours we see that consider women lesser than men. We must all work to ensure the next generation understands what respectful relationships look like. And we must all work together to dismantle the systems of power that allow some men to perpetrate this violence.

I acknowledge that men are also victims and survivors of domestic and family violence, and I acknowledge the men we lose to family and domestic violence. My focus is on women today because four in every five perpetrators of this violence are men, and this must end. Even if we locked up and threw away the key of every current and future non-male perpetrator of family and domestic violence today, we would only reduce these cases by 5 per cent. Men are the overwhelming perpetrators of this violence and the buck must stop with them.

I am bewildered by the men in the social media comments section of my colleagues and I who, at even the slightest allusion to the fact that women make up the overwhelming majority of victims of family and domestic violence, bring up often an entirely unrelated matter, which does disproportionately affect men. To these men, not all men, I ask this: where is your energy every other day?

Over the weekend before last, I stood alongside women from this place, business and community to honour and mourn all the women lost to violence in 2022. As it has been every year I have attended, it was a moving event. I love women coming together to support other women—women standing together—but, gosh, I hate that we have to. I hate that events like this have to happen. I dread the fact that we will be back on the steps of parliament next year at the same time doing the exact same thing.

When I had the privilege of working in this space at Women's Safety Services South Australia (WSSSA, as it is affectionately referred to), I would think about how sad it is that the organisation has to exist at all. There are well over 120 staff spread over six locations, all working to support women and children experiencing domestic and family violence—and that is just one organisation of many. Imagine a world where these organisations all become obsolete because, to put it bluntly, men choose to stop abusing women. It breaks my heart that that sounds like a complete fairytale because it should not.

Mr Speaker, do you know when the phrase, 'When is International Men's Day?' most searched online? It is 8 March—International Women's Day. I mention this fact because it is important. It is important to acknowledge that the systems of power and privilege that allow some men to perpetrate family and domestic violence are the same systems that keep us divided and perpetuate the myth that gender equality comes to the detriment of men. That is what we are seeking to change, and it is bills such as these that will go a long way for achieving gender equality for everyone.

In summary, all power to the men who walk beside us such as those I am often surrounded by in parliament—those who are supporting legislation such as this. While the majority of domestic and family violence perpetrators are men, the majority of men are not perpetrators. We can and we must all strive together to achieve gender equality.

I also wish to speak to another aspect of this bill, which seeks to amend the objects of the Fair Work Act to include promoting and facilitating gender equality, ensuring this is taken into account by the South Australian Employment Tribunal when determining future industrial entitlements.

The Malinauskas Labor government has a strong vision for achieving gender equality and one day bringing an end to domestic, family and sexual violence and all other forms of disrespect and discrimination that disproportionately affect women within our community. We are committed to working alongside service providers, women's organisations, women experiencing domestic violence, and other stakeholders to use all possible opportunities available to us to prevent and end domestic and family violence.

Already our state government has restored the \$800,000 of funding over four years that was shamefully cut from the Women's Domestic Violence Court Assistance Service by the former state government. This vital service supports women with intervention order applications, variations and

revocations, ending tenancies, and liaising with police to report breaches of intervention orders. We also reinstated the \$1.2 million of funding to Catherine House that was, again, disgustingly cut by the former state government. Catherine House is an incredible service providing a safe and secure place for women experiencing homelessness, often as a result of family and domestic violence.

This bill is an example of our government's commitment to enacting a range of legislative change, preventive actions and policy, and options for recovery to help women stay safe. I stand proudly as a member of the Malinauskas Labor government, a state government that is unapologetically pro worker and relentlessly against family and domestic violence. Domestic and family violence has no place in our community. Everyone should feel and be safe. I commend this bill to the house.

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (11:26): I rise today to make a contribution and indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition in regard to this bill, the Fair Work (Family and Domestic Violence Leave) Amendment Bill 2022. I also indicate the opposition's support for this bill and, more broadly, this important issue, and indicate that the opposition wholeheartedly supports the intentions of the bill and the bill itself.

In short, the bill makes changes to state family and domestic violence leave arrangements to allow greater access and support, and also includes promotion and facilitation of gender equality as an object of the Fair Work Act. The minister, in her contribution, referenced the fact that addressing domestic and family violence is everybody's responsibility, and we most certainly concur with that. It is also true that nobody who experiences domestic and family violence should have to make the choice between securing their safety and accessing the support they need and their financial security.

I will keep my remarks short because, as I have indicated, the opposition fully supports this bill and does not wish to frustrate its passage in any way. This bill is another step forward towards preventing and ending the scourge of domestic and family violence. It adds to the bipartisan efforts of this parliament in addressing these issues.

Under the previous government, legislative reform measures included the introduction of changes to the Statutes Amendment (Domestic Violence) Act 2018. These included expanding the definition of abuse and increasing penalties for repeated and violent breaches of intervention orders, allowing police-recorded interviews with victims to be admissible evidence in court, and introducing a standalone criminal offence of non-fatal strangulation.

There were also amendments made to the Victims of Crime Act 2001, which removed the requirement for victims, including victims of domestic and family violence, to have any contact with the perpetrator when accessing compensation, as well as the abolition of the defence of provocation. New measures and programs that were introduced over the last four years include the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme trial, and we also funded the Department for Correctional Services to provide victims with information about a perpetrator's custody status and parole conditions. We also introduced the 24/7 DV crisis line, provided 40 new crisis accommodation beds, and provided funding to operate DV safety hubs in regional areas. These are just a few of the programs and initiatives implemented over those past four years.

We would like to go into committee briefly to tease out some operational questions and to provide some further context and guidance for both employers and employees. It is unfortunate that there is always more work to be done in this space, and this parliament, I am confident, is up to the challenge of continuing to make forward progress in this area.

I commend this important bill to the house, and look forward to its speedy passage through this place.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (11:30): I rise to speak on the Fair Work (Family and Domestic Violence Leave) Amendment Bill 2022. One in four women has experienced intimate partner violence since the age of 15. Domestic violence includes physical, sexual, emotional, financial and psychological abuse.

Sexual assault or sexual violence can include rape, sexual assault with implements and enforced prostitution, being forced to watch or engage in pornography and being forced to have sex with friends of the perpetrator.

Family violence is a broader term that refers to violence between family members, as well as violence between intimate partners. It involves the same sorts of behaviours as described for domestic violence. The term 'family violence' is the most widely-used term to identify the experiences of Indigenous people and many people within migrant communities, because it includes a broad range of marital and kinship relationships in which violence may occur.

Emotional and psychological abuse can include a range of controlling behaviours, such as control of finances, isolation from family and friends, continual humiliation, threats against children and threats of injury or death. This bill introduces a new minimum employment condition for public sector and local government employees of 15 days paid leave of family and domestic violence leave each year.

The bill also amends the objects of the Fair Work Act to include promoting and facilitating gender equity to ensure that this is taken into account by the South Australian Employment Tribunal when determining future industrial entitlements. This follows the 10 days of paid and family domestic violence leave introduced for private sector employees by the Albanese federal Labor government last year, which came into effect this month.

Family and domestic violence leave can be used for any purpose relating to the worker experiencing family and domestic violence, including but not limited to attending medical appointments, court proceedings, receiving legal advice and relocating residences.

This leave is an important safeguard to make sure that people attempting to escape family and domestic violence situations do not have to choose between their safety and independence on the one hand and their economic security on the other.

A report commissioned by the Australian Migrant Resource Centre, 'Working with New and Emerging Communities to Prevent Family and Domestic Violence Good Practice Resource', provided the following summary of how domestic family violence impacts culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) communities. I quote:

- With the changing cultural and linguistic composition of Australia, the proportion of victims of domestic and family violence with immigrant and refugee backgrounds is likely to increase necessitating service systems that are culturally appropriate and able to implement targeted responses.
- Disclosures and help-seeking can be complicated by factors relating to culture, religion, language, past refugee experiences, current settlement experiences, citizenship status, financial insecurity, a lack of access to appropriate services and an absence of family and friends for support.
- Mainstream service systems are generally not equipped to respond adequately in relation to the specific needs of migrant and refugee women.
- Exposure to family violence for migrant and refugee women can include extended family members, including family members living overseas and intersecting cultural factors, such as dowry systems [and forced marriage].

There are many organisations within my portfolio of multicultural affairs that are doing incredible, engaging and practical work with CALD communities to educate and prevent domestic violence, and I would like to take this opportunity to commend them. These include but are not limited to the Australian Migrant Resource Centre, the Australian Refugee Association, the Multicultural Communities Council of South Australia, Multicultural Youth South Australia, Relationships Australia and the Zahra Foundation.

This amendment to employment rights within the public and local government sectors sets an important standard for our broader community, including our CALD community. Enshrining this leave will send a clear message to our community and to workers and their families that their

government and the biggest employer in this state, the public sector and local government, do not and will not tolerate domestic violence.

This bill that is before us today builds upon changes to legislation that have been within this house and within the federal sphere as well. It also builds upon the services and information that are provided to people. We talk about the court assistance service to help people when they are presenting to court and the services around emergency housing.

As a former minister for social housing, one of the most important things was the support of increased security on houses when the perpetrator was asked to leave and therefore the family could remain in the family home and the children could continue going to school and do all the things that they do. The perpetrator was removed, but the support of cameras and increased security was important to make sure that happened.

We have heard many members talk about the DV Disclosure Scheme, which the member for Elizabeth spoke about initially. As a former police officer, he had firsthand experience and knowledge. This is an important tool that we have for people who are worried about their relations in intimate situations with someone they have concerns about. It enables them to ask questions about previous crimes or situations that person has been in. We have tightened the breach of bail conditions as well.

All of these are important steps for us taking that cultural change to accept that we must do things differently. We must protect but, above all else, we must seek out awareness. We must talk about this openly. When I was growing up, this was something that was said: 'What happens down the street behind closed doors is their business.' People did not talk about family violence. People hid it because it was shameful. That is changing. We must step up and speak up.

Culturally, it comes down to how we view women in our society. A lot has changed over many years: the traditional role of a woman who stays home and looks after the family to women who are now participating in greater numbers than ever before in the workforce. But we still know there are issues. There is a lack of equality. The pay gap still exists, not to mention the negative or lower superannuation balances a woman faces on her retirement. Our greatest challenge is older women sliding into homelessness.

Are these all tied to domestic violence? Some are, some are not, but it goes to the nature of equality and equity for women. We must stand up and we must speak up. Just like the member for Elder, I thank the men who walk alongside us. The vast majority of men accept that things have changed, but it is how we speak, how we act and how we support women in the workplace, in the home and in all aspects of life that points to how we view them. This has got to change. It is changing, but there is certainly more work to be done.

As a former minister for the status of women, I had the opportunity of understanding this at a greater depth. I think ultimately we have some questions of culture to ask ourselves about the role of caring in our society. Traditionally, that is seen as a role for women, whether you are caring for younger children or older parents. Until we value that caring role more, this inequity will always be there.

In these situations where domestic violence exists in many different forms, people must feel they have the choice and are supported to leave, and that is why this bill is so important. It builds upon all the work that we have been doing federally and in this state to make sure that, if that is the situation, that person feels supported, and that is what we are doing here today to put this bill forward.

But as we head into International Women's Day in two weeks' time, there are unresolved issues, wider issues, structural issues that we must continue to address. I have to say that, in my time in this house, this attention about family and domestic violence is something that has been supported, generally in a bipartisan way, but of course there is more to do. I thank people for their support of this bill and I commend the bill to the house.

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (11:40): I rise, too, to offer my support for the Fair Work (Family and Domestic Violence Leave) Amendment Bill 2022. All women and children have a right to a life free of violence. Let's take a minute to acknowledge some hard truths. In Australia, one in four women have experienced partner violence; one in four women have experienced emotional

abuse by a current/former partner. In this country, a woman is killed by an intimate partner on average every 10 days, and rates of violence are even higher for certain groups such as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women.

Violence against women and children is a leading cause of homelessness. Children exposed to violence experience long-lasting effects on their development, health and wellbeing. This is why our government has a strong vision for ending the scourge of domestic, family and sexual violence, and other forms of disrespect and discrimination that affect women and families in our communities.

Our government is committed to working alongside service providers, women's organisations, women experiencing domestic violence and other stakeholders to use all possible levers to prevent and end domestic violence. We will be doing everything in our power to better support, protect and empower those affected by domestic violence. This bill introduces a new minimum employment condition for public sector and local government employees of 15 paid days of family and domestic violence leave each year.

The bill also amends the Fair Work Act to include promoting and facilitating gender equity to ensure this is taken into account by the South Australian Employment Tribunal when determining future industrial entitlements. This follows the 10 days of paid family and domestic violence leave introduced for private sector employees by the Albanese Labor government last year, which came into effect this month.

Paid family and domestic violence leave is a workplace entitlement that will save lives. The measure will allow victims of family violence to take time off work without losing income and without losing their jobs. For a long time, we have assumed family and domestic violence is something that just affects you in somebody's home and is something that happens outside of the workplace, but it has a huge interface with work and employers have an increasingly important role to play.

The connection with work and the payment of wages are important in maintaining stability in the lives of those experiencing violence when they are attempting to leave a domestic violence situation. Family and domestic violence leave is an extra layer of support for women and children experiencing violence. Research shows that finances and domestic violence are inextricably linked and that access to a steady income can mitigate the effects of violence and provide avenues out of abuse. Paid family violence leave is one tool to help us to achieve this.

Women in my community who have shared their stories with me tell me that leaving an abusive relationship can be costly. There is the cost of finding a new home, the cost of moving house, medical and counselling bills, legal fees, there can be increased transportation costs due to the loss of access to a car, and then there is the loss of earnings among other financial burdens. Because of this, financial hardship can bind women to abusive relationships.

The economic support that comes from ongoing employment can be critical in supporting women to leave abusive relationships. Providing paid leaves means we are not asking victims to choose between forgoing the necessary support and financial security. It also means that victims may be better able to weather the storm of domestic and family violence.

Addressing domestic and family violence is one step towards closing the gender pay gap, as women who experience violence are more likely to fall behind in their career, into low-paid and casual work or out of the workforce entirely. A worker should not suffer financial disadvantage for choosing to access these entitlements. That is why, unlike other leave entitlements, family and domestic violence leave is calculated including any penalty rates or overtime payments a worker receives. It is also why this leave is available to all employees: full time, part time and casual.

The bill also includes robust confidentiality requirements so that employees can have confidence their personal information will be treated appropriately. Employers cannot copy or retain evidence provided by the employee to support their leave claim. Employers are also prohibited from requesting information from an employee about the nature and extent of the domestic violence they are experiencing.

The bill makes it a criminal offence for an employer to disclose information obtained through these processes without the consent of the employee to whom the information relates. I hope that the implementation of this leave will send a strong message to our community and to workers and

their families that their government and the biggest employers in this state—the public sector and local government—do not and will not tolerate domestic violence.

The Malinauskas government is committed to enacting a range of legislative change, preventative actions and policies that will help keep women safe. Restoring funding to the Women's Domestic Violence Court Assistance Service last year, after it was cut by the former government, is an essential component of this effort. This important service helps hundreds of women affected by domestic violence to access free legal advice and provides invaluable support by helping survivors of domestic and family violence secure the necessary legal protections against an abusive partner.

By restoring this funding, our government is ensuring the service can continue and cope with growing demand, with 800 women accessing support each year. The investment also means that the service can expand its focus to better support those in regional areas, as well as women from culturally diverse backgrounds who may face additional barriers in reporting abuse and seeking support.

We know just how important free, easily accessible legal advice is for those at risk. In recent years this service has helped to protect thousands of SA women and empower them to escape abuse. Our government has also reinstated the \$1.2 million of funding to Catherine House that was cut by the former government. Catherine House is an incredible service, offering a safe and secure place for women experiencing homelessness, often as a result of domestic violence.

In line with our election commitments, we will soon be introducing legislation to criminalise coercive control. Across Australia, communities just like many here in our state are rightly calling for the criminalisation of coercive control, and this reform will represent a major step forward in the need to address the horrendous prevalence of domestic violence.

We know that coercive control is overwhelmingly perpetrated against women by a current or former intimate partner and often precedes other forms of domestic violence. Those who have experienced it are dominated and controlled through intimidation, humiliation, isolation and by removing their sense of self-worth. The controlling behaviour often includes threats and actual violence and, in some cases, tragically precedes murder.

We have been consulting with the domestic and family violence sector and our community to determine the most effective way to legislate against coercive control, how to educate service providers for our community and teach people to recognise it when they see it, and ensure that perpetrators are brought to account for all acts of domestic violence.

We are committed to hearing the voices of victim survivors, at-risk groups, women who live in regional areas, women from diverse cultural backgrounds and Aboriginal women, as we move towards introducing legislation to the South Australian parliament this year. There is still so much that we can do in this space and we intend to progress a range of legislative changes and reforms. We will also be introducing legislation to:

- include the experience of domestic violence as a ground for discrimination in the Equal Opportunity Act;
- require those who have been charged with serious domestic violence offences and granted bail to be electronically monitored as a condition of their bail; and
- review legislation pertaining to consent to sexual activity.

Fifteen days of paid family and domestic violence leave will set a national benchmark. People experiencing domestic violence should never need to make the choice between their financial security and their safety. We will continue to relentlessly speak up and act to prevent and end domestic violence, because domestic, family and sexual violence has no place in our community. I commend this bill to the house.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (11:50): I rise of course to support this important bill. First and foremost I note that, whilst often areas of law reform relating to women's safety are categorised as social issues or social matters, at its core this is fundamentally economic reform undertaken by this government.

Keeping women at work, encouraging women to be at work and removing barriers to women's participation in the workforce are fundamental to opening up a wealth of economic opportunity. A raft of reforms are currently being considered and advocated for from a national perspective that go directly to the heart of that. I will just touch briefly on the commitment by the Albanese Labor government to revolutionise early childhood, particularly the way that it is funded.

When it comes to the lion's share of caring responsibilities, we know that that falls disproportionately and unfairly into the laps of women. I am sure I speak on behalf of all the men in this chamber, particularly the Minister for Health and Wellbeing who has children of similar age to mine, when I acknowledge the enormous work our wonderful, caring, patient partners and wives do—

An honourable member: Forgiving.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: —forgiving partners do, with my beautiful seven year old and two year old at home.

Any policy that seeks to support women into the workforce or to stay in the workforce is good economics. We can talk often about the levers that governments can pull at state and federal level around workforce planning, jobs policy and skills policy. Often that goes to skilled migration or, rightfully so, to skills development at school, but the greatest untapped economic lever that we can pull is greater women's participation in the workforce. This reform, whilst supporting women who are already in work, will fundamentally keep more women in work.

Before being elected to this place, I had the privilege of spending many years as, first, an employee, an advocate and a campaigner and then, ultimately, a leader in our trade union movement. It is something that I am incredibly proud to have done, and to this day I remain an incredibly proud trade union member and trade unionist. Amongst the many roles that I had, and most recently before being elected to this place as secretary of SA Unions, I was part of a campaign to see this very reform enacted.

I still recall back in late 2017, potentially very early 2018, when the then Premier, Jay Weatherill—a terrific leader of this state and wonderful former member for Cheltenham—announced his then Labor government's commitment, if they were to be re-elected, to roll out this reform some four years ago. It was an incredibly proud moment obviously for me personally and for the advocates and trade unions who had been campaigning for this very thing.

In noting that, I want to acknowledge a couple of trade unions particularly that have been advocating for this and dedicating significant time and resources to seeing this reform rolled out both in South Australia and also, as we have seen, on a federal scale. Those unions that largely represent South Australian-based workers within our retained industrial relations system, the Public Sector Association, the Australian Workers' Union, and the Australian Services Union—my union—have done extraordinary work in this space.

They represent the workers who support, care and pick up the pieces in family and domestic violence situations, workers like those who work for Women's Safety Services, an organisation that I have known for a long time and have a particular admiration for having seen the work that they do in my electorate in the western suburbs in supporting women who are fleeing family and domestic violence.

I think there are few organisations in this state better equipped to speak about the impacts of family and domestic violence than the Australian Services Union themselves because they represent the workers on whom this scourge takes such a huge toll. I do commend them, and I want to acknowledge the important role that they have played and how proud they must be today to see this after many years on the pathway to becoming law in South Australia.

There are some \$26 billion or 26 billion reasons that this is important reform. As I said, this is good economic reform, and the 26 billion reasons are the \$26 billion of impact that family and domestic violence has on our national economy each year. So much of that cost is borne by women.

I say women because it is the case almost with no exception that women are the victims of family and domestic violence. It is those women who flee, those women who up until now, both here

in South Australia and also on a national level through the national system, have been forced to take unpaid leave when it comes to taking the simple but profound steps that would involve the loss of income to seek safety from a violent situation at home. Attending counselling appointments, medical appointments and police interviews are just a few examples of things that take a considerable amount of time.

These reforms will absolutely make a profound social impact on these women's lives, but they will also have a profound economic impact on women's lives. As has been said and spoken to by a number of members of this chamber, women's safety is a non-partisan issue. There are things that each government will of course do, and there are things that subsequent and former governments will not have done, but no-one in this place underestimates the importance of policy reform to keep women safe. No-one in this place undervalues the importance of making changes where we can, particularly for a small but important cohort of retained South Australian state industrial relations employees.

I commend this bill to the house and, in doing so, I do so proudly as an individual and as a proud trade unionist who has been campaigning for this for a long time, and I am very proud to see this getting closer to law.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (11:59): I rise to make a brief contribution to the Fair Work (Family and Domestic Violence Leave) Amendment Bill. I want to thank all the previous speakers. I think it has been an enlightening debate. I have missed some of it, but I just want to put on the record my admiration for the member for Elder's speech. She outlined very succinctly the extent of the problem of domestic violence in our society and pulled no punches in saying that this is very much a problem of man on woman violence rather than any other permutation of that. The rates of domestic and family violence perpetrated by men on women far outweigh any other permutation of that violence. I think that is something we absolutely have to accept when we are having debates of this sort. I want to commend the member for Elder for laying it out so clearly.

As many others of us have remarked in this house, the Malinauskas Labor government has a strong vision for achieving gender equity, closing the pay gap and, of course, continuing the project of ending domestic, family and sexual violence and all other forms of disrespect and discrimination in our society.

The rates of domestic violence in all forms throughout Australia are deeply alarming. The statistics speak for themselves. I know that we have heard them, but I do want to read them into the *Hansard* again because I think they are so important. One in four women has experienced intimate partner violence since the age of 15. If we accept that these are accurate figures and not an under-representation based on reporting, this is alarming—this is fully one quarter of women over the age of 15 experiencing intimate partner violence. One quarter of women has experienced emotional abuse by a current or former partner since the age of 15. On average, a woman is killed by an intimate partner every 10 days. Of course, as we all know, rates of violence are even higher for certain groups in our society.

As the member for Elder did outline and expand upon, 95 per cent of people who have experienced physical or sexual violence name a man as the perpetrator of at least one incident of violence, and around four in five family and domestic violence offenders are men. The effects of domestic and family violence are long-lasting and unjust, impacting the development, health and wellbeing of women and, particularly, children. Violence against women and children is also a leading cause of homelessness for women and children.

As I said at the outset, the Malinauskas Labor government takes these issues extremely seriously. An important part of that program is continuing in this state the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme. As the Minister for Police has just pointed out, I do want to acknowledge those on the other side who have worked towards these ends as well. I do particularly want to acknowledge the former member for Bragg, which does not happen that often in this place. I do want to acknowledge her particular work in bringing the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme to something like the form we see now—and long may it continue.

I first raised the issue of a domestic violence disclosure scheme back in 2014 during the Weatherill government. That started a process within the government of looking at this issue and

how we could best model a domestic violence disclosure scheme. It is complicated work; it relies often on disclosure of information that would not necessarily ordinarily be disclosed. Of course, there are legal processes by which information can be disclosed—for instance, to defendants in a case or, indeed, accused persons in a certain case.

But the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme, by its nature, goes beyond that. It allows the proactive disclosure by police, when requested, of information about a potential partner (particularly of a woman) who, despite having no legal proceedings against them at the present time, may present a danger to that woman. The police now have the power to proactively disclose that information. It also allows a potential victim to ask the police for this information.

As I said, it is complicated. There should be safeguards around this. This is information which does not have the rigour applied to it that a legal proceeding would, but it absolutely is very important work. I hope to see the work that has been done expanded in future years.

I missed a lot of the Minister for Police's speech, but I know that the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme works closely within SAPOL and within the Multi-Agency Protective Service (MAPS) structure. It is very much my hope that that structure continues, of course, but also that it can be expanded, because I think it is important work. It touches the surface of these things. The more we chip away at it, and the more we normalise the idea that domestic violence and violence against women is not acceptable in our society, can only be a good thing.

The Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme has been a success and the statistics bear that out. In 2022, under the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme:

- 177 disclosure meetings were scheduled and 156 took place;
- 65 per cent of women at risk had children in their care;
- 12 per cent self disclosed a diagnosed disability and 34 per cent a mental health concern;
- 7 per cent identified as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander;
- 9 per cent were from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds; and
- around 1 per cent identified as LGBTIQ+.

Of the total applications to the DVDS over the past four years, that is, since it was instituted by the member for Bragg and building on work done by the Weatherill government:

- 96 per cent of applications were from women—again, this bears out the observations of the member for Elder in that this is a problem of men perpetrating violence on women almost exclusively;
- 39 per cent were from regional areas; and
- 33 per cent of applications were made by a concerned third party.

When I was a police officer some 20-odd years ago, it is fair to say that the police and the police structures did not take domestic violence as seriously as they do now. That was a fair criticism then and, looking back historically, it remains a fair criticism. There were people back then working in the background in SAPOL—the current commissioner and deputy commissioner among them, who were working diligently and thinking about these things.

That led to police now taking these issues far more seriously aided, of course, by legislation introduced by the Weatherill government around interim orders. The police were empowered to impose orders upon people, almost on the spot, so that women who were immediately endangered did not have to go through a lengthy court process in order to obtain a restraining order. That was a very good move. It was work done by the Weatherill government but very much led by SAPOL and by people like the commissioner, the deputy commissioner and, of course, the late Jo Shanahan whom we have spoken about in this place on many occasions. So I do support this bill.

Another important facet of this bill is that it legislates the facilitation of gender equity for future industrial entitlement determinations by amending the Fair Work Act. These things will be taken into

account by the South Australian Employment Tribunal, and again is another step toward gender equity in our workplaces and in our society.

Violence against women affects all aspects of their lives. It can have a negative impact on their capacity to attend work, with 48 per cent of women who had experienced violence saying that it reduced their attendance at work. People suffering from domestic and family violence may also suffer from financial abuse, leaving them with an economic dependency to stay in that situation. They often do not have the means and the capacity to safely and independently escape.

Having access to paid family and domestic violence leave is an important safeguard, to ensure that people in family and domestic violence situations do not have to choose between their safety and their financial security. A worker should not suffer financial disadvantage for choosing to access domestic and family violence leave entitlements.

That is why, unlike other leave entitlements, with this legislation we go one step further and allow family and domestic violence leave to be calculated, including any penalty rates or overtime payments a worker receives. That is also why this leave is available to all employees—full-time, part-time and casual.

Another important requirement for people attempting to leave domestic and family violence situations is strict confidentiality. This bill ensures that employers cannot copy or retain evidence provided by the employee to support their leave claim. Employers are also prohibited from requesting information from an employee about the nature and extent of the domestic violence they are experiencing. If an employer does disclose information obtained through these processes, this bill makes it a criminal offence, provided the employee to whom the information relates did not provide consent.

As the largest employers in this state, the government, the public sector, and local government will be setting the standard in our community, and to its workers and employers. We do not and will not tolerate domestic violence. I commend the bill to the house.

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (12:09): I am incredibly proud to stand in this chamber, as I often am, when I have the opportunity to speak to my three main passions: defending the rights of and advancing the interests of women, of children and of working people. In fact, it is the defence of working people and the defence of women and children who grew up very much like I did that has given rise to my opportunity to stand in this place at all.

Minister Szakacs said a moment ago, in his contribution, that this is predominantly an economic bill as well, obviously, as a social one, and I could not agree more. The economic benefits will be felt for generations to come.

One in four women has experienced intimate partner violence since the age of 15 and one in four women has experienced emotional abuse by a current or former partner since the age of 15. Historically, on average a woman is killed by an intimate partner every 10 days. Rates of violence are even higher for certain groups such as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women.

Like so many others, I have lived my entire life marred by the perils of family violence, and, as a very young child, was one of many, many South Australians forced to seek accommodation support as a result of that continued violence. In fact, that is a situation that still afflicts my life in many different ways, and I know first-hand that the impacts of family and domestic violence are long-lasting and incredibly complex. Children, particularly, exposed to violence experience long-lasting effects on their development, health and wellbeing, and eventual economic opportunities. I feel incredibly privileged to have found a path out, knowing that for so many that is not possible.

Despite that, the complications of my own childhood led, in my opinion, to the best decision I have ever and will ever make: that is, the decision to join the Australian Labor Party. It is that decision that gave me, eventually, the opportunity to stand in this place and fight for progress. Today we are given that opportunity again, and I am so intensely proud to be speaking to this bill introducing a new minimum employment condition for public sector and local government employees of 15 paid days of family and domestic violence leave each year.

The bill also amends the objects of the Fair Work Act, which, if successful, will now promote and facilitate gender equity, noting the disproportionate impact of family violence on women, and ensure that the South Australian Employment Tribunal considers family and domestic violence when determining future industrial entitlements. We are not the first to take on this responsibility—and it is, in my opinion, a responsibility. Family and domestic violence is everyone's business, and it has taken me until the last year to actually realise that in its entirety.

For me, although speaking out about family and domestic violence is very new, it has been the response of so many in my local community, in my friendship group, in my peer group, and in my family. That response has shown to me how important it is not just to normalise speaking out but to normalise leaving shame at the door and taking action. It was the Albanese Labor government that first introduced 10 days of paid family and domestic violence leave for private sector employees last year, and that had a consequential impact on so many Australians. We have an opportunity now to add to that impact.

Family and domestic violence leave can be used for any purpose related to the worker experiencing family and domestic violence, including attending medical appointments, court proceedings, receiving legal advice, and—one that I think is incredibly important, particularly for those not choosing to or not able to seek formal reparation against their perpetrator—the ability to take leave to move house, to get themselves and their families out of an unsafe environment, often during the day when the perpetrator is out at work.

This leave is an important safeguard to make sure that people attempting to escape family and domestic violence situations do not have to choose between their safety and independence on one hand and their economic security on the other. And we do know that economic security is one of the major barriers that particularly women—but not only women—face when assessing whether or not they are able to leave.

We know that addressing domestic and family violence is one step also towards closing the gender pay gap, as women who do experience violence are more likely to fall behind in their career or find themselves in low-paid and casual work out of necessity. Often we find that women experiencing domestic and family violence are unable to continue in the workforce at all.

A worker should not suffer financial disadvantage for choosing to access these entitlements. That is why, unlike other leave entitlements, family and domestic violence leave is calculated including any penalty rates or overtime payments that a worker would receive. That is also why this leave is available to all employees—full time, part time and casual.

The bill also includes robust confidentiality requirements so that employees can have confidence that their personal information will be treated appropriately. Employers cannot copy or retain evidence provided by the employee to support their leave claims. Employers are also prohibited from requesting information from an employee about the nature and extent of the domestic violence they are experiencing, which for many as we know exacerbates the trauma at home. We know that without this there would be a significant number of people who would simply choose not to request their leave, choosing instead to eat into their annual leave or simply go to work.

The bill also makes it a criminal offence for an employer to disclose information obtained through these processes without the consent of the employee to whom the information relates, which is incredibly important, particularly where there are safety concerns relating to other employees or relationships at work.

Enshrining this leave will send a clear message to our community and to workers and their families that their government and the biggest employers in the state—the public sector and local government—do not and will not tolerate domestic violence.

Our government is staunchly committed to making a real difference to the lives of women in South Australia, and we will continue to speak up and act to prevent and end domestic violence. Domestic family and sexual violence has no place in our community, and we will continue to fight for the rights of those victims who need strong governments on their side. I commend the bill.

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (12:17): I rise in support of the Fair Work (Family and Domestic Violence Leave) Amendment Bill 2022. What we have before us is a bill that strikes a cord with Labor

values, and while I am proud to be associated with a movement that strives to give working people a fair go, I consider it a deep privilege that we can help enshrine another win for workers and their families that I am sure will save lives. I do not say this in jubilation as there is sadly an inevitability that the leave provisions will be used, even if it is my wish that this would never be the case.

As I said in my maiden speech, I come from a wealthy background. Wealth to me does not mean being surrounded by an abundance of money. Instead, my wealth came through growing up in a loving home with two parents in love with each other and their children. To this day it remains unchanged, and my wealth has grown further with the addition of a beautiful wife and a son in my life. Because of this my exposure to domestic violence would appear to be a distant one, and while it has only affected me indirectly it is something that has recently and profoundly crept into my life.

Out of respect to the victim, I will not go into details, but I have now seen firsthand how many lives it shatters. Having said that, I take this opportunity to remind the perpetrator to face up to your actions and start thinking of others ahead of yourself. I would like to say more but this is not the time and the place.

Like so many facets within our society relating to matters such as health, disability, mental health and the environment there is always more to do. We can add domestic violence to this list. Today we are here to debate a new minimum employment condition for public sector and local government employees of 15 days of family and domestic violence leave each year. I am in full praise of this, but in speaking in support I stress that we have a long journey ahead of us.

Noting that this bill follows 10 days of paid family and domestic violence leave introduced for private sector employees by the Albanese government, I take this opportunity to suggest that private employers consider the 10 days as a minimum. The equivalent of two weeks off from work will burn up quickly when considering time is needed for domestic violence victims to attend medical appointments and court proceedings, to receive legal advice and for the inevitable time spent moving home. I can only imagine how difficult it is to be doing this alone, and for this I urge all employers to look beyond the minimum level of leave prescribed and be as flexible as possible during a challenging time.

I also said in my maiden speech that I would do everything I can to increase the time we have to spend with our families. It should be made clear that the 15 days' leave we are discussing here does not tick that box. There is nothing recreational about domestic violence, and it is almost inevitable anyone fleeing from it will use up the leave they have very quickly.

I have seen enough to know victims experience a lot more than just physical pain. Fear, harassment, disruption, mental torture: they are just some of the words that come to mind when I try to imagine what the victims experience. That said, until it happens to you, I am pretty sure my words only scratch the surface. I choose them to express that victimisation cannot be done and dusted in just a few days. Clearly, this is not just a symbolic gesture, but there is symbolism within the actions of this bill that I feel is significant and should not be discounted.

To all the victims out there, I want you all to know that parliament, as is the broader community, is on your side. This is backed up further by some significant provisions that stretch beyond the extra leave in this bill. The bill has robust confidentiality requirements so employees can have confidence their personal information will be treated appropriately. Employers cannot copy or retain evidence provided by the employee to support their leave claim. They are also prohibited from requesting information from an employee about the nature and extent of the domestic violence that they are experiencing.

I am also pleased it will become a criminal offence for an employer to disclose information obtained through these processes without the consent of the employee to whom the information relates. This is vital as the mishandling of information is something in these circumstances that I see to be a major problem. It reinforces the point I made earlier that we do have a long way to go. If we suppress the emotional elements for just one moment and focus solely on the economics of domestic violence, noting it costs the national economy \$26 billion each year, we do have to go further.

We have before us a bill that is doing a good thing, but how we change beyond this requires a high degree of introspection. In saying this, I am looking at myself and all the men around us. I do

not discount that domestic violence happens to men, but it cannot be ignored that 95 per cent of people who have experienced physical or sexual violence name a man as the perpetrator. In commending this bill, I stress as a male we must all do a lot better.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (12:22): I rise today also to speak in favour of the Fair Work (Family and Domestic Violence Leave) Amendment Bill 2022. As you are aware, Mr Deputy Speaker, the federal government legislates for a vast majority of workers in Australia; however, we as a state government have jurisdiction over state and local government employees, and that is what this bill is seeking to target, to bring the South Australian Fair Work Act in line with the federal act with respect to family and domestic violence leave.

Many countries, including Australia, have provision for family and domestic violence leave included as a workplace right in various forms of employment legislation. Family and domestic violence leave is an entitlement that, as you are aware, Mr Deputy Speaker, enables an employee to have either paid or unpaid time off for purposes related to family or domestic violence. It can include things from attending medical appointments, seeking legal assistance, attending counselling or having to relocate to escape a domestic violence situation, a range of issues that make it difficult for people in this position to be able to attend work.

The commonwealth Fair Work Act previously provided an entitlement for leave of up to five days each year. I am really proud that the Albanese Labor government last year amended the commonwealth legislation to increase paid family and domestic violence leave for employees covered through that commonwealth act from five to 10 days. That came into effect this month.

With this bill in South Australia, we are introducing a new minimum employment condition for public sector and local government employees in South Australia providing 15 paid days of family and domestic violence leave each year. That is something we are really proud of.

We cannot underestimate the importance of taking this step as one of many steps that need to be taken to improve the situation. It really is an important safeguard to make sure anyone who is attempting to flee a domestic violence situation does not have to choose between their safety and independence on one hand versus their economic security, either keeping their job or getting paid for the time they are away.

Any worker seeking to escape domestic violence should not really have to have that decision put in front of them and should not have to suffer that financial disadvantage when they are trying to protect their safety and wellbeing—and often, not only their own but those of their children as well. That is why, unlike other leave entitlements, family and domestic violence leave will be calculated to include penalty rates or overtime payments that a worker would otherwise be entitled to receive to make sure they are not disadvantaged. Importantly, it will be available to all employees, including full-time and part-time employees and, critically, to casual employees as well.

As I said, this is just one step towards closing that gender gap, with women who live in domestic and family violence environments more likely to fall behind in their career, more likely to be in low-paid work or casual work and, sadly, many are forced out of the workforce entirely when they suffer this kind of crisis. We are committed to making it as easy as possible for people to leave domestic and family violence situations. The financial abuse and hardship that can result in some people being forced to remain in bad environments are horrendous, and that is why we are taking steps to make sure it is as easy as possible for these victims.

We also are working with the financial industry, the real estate industry to make sure that victims of domestic violence do not bear the brunt of mortgage repayments or rent when they are trying to exit these situations. When mortgages or rents go unpaid, it is often of serious financial consequence for the women, it can be overwhelming and it can put them further behind in trying to rebuild their lives.

While working with these industries to provide financial protection, we are also reinstating funding previously cut by the former Liberal government to provide assistance to women escaping domestic and family violence. I am really proud that we have restored the \$800,000 of funding over four years for the Women's Domestic Violence Court Assistance Service. This is a really important

service that helps women, whether they are applying for intervention orders, trying to end residential tenancy agreements, having to deal with police to report breaches of intervention orders, and it provides a range of other assistance, so it is really important that that funding was restored when we came in to government.

I want to particularly talk on one organisation that has been close to my heart for 10 to 15 years or so, and that is Catherine House. I have been an ambassador for Catherine House for quite some years and a supporter before that. The former Liberal government cruelly cut \$1.2 million of funding from Catherine House when Catherine House has been the only women's homelessness service in South Australia. Those funds were desperately needed for their emergency crisis accommodation at Catherine House. Deputy Speaker, as you are aware, we have reinstated that funding and it was really important when we came into government that we did that.

The fastest growing cohort of women facing homelessness are women over the age of 50. That is my mother. Deputy Speaker, I am sure that is your mother. They are the types of women who, in the wrong situation, are falling into homelessness. That is a really sad state of affairs that we need to take action on and we need to support the organisations that support those women.

When the funding was reinstated to Catherine House, I know from my conversations with them that they breathed a massive sigh of relief. It is an incredible service offering safe and secure accommodation for women experiencing homelessness, often as a result of fleeing domestic violence situations. Catherine House is a not-for-profit organisation based in South Australia. It provides not only accommodation but also further wraparound supports, mental health supports and education services, getting these women job-ready from the emergency accommodation right through to finding them stable accommodation for them to be able to set up their new lives.

It is really important that we are supporting organisations like that, and particularly the emergency accommodation and the counselling and advocacy that they provide. This sort of service not only improves women's health and wellbeing, it sets them on a path to achieve their own personal goals. As I said, Catherine House does offer a range of various programs including financial and literacy ones—and there are law firms that provide pro bono advice to help women at Catherine House—as well as basic computer skills and job readiness training. It provides that whole gamut to get these women back on track and surviving the situation of domestic violence.

One of the programs is the Sow and Grow program. It provides opportunities for women to develop new skills and social connections through gardening and through food preparation. As a by-product of the program, the Catherine House team that produces the meals there gets fresh produce from the garden. The primary goal of Catherine House is to break that cycle of homelessness and empower the women they serve through the provision of services and to support and help them to overcome the challenges they face and to achieve their independence—and part of that is the training and education they get through programs like that.

I continue to proudly support Catherine House and I am very grateful for the services they offer to the women in our community. From a whole-of-government approach we are committed to working with a range of service providers, women's organisations, women themselves experiencing domestic violence and other key stakeholders in order to use every lever at our disposal to prevent and end domestic and family violence.

We are committed to enacting a range of legislative change, preventative actions and policies and options for recovery to help women ensure their safety at all times in our community. Violence against women is not just a problem for the government to deal with. We do need the assistance of the not-for-profit sector. We need the support of the business community, our community at large, and our faith groups. We all need to work together to deal with this problem.

From the age of 15, one in four women have experienced intimate partner violence or have experienced emotional abuse by a current or former partner. That is an awful statistic. What is worse is that one woman is killed by an intimate partner in Australia every 10 days. Every 10 days. These women, these victims, are why we need to put in place measures like this to ensure people have the freedom and the ability to be able to flee a domestic violence situation and have the support services around them to help them survive.

Domestic and family violence has a real monetary cost too: \$26 billion a year. It is a cost to the national economy. It is a cost borne by victims and their families, businesses that support them and the community. It impacts the ability to work and it often results in people not being able to attend work, and losing their jobs in some cases. This is a common cause of homelessness for women and their children trying to flee domestic violence.

Enshrining in law this leave for our public sector employees sends a really clear message to the community, to workers and their families that this government will not tolerate domestic violence and will do everything in our power to make sure we take action to end that domestic violence cycle. We are staunchly committed to making a real difference here in South Australia to the lives of women and we will continue to work towards the prevention and ending of family and domestic violence. It has no place in our community.

This bill shows our commitment that, should these acts occur, there are measures in place to help these victims, in a non-judgemental and discriminatory manner. With that, I commend this bill to the house.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (12:33): I rise to speak in support of the Fair Work (Family and Domestic Violence Leave) Amendment Bill 2022. I stand here as a feminist, an advocate for equality and as a proud member of the Australian Services Union (the ASU), a union that has been advocating in workplaces across our country for family and domestic violence leave for more than a decade.

ASU members negotiated Australia's first domestic violence leave entitlement in the Surf Coast Shire council over 10 years ago. In February 2023, 10 days of paid domestic violence leave came into effect for all private sector employers across Australia by the Albanese Labor government. This is a historic change that would not have been possible without the hard work and dedication of ASU members across Australia. These workplace-level changes led to a movement that has now changed federal workplace laws, and today it is our chance to make history with this bill.

This bill introduces a new minimum employment condition for public sector and local government employees of 15 paid days of family and domestic violence leave each year. The bill also amends the objects of the Fair Work Act to include promoting and facilitating gender equity to ensure this is considered by the South Australian Employment Tribunal when determining future industrial entitlements.

Family and domestic violence leave can be used for any purpose relating to the worker experiencing family and domestic violence, including but not limited to attending medical appointments or court proceedings, receiving legal advice and relocating residences. This is an important change, as one in four women has experienced intimate partner violence since the age of 15, and one in four women has experienced emotional abuse by a current or former partner since the age of 15.

Further, on average, a woman is killed by an intimate partner in Australia every 10 days. These statistics are horrific and shameful, and my thoughts are with those who have suffered or currently suffer from domestic or family violence. I particularly think of the children exposed to such violence, who will experience long-lasting effects in their development, health and wellbeing and are also at risk of experiencing homelessness with their mum.

People can seek help through 1800RESPECT, and men who need help can call MensLine. I do note that, while four in five family and domestic violence offenders are men, there is also violence against men and against members of our LGBTIQ+ community. Violence against women and children costs our national economy \$26 billion each year, with victim survivors bearing approximately 50 per cent of that cost.

Violence against women affects all aspects of their lives. It can have a negative impact on their capacity to attend work, with 48 per cent of women who had experienced violence saying that it reduced their attendance at work. Therefore, the leave introduced by this bill is an important safeguard to make sure that people attempting to escape family and domestic violence situations do not have to choose between their safety and independence on one hand and their economic security on the other.

Addressing domestic and family violence is one step towards closing the gender pay gap, as women who experience violence are more likely to fall behind in their career, into low-paid and casual work or out of the workforce entirely. A worker should not suffer financial disadvantage for choosing to access these entitlements. That is why, unlike other leave entitlements, family and domestic violence leave is calculated including any penalty rates or overtime payments a worker receives. That is also why this leave is available to all employees—full time, part time or casual.

The bill also includes robust confidentiality requirements so that employees can have confidence their personal information will be treated appropriately. Employers cannot copy or retain evidence provided by the employee to support their leave claim. Employers are also prohibited from requesting information from an employee about the nature and extent of the domestic violence they are experiencing.

This bill makes it a criminal offence for an employer to disclose information obtained through these processes without the consent of the employee to whom the information relates. Enshrining this leave will send a clear message to our community and to workers and their families that their government and the biggest employers in the state—the public sector and local government—do not and will not tolerate domestic violence.

I am proud to be part of a Labor government that is staunchly committed to making a real difference to the lives of women in South Australia. We will relentlessly speak up and act to prevent and end domestic violence. Domestic, family and sexual violence has no place in our community.

We have already restored the \$800,000 of funding over four years to the Women's Domestic Violence Court Assistance Service that was cut by the former government. This important service helps women with intervention order applications, variations and revocations, ending tenancies, and liaising with police to report breaches of intervention orders and other domestic violence issues.

Our government has also reinstated the \$1.2 million of funding to Catherine House that was cruelly cut by the former government. Catherine House is an incredible service offering a safe and secure place for women experiencing homelessness, often as a result of domestic violence.

We are committed to enacting a range of legislative change, preventative actions and policies, and options for recovery that help women stay safe. I thank the Australian Services Union, their organisers and workplace representatives for their hard work every single day fighting for the rights of workers, particularly our most vulnerable in our community. I commend this bill to the house.

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (12:40): I rise in support of this, the Fair Work (Family and Domestic Violence Leave) Amendment Bill. Before coming to this place, my role was to help workers communicate with their employers, to ensure that they were being treated fairly, and to advocate on their behalf.

As an industrial advocate, it was my job to help members understand their rights, support them when they were being treated poorly, and to help support them when they had no-one else to turn to. From time to time, members would call up having issues accessing their leave entitlements, whether it be annual leave, sick leave, parental leave and even bereavement leave, and sometimes a member would call up needing to talk about what options were available to them when they were experiencing domestic violence. Some would feel that they should not or could not let their managers know that they needed to take time off; time to look for a new home, time to attend medical appointments, or time to help their kids adjust.

For a long time, we only really had a few thousand workers whose employers provided their staff with paid domestic violence leave. Opportunities during enterprise agreement negotiations allowed this leave entitlement to be discussed, and we saw some of our other major employers also provide this entitlement. I will call out Westpac, who in 2018 during negotiation committed 20 days of paid leave, and in 2019 Commonwealth Bank offered unlimited leave. These are private companies who understood the need.

I remember when the We Won't Wait campaign to have domestic violence leave to be added to the National Employment Standards began, to ensure all employees from all industries covered by the NES would have access. To me, it seemed like we should have had this in place where, as a

nation, supporting someone who is having to deal with domestic violence—mostly women—should have been something that the Fair Work Commission sought to introduce.

The campaign called for 10 days paid leave back then. Disappointingly, the Fair Work Commission ruled five days unpaid would be sufficient. Sufficient for whom? The employer? The federal government refused to ensure Australian workers had access to paid domestic and family violence leave, despite evidence that it would save lives and cost business just 5¢ a day. To not provide payment for days needed to attend medical appointments, see a lawyer, look for a roof to put over someone's head—often their children as well—prevented many from even asking to take leave.

Not only were they dealing with financial worries that come from a relationship breakdown, they would have to go without pay should they dare to have the courage to tell their employer that they were experiencing domestic violence. Not surprisingly, it took a federal Labor government to introduce paid domestic violence leave. It took a Labor government to understand the importance of supporting victims of domestic abuse, provide them with an income whilst they were dealing with what quite likely is the most scary thing they have ever had to do, and allow them to put food on the table, look for a new home, and have money to afford rent/mortgage payments, so that they had a roof over their heads.

Of course it took a Labor government to do that, and it is a Labor government here in South Australia that is on the front foot again to provide 15 days of paid domestic violence leave for public sector and local government employees. As the state's biggest employer, we are leading the way. This leave means that those people who have finally made the decision to flee an abusive relationship do not have to choose between theirs and possibly their children's safety, and their independence and their economic security.

The leave will cover full-time, part-time and casual employees, including all loadings, penalties and overtime that the worker may normally receive. There will be no punishment for taking the leave. They will not be worse off for needing to take the leave. They should not fall behind because they need to access the leave.

During my time supporting members, I came across examples of where an employee felt like they had to jump through hoops to prove that they were even experiencing domestic violence. They had to provide medical records, letters from doctors, certificates, lawyers' documents, police reports and so on and, on a few occasions, were talked out of even accessing the leave—instead told they had to take annual or sick leave. They often did not even want to ask for the leave, knowing that they would be questioned about their situation.

This legislation will have strong confidentiality requirements so that employees can have confidence their personal information will be treated appropriately. Employers cannot copy or retain evidence provided by the employee to support their leave claim. Employers are also prohibited from requesting information from an employee about the nature and extent of the domestic violence they are experiencing.

The bill makes it a criminal offence for an employer to disclose information obtained through these processes without the consent of the employee to whom the information relates. At a time when an employee is going through such a harrowing experience, which they may have been plagued with for what could have been quite a long time, they should not have to relive the experience with their manager just to be able to take the leave.

One in four women has experienced intimate partner violence since the age of 15, one in four has experienced emotional abuse by a current or former partner since the age of 15, and on average a woman is killed by an intimate partner every 10 days. In the time between now and when we sit here in the house again, a woman will be killed by her intimate partner. It is a startling statistic. Enshrining this leave will send a clear message to our community and to workers and their families that their government and the biggest employers in the state—the public sector and local government—do not and will not tolerate domestic violence.

Our government is here to support women. We know we need to pull all the levers to work hard in achieving gender equality and ending the atrocity that is domestic, sexual and family violence,

and all other forms of disrespect and discrimination that disproportionately affect women in our community.

Unlike the former Liberal government—who cut services to the Women's Domestic Violence Court Assistance Service (a service that helps women with intervention order applications, variations and revocations, ending tenancies and liaising with police) and cut funding to Catherine House (which offers women fleeing domestic violence a secure and safe place to recover)—it has taken a Labor government to reinstate this funding, to bring this legislated domestic violence leave to the house. We are committed to working alongside service providers, women's organisations, and women experiencing domestic violence to do what we can to help end the scourge.

Addressing domestic and family violence is one step towards closing the gender pay gap, as women who experience violence are more likely to fall behind in their career, into low-paid and casual work or even out of the workforce entirely. We are supporting women, we believe in women, and we are standing with women to say enough is enough. I commend the bill to the house.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (12:47): I welcome the opportunity to speak today on the Fair Work (Family and Domestic Violence Leave) Amendment Bill 2022 introduced by the Malinauskas Labor government—a bill for an act to amend the Fair Work Act 1994. I stand proudly that again we are fulfilling another election commitment to South Australians. Today, it is to the victim survivors of domestic violence.

The bill covers workers in the state industrial relations system that covers public sector and local government employees. The recently amended commonwealth Fair Work Act 2009 covers those in the private sector for 10 days' paid family and domestic violence leave. The application of the bill before us today will ensure workers who are victims of family and domestic violence—at a time when they are so vulnerable, often scared, feeling helpless and lost—are supported with being able to access up to 15 days' paid family and domestic violence leave for attending related medical appointments, counselling, relocation, legal proceedings and making safety arrangements.

We know that in the majority of cases (but not all) it is women who are the victims of family and domestic violence. The changes to the act promote gender equity by addressing some of the socio-economic impacts, including the loss of income and employment security. It is not right and it is not fair that those impacted by domestic violence are often forced to make a choice between financial security, independence and their safety.

The legislation before us today will go some way in supporting victim survivors, including the children whose lives are significantly impacted: the physical impact, the impact on their schooling, their day-to-day lives and their wellbeing, at the time and into the future. These changes will help support the victims in making a decision to leave the environment where the violence is occurring—the first step to an improved life for them and their family. I say that because it is not just the immediate family residing in a household that is affected by family and domestic violence. Often, it extends to family members beyond the household—to siblings, parents, grandparents and friends of the survivor victim.

There are circumstances where the ongoing violence, including coercive control, has become so unbearable, impacting so severely on the victim's wellbeing, that it has led to the victim taking their own life, just to end it. I have met with residents who have told me that tragically they lost a family member as a result of domestic violence. Tears rolled down their faces as the parent and sibling of the victim told me of the impact on their lives of losing their daughter and sister, how their lives have irreversibly changed, and how they support legislation that includes coercive control. They told me that as a government we should do whatever we can so that other families will not have to live their days as they do now.

It should never get to this. We must do all that we can to ensure that there is a way out, and I feel confident that this legislation will offer into the future a pathway that to date has not been available. This bill will provide consistency across the state industrial relations system, by inserting a new schedule 3B to the Fair Work Act, providing a minimum standard for paid family and domestic violence leave.

Family and domestic violence leave takes many forms, including physical injury, emotional psychological harm and coercive control of a person's financial, social and personal autonomy. Both full-time, part-time and casual employees are entitled to up to 15 days of paid leave each year at the employee's full rate of pay, including overtime, allowances and loadings.

Importantly, the privacy of the person accessing family and domestic leave is addressed, with confidentiality requirements of the employer. Employees can feel confident that their privacy in the workplace is protected with this bill, as it will be a criminal offence for an employer to disclose information obtained without the consent of the employee.

A former Torrens resident, who spoke and wrote to me about the impact of domestic violence, and the toll it takes on the victim at a time in their life when they feel most vulnerable, told me that the impact of this legislation before us today can and will be life changing. She said, 'You miss days, if not weeks of work. You try and juggle counselling sessions for your kids and you, medical appointments, lawyer visits for document preparation, court appearances, all on top of leaving the family home and having to find rental accommodation. That's why the paid domestic violence leave allocation to the Fair Work Act is fair. It means you don't have to take leave without pay. It means you can feed your kids and pay a bond and the required rent in advance to put a roof over your head. These legislative changes change lives,' she told me.

Our government is determined to address the issue of family and domestic violence in this bill, and with other measures, including those already mentioned by my colleagues, such as reinstating funding to Catherine House. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:53): I also rise to indicate my support for the Fair Work (Family and Domestic Violence Leave) Amendment Bill 2022. Much has been said, and people have gone over what the legislative changes are, so I am not going to add to that in any significant sense except to say that the nub of this bill is to provide 15 days' leave for public servants in this state, and employees of councils, and it comes on top of the Albanese government's initiative to provide 10 days' leave for the private sector.

Any response to domestic violence is going to be layered: elements of it are going to be complex. We can bring about legislative changes and that is important. There are things that we can do as communities and there are things that we can do when it comes to speaking out. The hard challenge is shifting culture so we do not see the death of a woman every 10 days as a result of intimate partner violence. Changing the culture is the challenging part. To a significant degree we still live in a patriarchal culture with, at times, a lot of unspoken assumptions, and misogyny is still a real force in parts of our society.

When I look at some of the communities I represent, the experience of domestic violence can sometimes be different, to a degree. The city always strikes me as somewhat amorphous. There might be local identity in some areas, but when you look at regional communities they have a very strong self-identity, so when someone loses their life as a result of domestic violence the odds are you going to know that person or you are going to know family members or other people related to that person.

Some years ago in Whyalla I attended the opening of a monument to remember those women in our community who have lost their lives as a result of domestic violence. Being at the launch of that memorial it came to mind the number of those women I knew, either directly or indirectly, in my community, and the impact it had on me and the impact it had on others. All the deaths were terrible, but one or two of them were particularly brutal.

I sometimes have people in my community say, 'The police are never around.' That is because these days they focus on some things that are incredibly important. In years gone by—as has been touched on by other speakers—domestic violence was not treated with the seriousness it deserved. It is now, and I do not begrudge the focus of the police when it comes to being the first responders on domestic violence.

If I look wider in my electorate, there are areas where the violence can be intense. I know the statistics but statistics are cold, when you consider that an Aboriginal woman—and I have a number of Aboriginal communities in my electorate—is 45 times more likely to be a victim of domestic

violence or violence than a white woman, and they are five times more likely to be hospitalised. Consider some of the statistics that have come out of Alice Springs: I think there are 14 to 15 beds in the intensive care unit there and, of those, all but one was occupied by an Aboriginal woman who had been incredibly severely bashed. Some of the injuries we are talking about were horrendous.

Of course, legislation like this is not going to make any difference to that particular set of circumstances—that is not to say this bad legislation, quite the opposite—but this is a layered approach. When I look at some of the communities I represent, clearly a lot more needs to be done. I am not trying to imply here that this is just an Aboriginal issue; clearly it is not. When you look at our overall population, most of the women dying are white women, scattered throughout our nation.

It is interesting to note the approach we have taken, in years gone by, to terrorism; it is less so now, but in years gone by one or two people might be killed domestically, and look at the approach that was taken. I do not begrudge that approach, but when you look at the rate of very serious injury, at the rate of death amongst women in Australia, do we bring the same degree of focus to that? I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. P.B. Malinauskas)—

Remuneration Tribunal—No. 1 of 2023—Correction—2022 Review of Remuneration of Members of the Judiciary, Presidential Members of the SAET, Presidential Members of the SACAT, the State Coroner, and Commissioners of the Environment, Resources and Development Court—
Report and Determination

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

Regulation made under the following Act—
Burial and Cremation—Voluntary Assisted Dying

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Radiation Protection and Control—
Fees Notice
Fees Notice (Superseded)

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

State Owned Generators Leasing Co Pty Ltd (SOGLC)—Annual Report 2021-22

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

Wellbeing SA—Pregnancy Outcome in South Australia 2020—Report

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

Education and Care Services National Law—Education and Care Services National
Amendment Regulations 2022

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon. G.G. Brock)—

Local Council By-Laws—
Flinders Ranges Council—No. 8—Local Government Land (Public Facilities)

By the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs (Hon. A. Michaels)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Community Titles—Resolutions
Residential Tenancies—Limit of Amount of Bond

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Planning, Development and Infrastructure—General—Temporary
Accommodation—No. 2

Ministerial Statement

WATKINS, MR K.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:01): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: On Monday 13 February I was informed of the passing of Surf Life Saving South Australia's State President, Kevin Watkins—known as 'Brakey' to those who knew and loved him best.

Mr Watkins was an active surf lifesaving member for a remarkable 55 years having gained his Bronze Medallion in 1967 and immersed his life in the surf lifesaving movement.

He was a life member of his beloved Brighton Surf Life Saving Club, and a much celebrated surfboat sweep having won state and national medals and having represented South Australia on numerous occasions.

Mr Watkins was appointed as Surf Life Saving South Australia President on 26 May 2021, and has been instrumental in bringing the movement together promoting gender equality and fiercely embracing and working toward people being safe in South Australian waters.

His commitment and drive was highly regarded. In his professional life, Mr Watkins was also a successful business leader in registered training organisations. He was the founder and Chief Executive Officer of SA Health Education Centre, and more recently he was the State Manager SA and National VET Manager for Endeavour College of Natural Health.

Mr Watkins had served on a number of local and national boards and was exceptionally well respected. His dedication, excellence, passion, commitment and care was remarkable, and it will inspire generations to come to devote their time and energy to the surf lifesaving movement and to other causes in support of community.

I understand Kevin's long battle with illness did not stop him from continuing to be an active patrol member until the age of 70. His time spent actively patrolling spanned decades.

His extraordinary contribution and commitment to ensuring local people and visitors to South Australia can enjoy our magnificent South Australian beaches is a gift that will long be celebrated, as will his invaluable contributions as the President of Surf Life Saving South Australia over the past two years and his service through the Brighton Surf Life Saving Club.

Surf Life Saving SA has confirmed that Ms Sarah Cutbush, the current Vice President will become the Acting Surf Life Saving SA President until the board elections in May 2023. We wish her all the best and offer our support to her.

Mr Watkins was a true legend of surf lifesaving in South Australia and will be deeply missed and lovingly remembered by many. I extend the sincere condolences of everyone in this place to Mr Watkins' wife, Sofie, children, Oskar and Ella, their family, friends and the entire surf lifesaving community at this very difficult time and in the years ahead.

Vale, Kevin Watkins. May you rest in peace.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04): Just briefly, on indulgence, I wanted to add to the minister's contribution on the life of Kevin 'Brakey' Watkins. As a long-term member of Brighton Surf Life Saving Club myself, I knew Brakey exceptionally well; in fact, like many in the community that I am part of, we did not know he was ill at all, never mind in the last days of his life.

He was someone who continued to serve the local community, the Brighton community, his professional community in the health services and, of course, surf lifesaving as a movement as the state president until the very last hours of his life. He was well known to me at Brighton Surf Life Saving Club, seeing him on a regular basis either in the club or at the Sellar Door, the local cafe that he would meet at at 7.30am after he had done the boat training out from the surf club.

He was kind. He was generous. He continually sought to invest in the youth movement within surf lifesaving and particularly women's involvement in the sport and in the institution. It is a great shame that his tenure as the State President of Surf Life Saving SA has been cut short, but in the relatively short period of time, just short of two years, that he has held that role, he has made an immense mark. Of course, with 55 years of involvement in the institution, he is a true giant of surf lifesaving in the state of South Australia.

Vale, Kevin 'Brakey' Watkins. You have caught your last wave, and may you rest in peace.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call questions without notice, I recognise the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Larry Anthony, former Howard government minister, guest of the leader.

Question Time

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question is to the Premier. When will the Premier fix ramping? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Ramping has nearly doubled since the election. Just yesterday, it was reported that nine people waited over 24 hours for a bed in a hospital and 16 people waited over 12 hours.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:07): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. I appreciate and note the leader's appetite for manipulation of statistics to serve his own purposes, but—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

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

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

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Standing order 127 and 98 as well, if you'd like.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will allow the leader and the Premier some latitude because of their positions. I will listen carefully. Standing orders do apply to both.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The Leader of the Opposition would do well to familiarise himself with remarks that I consistently made throughout the course of the election campaign when I was asked this precise question because, clearly, we were very determined in opposition, as we are in government, to commit ourselves to the task of turning around ramping in this state, which of course effectively quadrupled during the course of the last government.

When I was asked the question during the election campaign about what actually constitutes fixing ramping and when it will be done by, I made very clear statements. The first thing is that we are seeking to address the ramping crisis, and what that means—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

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

Ms Hood interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Adelaide! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: What we said constituted fixing the ramping crisis was getting it in such a position that we would see ambulances roll up on time. That was not something that those opposite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Morialta!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —seemed to care too much about, which is why—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley! Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —they didn't go to the election with a comprehensive—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is warned.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Of course, this stands in stark contrast to what we delivered on this side of the aisle which was a comprehensive health policy that seeks to address a number of different elements: more beds, more nurses, more doctors, more ambulance officers, more ambulance stations. And each and every element of that policy we are progressively rolling out. In respect of the second component—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is warned.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —regarding the timing, we made it clear during the course of the election campaign. Again, I stated this repeatedly in press conference after press conference, and I invite the Leader of the Opposition amongst others to familiarise themselves with these remarks. I made it clear that we expected that it would take the full four years—in fact, I think SALibMedia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —tweeted to this effect—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —that it would take time to roll these things out, and we are committed to doing so.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I am happy to say—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey, member for Schubert, member for Morialta!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I am happy to say that those people working within our public hospital system have been very pleased—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —to see constant updates coming through from the government about how we are progressively rolling out those resources. We believe that in due course that will have a positive impact. I just invite the opposition to also contemplate a counterfactual: imagine what a world looks like where you get re-elected and we don't have more nurses, we don't have more doctors, we don't have more ambulance officers and we don't have more beds. We know what the system would look like then.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: We know what the system would look like then.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: On this side of the house—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —we continue to deliver.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Wright!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: We continue to deliver on each and every element of that policy and on that side of the house—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned. The member for Chaffey is warned. Member for Frome! Member for Hartley!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —they continue to want to fight with ambos or whatever it might be. We will get on with delivering and making a difference and you get on complaining about it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! In addition to a long list of warnings, the member for Hartley is warned.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:12): My question is to the Premier. Is it the Premier's first priority to fix ramping?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:12): Yes, it is one of our major commitments and we are ensuring that we will deliver upon it as best as we can.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

ULURU STATEMENT FROM THE HEART

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (14:12): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house about the consultation process to deliver on our commitment to the Uluru Statement from the Heart and any related matters he is aware of?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:12): I want to thank the member for Waite for the question and I appreciate her efforts to ensure that as a state we come together to do something wholeheartedly good for the nation, because this government is committed to delivering a Voice to the state parliament which was something that used to enjoy bipartisan support. It used to enjoy bipartisan support. I must say that I have been somewhat surprised today to learn that those opposite have decided to withdraw bipartisan support for the Voice to Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The interjections run thick and fast.

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: No, that is not right.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Whatever the interjections are of those opposite, here is something that I can say with a degree of confidence, notwithstanding the fact that I am not in a position to prejudge the outcome of decisions in another place, but should a piece of legislation come into this chamber for a Voice to the parliament, there will be a vote.

An honourable member: There is one.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: There will be a vote, and on this side of the house we will be supporting it. We will be supporting it.

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

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Sir, the Premier seems to be anticipating debate on Order of the Day No. 7 listed for tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey, order! Well known for his interjections he may be, but they are contrary to the standing orders. I will listen carefully. I have the point of order well in mind: some context is permissible but no breach of the standing orders is.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: We understand today that the opposition have decided to oppose the government's bill for establishing a Voice to Parliament and one of the reasons that was cited was process and consultation. I think it is an important moment to outline to the house exactly the process that has delivered the bill that is currently before the other place.

First and foremost, on 4 July the Malinauskas government announced the appointment of a Kurna, Narungga and Ngarrindjeri man, Dale Agius, as the state's inaugural Commissioner for First Nations Voice. Then on 29 August 2022, Commissioner Agius holds his first in-person consultation session. On 8 September last year, the Attorney-General met with the member for Heysen to discuss the Voice to Parliament.

Then on 9 November, the draft First Nations Voice Bill was released publicly by Commissioner Agius for consultations. Following that draft bill being released back in November, there was a further round of consultation that commenced on the back of that bill—back in November. Then on 24 January, the Attorney-General met with the member for Heysen to discuss the Voice to Parliament. We are now August through to January.

Then on 7 February, announcement of the final Voice to Parliament model was provided to the member for Heysen along with Commissioner Agius's final report, along with answers to Peter Dutton's 15 questions on the Voice, along with 42 written submissions that were made on the draft bill. Do you know how many draft submissions came from those opposite? None. Not one draft submission and not one serious piece of engagement. So, having started the process—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for West Torrens, member for Chaffey! The Premier has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: There may be an opportunity to talk about this more in due course, but having had the opportunity going right back to the middle of last year to engage with this process, there has been no evidence of a wholehearted or genuine exercise on behalf of those opposite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —which has led us to an incredibly disappointing moment where the opposition have changed their position, as they are well entitled to do, but not in a way that accords with the best interest of Indigenous affairs in the state, and for that they will be judged accordingly.

The SPEAKER: The Premier's time has expired.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader, I recognise the presence in the gallery of a small group of students from Ungarra Primary School, guests of the member for Flinders. I understand this, in fact, may be half the school present. Welcome to parliament.

Question Time

DEFENCE SHIPBUILDING

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier explain whether his comments from 25 August 2022 relating to a proposal by Spanish shipbuilder Navantia have led to any tangible outcomes for South Australia? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: On 25 August last year, the Premier said that he supports Navantia's proposal to build three new air warfare destroyers including that he would, and I quote:

...be advocating to the federal government in Canberra on behalf of the people in South Australia to ensure our state is in the best possible position to seize this opportunity.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:18): Thank you to the Leader of the Opposition for this question. The short answer to his question is that at every single moment that I have had the chance to advocate for South Australia's naval shipbuilding program in a number of different forms, I have grabbed it and seized it. Those opposite have sought to illuminate the public on various occasions when I have sought to engage with the Minister for Defence and the Deputy Prime Minister, but I continue this advocacy and I will be keeping it up pretty fulsomely right up until the moment that we see a decision from the commonwealth in respect to the AUKUS decision.

I am firmly of the view that both the AUKUS decision that we are expecting in coming weeks along with the response to the strategic defence review represents one of the most substantial commonwealth commitments to the state of South Australia to advance our economic complexity that we have seen in our history. This has been a program of works that has enjoyed bipartisan support going right back to when the member for Dunstan, the former Premier, invited me to the Euronaval conference in France back in 2018-19.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

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

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: This is something that I know those opposite want to make sure happens in our state, as does everybody on this side of the house. I have been rather forthright with the Deputy Prime Minister and also the Prime Minister on our expectations around that decision, and we have every confidence that when it is announced in a few weeks' time it is one that will stand South Australia in good stead for a long time to come.

The SPEAKER: I see the member for Morphett, and I remind the member for Chaffey he is on a final warning.

DEFENCE SHIPBUILDING

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:20): My question is for the Premier. Can the Premier detail whether Navantia's proposal includes offshoring any South Australian jobs to Spain? If so, does the Premier support this? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PATTERSON: *The Australian* newspaper revealed over the weekend that there is zero spare capacity at Osborne to support Navantia building air warfare destroyers and the only feasible option would be to offshore the build to support Spanish shipyards. Today, there are over 1,500 employees working at Osborne on the Hunter class program.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:21): We want as much naval shipbuilding work in South Australia as possible. Whether it be the FCD program, the load exercise on the Collins class, the future AUKUS submarine being built here or the Hunter program, we want to make sure that naval shipbuilding is located at its home, at the heart of the nation's shipbuilding program, which is at Osborne. That is consistent with all of this government's advocacy and will remain so for as long as we have the chance to do it.

DEFENCE SHIPBUILDING

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:21): My question is for the Minister for Defence and Space Industries. Has the department provided any advice to the minister about potential job losses at Osborne should the Navantia bid be successful?

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) (14:21): I don't believe that I have received any advice to that effect, and I would be surprised if I did. The idea that Navantia was advancing was in the context of not only supplying needed ships, in their view, but also addressing the challenges of building a skilled workforce at Osborne in order to be prepared for these submarines.

As people may be aware when we contemplate the building of these submarines, we often talk about the challenges of the skills shortage and the need to train people for that. That is absolutely a priority. But there is another element to that that probably isn't aired as often, which is that skilled

workers are required—so not just people coming out with the qualifications but people with sufficient experience to be senior. That is not just in welding and others trades but also in project management, particularly of complex defence-build projects.

The context in which Navantia and other projects have been advanced has been entirely about building the workforce and building that capability steadily in order to have people at all levels of skill and experience ready for the very substantial demands of the sustained build of the submarines.

The SPEAKER: I see the member for Badcoe. Pardon me, member for Badcoe; the member for Morphett has raised with me his wish to ask a supplementary question.

DEFENCE SHIPBUILDING

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Defence and Space Industries. Have any unions approached the government with concerns around the Navantia proposal, including the offshoring of jobs?

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) (14:23): Again, I am not aware of any. None is springing to mind, but I don't like to be definitive in case there is a matter that has been raised with me. I am happy to confirm with my own records on that.

TORRENS TO DARLINGTON PROJECT

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister update the house on community consultation regarding the updated reference design for the Torrens to Darlington project?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:24): I acknowledge the member for Badcoe's advocacy for her constituents and the community of Badcoe on this matter. It has been a remarkable level of engagement, sometimes intense. Nevertheless, the member for Elder and the member for Badcoe are keen advocates for their community on this very important, once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for our state, and they have been fierce advocates.

I remind the house that community consultation on design changes closes this month, and I can inform the house that to date the Department for Infrastructure and Transport has had more than 5,000 face-to-face interactions with the community in a various range of settings. Interactions have occurred at the project's community information centres based on South Road, Clovelly Park, and a pop-up centre at the Brickworks Marketplace in Torrensville. One of the 11 community information sessions was held at the Torrens to Darlington community information centre at Clovelly Park. Also, at the West Adelaide Football Club, at the pop-up information stalls at the Marion shopping centre, Castle Plaza—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —Churchill Centre, the Kurralta Park shopping centre, or by booking one-on-one meetings with the project team at either the Thebarton Community Centre, the Torrens to Darlington community information centre, Clovelly Park, or at the Glandore Community Centre. These centres, stalls and information sessions have had detailed maps, images and animations, as well as the project staff who are designing the works on hand to answer questions that the public may have had.

Of course, the public can also provide their feedback on design changes by completing online surveys. The online surveys have had more than 800 responses to date, with over 68 per cent of respondents overall feeling very positive or positive about the project. Around 70 per cent of respondents found the latest round of information about the project, updating them on the outcomes of the project, to be very useful. Around 86 per cent of the respondents are feeling more positive or as positive as before towards the project as a result of the design changes.

Contrary to some criticism from members opposite about the transparency and scrutiny of the project based on these statistics, our engagement on the project has been extensive and well received. Also, the Public Works Committee—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That's a good interjection. The Public Works Committee reviewed and referenced the previous government's design and consultation, and was critical—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —and how do I know this? How do I know this? Because I was on it. And I just point out to members opposite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Chaffey is on a final warning.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —how was it that the opposition, a minority on that committee, got an inquiry up into the South Road project.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How? Division.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Contrary to recent criticisms, the member for Hartley himself also attended community information sessions at Clovelly Park.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hartley is on a final warning.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It was very, very good to see him along to learn lots about the projects, and he is welcome to have his contributions on there. I am very pleased that he made the time to come along. We will be providing information, answering questions and gaining insights from the public because we care about what the public think about this project, which is why now it is so overwhelmingly popular amongst people who live along the corridor, as opposed to the way they felt about it before the election. There has been a dramatic shift in sentiment, and 19 March is a large part of that shift.

TORRENS TO DARLINGTON PROJECT

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (14:28): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. What agency resources were used at the weekend public forum regarding the Torrens to Darlington project? With leave of the house, sir, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TARZIA: On 18 February, the ABC revealed that the member for Badcoe hosted a public forum on Saturday regarding the Torrens to Darlington project.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:28): I hope the member for Badcoe was ably assisted by my department, as she should be. All members of parliament, if they wish to hold community information sessions briefing the public on the government's agenda, I would be happy to send my departmental officials along. In fact, in my 25 years—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —in the parliament, I have never heard of an opposition complaining about a government engaging with its constituents.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I mean, it really is a first. Of course the member for Badcoe is holding public engagements, as is the member for Elder, as are most members in the parliament—

Ms Stinson: You should try it.

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —and when they ask for departmental briefings, they get them. And I will also point out that members opposite call chief executives directly on occasion, and I have also noticed that members opposite call me directly with their concerns—as they should. That's the whole point. The whole point of this place is that members of parliament advocate on behalf of their constituents and, when there are massive infrastructure spends or compulsory acquisitions using very, very strong government powers, that those constituents could have the decision-makers and the regulators and the bureaucrats in a room answering their questions. What's wrong with that? It's called democracy. That's exactly the point. I don't condemn the member for Badcoe; I congratulate her.

Mr Tarzia: Not the media; don't let the media in.

The SPEAKER: Member for Hartley!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In questions of when constituents are coming along to talk about personal matters in relation to the acquisition of their homes, of course media are not present. Of course they're not—and nor should they be, because we're talking about some very private information. When you invite people along who are directly impacted by compulsory acquisitions and roadworks, they're entitled to talk to people without the scrutiny of having the media there. Why? People can ask questions, they can identify themselves and say that they're impacted and have these questions. I also point out that it's important that we do this, and it's important that we do this regularly.

I also point out that there were many occasions when the previous government held public consultations and locked out the media, including me. I had a very famous case at the North Adelaide Football Club, where the then member for Adelaide, of blessed memory, Ms Rachel Sanderson, was holding a so-called public meeting into the land tax affair. I turned up and was told, 'I'm sorry, you can't enter and neither can the media.'

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The member for Hartley says, 'That's outrageous.' I also understand he held similar forums where the media weren't allowed in either.

Mr Whetstone: You're a dodgy looking character, that's why.

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

Mr Tarzia: No.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Not true?

Mr Tarzia: They just call me direct.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: They just call you direct? Okay.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Of course we consult with communities, and of course I make my department available—as they should be. Members, whether they are members of the government or not, have good access to ministers and good access to decision-makers and the bureaucracy, as they should.

When it comes to these matters in the constituencies of members of parliament, I am happy to offer members full briefings, I am happy for them to have access to the bureaucracy, and I am happy for them to hold public meetings and have the bureaucracy come along and answer questions honestly. It's important that we get the honest answers out, because sometimes all that is left is the political—what's the word I'm looking for here—meringue.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —that they beat up.

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member: A melange.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Melange. I don't know the Spanish term, but I'll refer to my dictionary.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I see the member for Hartley. Before I call the member for Hartley, the member for Badcoe is on two warnings. The member for Chaffey remains in breach of standing order 131 and would do well to inform himself of the contents of that standing order.

TORRENS TO DARLINGTON PROJECT

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (14:32): My question again is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Were residents instructed not to speak to the media after a public forum regarding the Torrens to Darlington project held by the member for Badcoe and, if so, why? With the leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TARZIA: On 18 February, the ABC revealed that residents were also told not to speak with the media.

Ms Stinson: Except they were ignored.

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe is on a final warning. The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:33): I have never told any member of the public not to speak to the media. Why would I? The media in this country—this is not Putin's Russia. People are entitled to speak to the media.

Mr Tarzia: They were told not to speak to the media.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, Mr Speaker, I have never, ever—

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —uttered those words.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I may have said, 'Don't trust the media.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I may have said, 'You can't believe everything they say,' but I have never said, 'Don't speak to them.' I can't imagine a scenario where any member of the public attending any meeting would ever take that type of instruction. How could it be legally enforceable? It's not legally enforceable. This is a free country. The only time I've ever heard the term, 'Don't speak to the media' was when the previous government was in office and regularly government backbenchers were calling the media to talk about party rooms—after they got off the phone to me, telling me what was going on in the partyroom meeting. There are many famous occasions where these partyroom meetings started with, 'Don't let this get—

Mr TARZIA: Point of order, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Too close to the bone?

The SPEAKER: Minister, please be seated.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I was going to give you an example.

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Hartley.

Mr TARZIA: Standing order 98: this has got nothing to do with people being told not to speak to the media after this forum.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have in mind standing order 98. I understand the Leader of Government Business is familiar with the standing order and I ask him to return to the question. The member for Chaffey well knows the standing orders.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: How come the residents get on camera and you can't?

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The exchange with the member for Hartley will cease. Minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The only examples I have ever seen up close of politicians telling other politicians in a meeting not to tell the media were former party room meetings. One famous case was when the then transport minister, Stephan Knoll, was in the witness protection program over the closure of bus stops—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —and wasn't allowed to answer any questions.

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

The SPEAKER: The minister will be seated. There is a point of order from the member for Morialta.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Sir, this is silly. It's in breach of standing order 98 as well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Hartley, I appreciate the advice.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the point of order and I remind the minister that he must answer the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have never told a public meeting for members of the public not speak to the media. Members of the public should speak to the media. The media is a very important part of our democratic system. A free, well-resourced media is important, as is diversity of

media—depending on your perspective, of course. It's very, very important that the media are kept well informed. I welcome media scrutiny. I think media scrutiny is a good thing, not a bad thing.

I don't think there is a single member on this side of the parliament who has at any stage not welcomed media scrutiny. You might not like it, it might feel a bit difficult at times, but it is one of the most important parts of our democratic system, and this government embraces media scrutiny. Why is that? I will tell you why: because we have seen what happens when governments attempt to try to push down media scrutiny. You saw the results on 19 March last year. It's a failure.

COST OF LIVING CONCESSION

Mrs PEARCE (King) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. Can the minister update the house on the Malinauskas Labor government's doubling of the Cost of Living Concession for this financial year and work to review our concession system?

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (14:37): I thank the member for the question and also for her dedication to her local community. We promised before the election to improve the lives of South Australians, and we have spent the past year delivering those promises. As many people struggle with cost-of-living pressures, we promised to double the Cost of Living Concession for this financial year. In fact, we indexed the payment and then doubled that amount, so hundreds of thousands of South Australians received more than double the last payment provided under the previous Liberal government.

Our first budget included an extra \$39.3 million to deliver on this promise, and I am proud to advise the house that our commitment has now been delivered in full. An amount of \$78 million has now been paid directly into the pockets of those who need it most. Over 141,000 owner-occupier households received \$449, over 57,000 renter households received \$224.60 and over 11,000 Commonwealth Seniors Health Card holders received \$224.60. In total, more than 211,000 households received this extra help.

This was the largest state government concession payment in South Australian history. One in five South Australian households have benefited, 21,000 households received a payment who did not receive a payment last year and 5,800 of those who registered for the Cost of Living Concession also received other concessions like help with their energy bills for the very first time. We didn't just deliver on the commitment, we overdelivered.

We received letters asking why renters had to wait until February or March in the financial year while home owners got paid earlier in August. It was a really good question in this cost-of-living crisis, and we responded. Our Premier stood next to Lyndall, a pensioner who rents in the western suburbs, to announce that we would bring forward those payments to renters, so they got help at the same time as home owners. In doing so, about 50,000 renters got a double payment and were paid seven months earlier.

The Malinauskas Labor government thanks everyone who helped spread the word about the extra help, and those who helped deliver it. Applications were open until the end of December, and Concessions SA received over 70,000 phone calls and tens of thousands of extra applications. We brought in extra resources to meet the demand, and when floods hit—

An honourable member: Because you weren't answering the phones.

The Hon. N.F. COOK: You're hilarious. When floods hit we prioritised processing for Riverland and Murrayland applicants. We also made public transport free 24 hours a day for Seniors Card holders to help ease the cost of living pressures.

Now that we have successfully delivered our election promise to double the Cost of Living Concession for this year, we are about to deliver another election commitment by reviewing our concession system. The reference group for the review meets for the first time this week, and its work will look at those who get the concessions, those who miss out on concessions, and how we can deliver concessions differently or more efficiently. When the Liberals had the chance to do something they did nothing—

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

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order—

The Hon. N.F. COOK: The Liberals offered zero—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. N.F. COOK: Don't like the truth? It's a shame.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister, please be seated. Order, member for Chaffey! The proceedings on a point of order are that I turn to the member immediately raising the point of order and hear him or her out.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Thank you, sir. The first six words of that sentence, in every case, lead to a breach of standing order 98.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is some merit in the point of order raised with me. We are in the dusk, you might say, of the answer; it is getting late. I will listen carefully.

The Hon. N.F. COOK: Thank you, sir. The pain is nearly over for those opposite, who offered zero new money for concession recipients—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. N.F. COOK: —no free public transport for seniors—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. N.F. COOK: —no new money for public housing, amongst many other failings.

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Colton!

The Hon. N.F. COOK: It will be their legacy. In contrast, the Malinauskas Labor government is listening to our community, and on all those measures—including public transport concessions and money for public housing, amongst many other things not delivered by those opposite—we are responding to their needs.

AUTISM SPECIAL NEEDS PROGRAM

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (14:42): My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. Did the minister's office urge the parent of a child with autism not to speak to the media about her concerns? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I have permission to use the family's name in this explanation. Late last year, Mrs Kirsten Richards and her daughter Chloe, who has autism, negotiated a 'One Plan' for Chloe to complete her SACE this year at Seaton High School. I am advised the plan, with SACE-approved allowances for Chloe's autism, was agreed by all parties in writing. It was also agreed that Mrs Richards would have oral and email access to a special needs coordinator.

Since school has returned Mrs Richards has been told that she is only allowed to speak to the principal and no-one else about her daughter Chloe's plan. Mrs Richards is now very frustrated, and feels she has been locked out of any direct involvement with the special needs program for her daughter. During a phone call on 7 February with a staffer in the minister's office, I am advised that Mrs Richards was told that going to the media would 'complicate things'.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:43): I thank the member for Unley for his question.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hartley!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I can rule out, from the start, that we would ever tell a parent—either Ms Richards, who I have—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Just listen to the whole answer—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Hartley and the member for Hurtle Vale—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey, you will depart the chamber under 137A for the remainder of question time—

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: —and the member for Badcoe, who interjects again and is on her final warning, will join the member for Chaffey.

The honourable members for Chaffey and Badcoe having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Thank you, Speaker. No, I can rule out—I would never and I would not expect and don't believe in this case that my staff have ever advised someone not to speak to the media. I know the South Australian that the member for Unley is talking about here very well, Ms Richards. I have worked to try to help her for a number of years, including as well when I was the shadow minister.

I think the last time I spoke to Ms Richards was yesterday. I think the last time my staff spoke to Ms Richards was Friday. I have had a number of staff speak to Ms Richards on the phone for a number of weeks to try to help her with the quite complicated situation that the member for Unley explained. Those conversations have been very long ones—up to 45 minutes, I understand—because it is a complex situation with the child that Ms Richards cares for.

I would never say that speaking to the media would complicate things. That is a question entirely for the consideration of Ms Richards. I think it is disappointing, and this is really a return to form by the member for Unley who is back to his old tricks—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, please be seated.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: —politicising issues like this.

The SPEAKER: Order, minister!

The Hon. P.B. Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is called to order!

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hartley, your colleague raises a point of order, which I will hear under 134. The member for Unley.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Sir, my advocacy for the children has lead to the Debelle royal commission, and I reject—

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I reject the accusation by the minister—

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley, raise your point of order immediately.

An honourable member: 127.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —127—and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: What part?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Back to four—in a derogatory manner. I ask that that be withdrawn.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members to my left and right, I have the point of order, which is 127: digression or personal reflections on members. I understand the personal reflection to be 'old tricks'. The request has been made for it to be withdrawn, and I expect that it will be. The minister.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I withdraw the comment.

The SPEAKER: And I think it is customary to offer an apology.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: And I apologise, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I will just reiterate what I said. I would never advise someone like Ms Richards or anyone else not to speak to the media. That is a decision for them. We are trying to assist her in every way we can in very complicated circumstances. I have been doing that for a number of years. As I said, I have been in contact with Ms Richards very recently. My staff have been in contact with Ms Richards very recently, and we are doing everything we can for her.

The SPEAKER: I see the member for Giles.

OFFICE FOR REGIONAL HOUSING

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Can the minister inform the house about the newly established Office for Regional Housing and contact with stakeholders?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Planning) (14:47): I thank the member for Giles for his question and for his advocacy for regional South Australia.

Last week the government announced that it was taking action to help resolve, help address, the housing crisis in regional South Australia, and we established the Office for Regional Housing based in Renewal SA.

We know that regions are the backbone of the state contributing billions to our economy every year, but we also know that the lack of housing is impeding economic growth in regions. We know that building costs are higher in regions. We know that skilled labour is more difficult to obtain and finance is also more difficult to obtain.

Last year I met with delegations from the South-East councils and the Spencer Gulf cities, and we spoke about the housing challenges those cities and other South Australian regions were facing. I subsequently requested that Renewal SA start having discussions with regional councils to ascertain the level of help and assistance they needed. It was evident through all those conversations that more support was needed and that the state government had a critical role to play.

Last year the government appointed Anne Maroney to the board of Renewal SA to help have some regional representation on that board. Ms Maroney is a former CEO of the Barossa Gawler Light Adelaide Plains RDA and a resident of the Barossa Valley.

I can inform the house that, since the establishment of the Office for Regional Housing, we have already received over 40 inquiries to provide support and advice, and that there are a dozen projects the Office for Regional Housing is currently exploring.

The initial focus of the office will be providing housing to our key workers—police, teachers, doctors, ambos and nurses—through the new Regional Key Worker Housing Scheme. That pilot will

deliver approximately 30 homes in regional South Australia and is expected to reduce pressure on the private rental market. The office will also work with local councils, regional businesses, builders and investors to facilitate other housing projects, and we will do that in conjunction with the federal government as well.

The government has also improved regulations associated with the construction of temporary buildings to be used by key workers on infrastructure projects and large industrial businesses. Under the previous government, there was no recognition of the housing problem in regional communities, no coordination within government. No direct funding was allocated.

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

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

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Standing order 98 says the minister may not debate in providing an answer.

The SPEAKER: I will keep the standing order closely in mind. The minister has joined us from the federal parliament, where there are slightly different rules.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: There are slightly different rules, Speaker, and I will be sure to take your guidance. What I would say is over the last four years we have seen rental vacancy rates in regional South Australia drop to effectively zero, and this is the first government to take any action on it. I think we can be proud, and I think other people should be embarrassed by their record.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Giles!

HYDROGEN POWER PLANT

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:50): My question is for the Minister for Energy and Mining. Who will pay for the government's proposed hydrogen plant? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PATTERSON: Before the election, Labor promised to own and operate the hydrogen production and power plant as a government enterprise; however, the minister released a request for proposals indicating the government is actively considering co-ownership opportunities, and last week we were advised that the minister has travelled overseas to meet with potential investors.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:51): The hydrogen plant will be owned by the people of South Australia.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: Like the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The people who will be building it will be determined by an independent procurement process.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: They're not investors: they're being paid.

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I don't think he does, sir. The independent procurement process will choose the successful group that will be building the hydrogen electrolyser, the generator and associated infrastructure, and it will be owned by the government of South Australia through a government business.

What the member may have misinterpreted in the request for proposal is that the government is also saying to people, 'If you wish to tender to build for us an electrolyser and you wish to build a potentially larger one, we would potentially partner with you. You could own the excess capacity you wish to build.' That does not mean that our 250 megawatts will be owned by anyone else but us. What we are attempting to do—as opposed to what the former government did, which was talk about doing something about hydrogen—is actually incentivise and allow our procurement—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What was that? I didn't think you would respond.

The SPEAKER: The minister will not respond to interjections. Minister, you have the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We want to make sure that the private sector has the ability, if they wish, to use the procurement power of the state in a way that would help them facilitate their construction of any type of electrolyser or generation that could exceed the capacity that we are looking for. I think it is a very good way, it is an inventive way, of the government using our procurement to try to help the private sector.

But make no mistake: 250 megawatts of electrolyser will be owned by the South Australian government, and 200 megawatts of generation will be owned by the South Australian government, and it will be operating in the public interest for the public good, as opposed to the generators that were purchased in the Weatherill government that were then privatised by the Marshall government, which are now—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey! Order!

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Dunstan!

Mr Brown: He's still here, sir. I can't believe it!

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, please be seated. The member for Florey will depart under 137 for the remainder of question time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hammond is also in breach of the standing orders but not for the moment to be ejected.

The honourable member for Florey having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We will be owning that equipment. I think the member may have misunderstood the terms of engagement the government is going through in its procurement. I think it is doing an exceptionally good job—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —and I am very pleased with the way the Office of Hydrogen Power South Australia is operating. We are actually going to get some hydrogen development.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We are actually going to get some people investing in South Australia in green hydrogen as opposed to what happened under the last four years of the Marshall government when there was almost no investment at all—in fact, no new wind farms, no new—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Frome!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Two new wind farms were opened under the previous government? When? Which ones?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Where? What?

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will not invite interjections. The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think someone is imagining having won a second term and thinking about the second term—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —as part of his term, but unfortunately they didn't win a second term, so it didn't happen.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sorry? I can't hear you from back there. Speak up.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister may well have concluded his answer or be close.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We will be owning that operation in full.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morphett and then the member for Newland, reminding for the moment too that the member for Hartley is on a final warning.

HYDROGEN POWER PLANT

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Will the government's proposed hydrogen plant produce any carbon pollution? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PATTERSON: The government's request for proposals shows that hydrocarbon gas could be used to power the generator; however, Labor's pre-election policy made no mention of this, instead promising that the plant will be powered by green hydrogen and that it will produce no carbon pollution.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:56): I understand the reason for that in the RFP was that there is some technology for thermal generation that requires a brief start using fossil fuels before operating entirely on hydrogen. So this is about the technology. We are very keen to make sure that the generation is carbon free.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: But I think, again, the member is misinterpreting the nature of the request for proposal.

Ms Pratt interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is going to be state owned. I said that earlier in my previous answer.

The SPEAKER: The minister will not respond to interjections.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Hydrocarbons are often used in some green technologies to get things started and then they operate entirely on renewable resources like hydrogen.

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What was that?

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The exchange will cease. The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I also understand that there are a number of proposals that we are seeking, but what we have attempted to do in our request for proposal is be as broad as possible to allow industry across the world to tender for this project which is gathering a lot of excitement and interest.

The difference between our project and everything else that is occurring in the country is that our project is actually funded. We are actually out to the market. We are putting all the approvals in place. There is financial close here. We are actually out procuring what is going to be the world's largest green hydrogen endeavour. There are other attempts around the world to do this but of course they rely on a form of government incentive or subsidy, and a lot of those projects have not received financial close and were refunded. Ours is funded and being built.

So what we have attempted to do in our request for proposal through our procurement process is be as broad as possible. The reason we were as broad as possible is that we want to see everyone's idea. What we ultimately choose will be a matter for (1) the cabinet, (2) the procurement processes and, of course, the entire process we went through.

The process that we are going through is trying to do what we did with the Hornsdale battery. When we built the world's largest grid-scale battery, we were mocked by Liberals across the country. We were told that this would be nothing more than a tourist attraction like a Big Banana. Here we are again attempting to push the envelope on the technology, to build one of the world's largest electrolyzers, to operate a gas-fired turbine that operates on hydrogen, pushing that envelope to try to again push forward the momentum for the transition, and again we are getting this mocking, this disbelief that it could be even possible.

Throughout any transition there are failures and there are successes. I know from when we built the large-scale battery at Hornsdale that most of the questions I was receiving from the then opposition were about its duration—how long will it operate?—insinuating it was worthless, not worth the effort, because it wouldn't get us anywhere. Here we are again getting questions about the hydrogen generator and the electrolyser implying, or trying to imply, that it won't be successful or it's not real.

It is again because members opposite don't believe that there should be a transition. Look at their federal colleagues and look at the way their federal colleagues behave about the transition. There is a problem within the Liberal Party that goes to its core and that is that they do not believe that we should transition away from fossil fuels. They do not believe that we should be investing in public good. They do not believe in public ownership of electricity assets, and that is why they keep on doing this over and over again.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. Can the minister update the house on international students studying at South Australian public schools in 2023?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (15:00): I thank the member for Newland for her question and her passion for international education. In fact,

the member for Newland knows all too well how important international education is as she is somebody who studied overseas herself.

The good news is that this year South Australia has seen a record number of international students studying in our public schools. In fact, more than 690 international students have begun arriving at our schools since mid-January and this is the largest number of students that we have ever seen. The previous largest intake, I am advised, was 570 in term 3 of 2019.

I was really pleased to be able to join the member for Newland yesterday at Banksia Park International High School, which of course will be known to many people in this place as a school with a very proud history of encouraging and supporting international students. The principal, who is a relatively new principal, Natasa Penna, spoke very eloquently I thought about the benefits of having international students at her school.

Of course, the entire school benefits from experiencing those different cultures and backgrounds that come with having students from a whole range of different countries. I think there are 690 students that make up the record intake for this year and that includes about 34 different countries. Some of the most prolific countries who are choosing to come to South Australia include Japan, China, Korea and Vietnam.

The students at schools like Banksia Park International who are welcoming and embracing this program have a lot to benefit from it. It was wonderful yesterday to meet two of those students. I met Tina, who is from Vietnam and came to South Australia three years ago and she will be undertaking all her high schooling here in South Australia, and also Rina, who arrived more recently from Japan.

I should pay special mention, and I know the member for Newland would join me in thanking their homestay mum, Victoria, who has had many students live with her over the past five years. Victoria says that she loves to have a busy household and she certainly has that. She has two children of her own and currently has three homestay children staying with her including Rina and Tina. I think it is fantastic news for the school, but it is wonderful to see post pandemic that these numbers are increasing with those students from overseas choosing to come to South Australia and study.

Of course, that is just one side of the benefit. The other benefit on top of those schools having these multicultural and diverse student cohorts is that it increases opportunities for South Australian students to actually do the same thing that students like Tina and Rina are doing, getting the opportunity to study overseas themselves, which of course is something that we promote. I think that all in all this is a real win-win for our state, and it was lovely to spend that time at Banksia Park International with those young students yesterday.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (15:03): My question is for the Minister for Local Government. At any time after the local government elections did the minister request a briefing or information from the Electoral Commissioner of South Australia regarding any issues with election processes and, if not, why not?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart—Minister for Local Government, Minister for Regional Roads, Minister for Veterans Affairs) (15:03): To answer your question, member for Flinders, yes. As he would understand, the local government elections were amended by the previous government in 2021 to require all candidates—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Taylor!

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: —in local government elections to lodge their campaign donation returns with the Electoral Commissioner rather than with the chief executive officer of the relevant council. This change—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call. The member for Flinders is called to order. The member for Wright is called to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order. Unless there is a point of order, the minister has the call. Member for Wright, gestures are contrary to the standing orders. Minister, have you concluded your answer? The minister has the call.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: The legislation was changed by the previous government and went through this parliament in 2021, which made it quite clear that the Electoral Commission was to handle the elections completely in isolation and away from the Local Government Association and also this parliament. It was made quite clear by the previous parliament that they wanted the Electoral Commission and the elections to be—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: —independent of all of the opportunities of both the LGA and also this parliament. If I might say, that precludes anyone from anywhere getting involved with it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: Also, as part of the decision of the local government sector at that particular time, the member for Flinders was the president of the LGA who facilitated that with the previous government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members to my left and right! Member for Hurtle Vale! The member for Flinders will cease interjecting.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: The way the legislation was, it precluded anybody from politics to actually get a briefing from the Electoral Commissioner. However, after the election—it was on the Wednesday of the last sitting of parliament—at 6 o'clock at night I was advised what the anomalies were with the disclosure of the returns by the Electoral Commissioner, going through the Office of Local Government. I was advised at 6.30 on that Wednesday night. The next day I asked for a briefing to understand a bit more from the Electoral Commissioner at 12 o'clock, and then I had that discussion with the Electoral Commissioner. Then at 2 o'clock that afternoon on the Thursday I made a ministerial statement. From that day on, we have been able to work our way through this.

At the end of the day, the previous legislation was very, very clear that the previous government and the minister at the time and also the president of the Local Government Association wanted it away from politics—independently, away from this chamber. So I make no bones about these stupid comments being made outside, fearmongering and confusing the general public—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Flinders! Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: If it had been done the right way, it would have been handled the old way previously, and we would have had the opportunity to have some discussion with the Electoral Commissioner to understand whether there were any issues leading up to the election in 2021. This parliament made those decisions. This parliament made the law, and I had to actually go by the legislation, and I make no bones about that. We could not interfere, could not get any briefings from the Electoral Commissioner, and we were going to fix this mess up once and for all.

*Grievance Debate***HYDROGEN POWER PLANT**

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (15:08): It is a new year, and that means more broken promises, more spin from this Malinauskas Labor government. This time, it is their \$593 million experimental hydrogen power station. The Labor government released their request for proposals for their experimental hydrogen power station with little fanfare, hoping no-one would notice, just before Christmas.

Well, in what is a hydrogen bombshell, the request for proposals has revealed that the Premier has completely changed not only the nature but the scope of what was promised to the South Australian people at the election. He has confirmed that he cannot deliver what he promised and for the amount that he promised.

The Premier has dropped his promise of 3,600 tonnes of liquefied hydrogen storage in order to avoid massive cost blowouts in the hundreds of millions of dollars. It is not surprising when you consider 3,600 tonnes is 10 times the amount of storage at Cape Canaveral for NASA's rocket program. The cost of this 3,600 tonnes of liquefied storage was proposed by Labor to be only \$31 million.

Mr Tarzia: Laughable.

Mr PATTERSON: Laughable. Before the election, expert advice from CSIRO had shown that that amount of liquefied hydrogen storage would cost north of \$310 million. In spite of this, before the election, the now minister doubled down on his modelling and reiterated his faulty costings to the South Australian public. The Labor government has now gone out to market after the election, and the market has proved them wrong. Subsequently, they have dropped any commitment to this 3,600 tonnes of liquefied hydrogen storage.

Now, this was one of their four main pillars of their hydrogen plan, and they have had to drop it. So this calls into question their modelling and costings for all parts of their plan. They have also given up their promise to construct a base load combined cycle turbine, instead opting for a peaking open cycle turbine. Just remember, the last combined cycle turbine commissioned in South Australia was over 20 years ago.

Energy analysts said about the combined cycle turbine just last year that it made no sense because they do not have the flexibility to efficiently operate in a system where wind and solar at times are producing energy at very low cost. This change, from a base load generator to a peaking plant, fundamentally changes the nature of the project. It means Labor's modelled bill reductions and job numbers are now up in smoke.

It also has major implications for industry in South Australia who were promised base load generation before the election. It has also come to light that Labor are contemplating the use of a hydrocarbon gas supply to help power this generator, not just hydrogen as promised, and flying in the face of the Premier's pledge to use green hydrogen that will produce no carbon pollution.

In another shock, the request for proposal also exposes the Labor government is actively considering co-ownership opportunities, meaning that the plant may not end up being fully owned by the state government as promised. This means that the Premier's experimental hydrogen power station, which he claimed would be state-owned and run, might end up being a public-private collaboration, further proving the costs are out of control and this project is in grave danger of running over budget.

The Labor government's lofty hydrogen promise is in peril and facing massive cost blowouts. The Premier and the minister are frantically changing the scale and scope of this project to try to make it fit within their \$593 million budget. But it has been proven time and time again that Labor cannot manage their budgets. Just recently we have learnt of the \$5.5 billion cost blowout for the final piece of the north-south corridor, so these changes and cuts brought on by the minister mean the final result for Labor's hydrogen power station will be drastically different to what South Australians were promised at the state election.

These massive changes to the project also call into question the number of jobs that this plan will actually provide, and the Premier must be up-front with South Australians about how many jobs will be created, rather than try to claim the thousands of jobs already created or in the pipeline from the former Liberal government's great work in this area that attracted over \$15 billion worth of renewable energy projects to South Australia.

The minister must explain why he is spending \$593 million of taxpayers' money on a power station that Labor has even admitted will not even reduce power prices for families, because right now all he is doing is cementing himself as the minister for cost blowouts and broken promises.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENTARY INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (15:13): I rise to pay tribute and express thanks to the South Australian Parliamentary Internship Program, or SAPI for short. This is an invaluable program to parliamentarians that is jointly supported by the Parliament of South Australia and the three largest South Australian universities. The program offers undergraduate students an opportunity to undertake a research project, working closely with a member of parliament, their peers and academic staff to ultimately produce a 6,000-word report.

While I did study public policy at Flinders, having now seen the program through the eyes of an MP, it is with great regret that I did not get involved back in my uni days in the late 1990s. In rewriting my own wrong, last year I was very fortunate to work with two talented students on two separate and diverse projects. The great thing is we worked together on selecting research topics that were both relevant to my work and of personal interest to themselves.

I want to take this moment to pass thanks onto Nicole Bowne and Robert Jamieson for their outstanding work that I will proudly highlight today. It has been a pleasure to have Nicole join me for lunch at parliament. While Robert could not be here, I could not be happier that he is currently progressing his studies in the United Kingdom as an exchange student at the University of Nottingham.

Before I attempt to do justice to their reports, I was impressed how they were deeply proud of their upbringing and how this has shaped their values. It was clear they both wanted to use their research skills to make the world a better place. I am not sure what grades they received from the universities; in my eyes, they both deserved high distinctions.

As I knocked on doors during the election campaign, the number of former Holden workers could not escape me. It seemed that everyone was in a different boat, which made it hard to gauge how this important group was travelling. Nicole stepped in and wrote a detailed report on the state of play. It discusses the policy interventions to alleviate unemployment and other social pressures, and draws upon secondary data to explore the labour market outcomes for the retrenched workforce.

Importantly, her work highlights that many former automotive members continue to experience adverse impacts, with many now in precarious employment. Also of note was the lack of recent research checking on the wellbeing of these constituents. I have supplied a copy to the Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union, who had conducted the most recent studies. Nicole's work highlights a timely need to once more look closely at how these people and their families are going, five years after the closure.

I was also very fortunate to work with Robert Jamieson, who sought to answer whether public housing serves as a catalyst for improved post-secondary outcomes for households living at or below the average income level in Australia. Knowing that I am only scratching the surface of summarising his research, one of the key points I took from Robert Jamieson's excellent work was a demonstration that proximity to both transport and educational infrastructure is a key determinant in helping to improve the educational and therefore life outcomes of public housing tenants. Wearing my previous hat as a planning adviser, I feel this is something we need to give thought to when working out where we place public housing into the future.

My summaries are brief, and clearly do not do justice in reflecting the amazing work put in by both Nicole and Robert. I also want to pass on my thanks to Cenz Lancione from the University of South Australia, who has been instrumental in ensuring the success of the program. Cenz has overseen the program and been a fantastic mentor to the students for a number of years.

SAPI is unique in so many ways. It helps train the researchers of tomorrow, but to us as MPs it is invaluable on so many different fronts such as helping us to hone in on hunches, testing out theories or putting a local lens over a major issue. I am looking forward to continuing my involvement this year, and encourage all my colleagues to do the same.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (15:17): It is fair to say it has been an eventful week and a half for local government here in South Australia. The last day we were sitting here, the local government minister stood up and told the house that, in his words:

...a significant number of council members, 46 to be exact, have failed to lodge their campaign returns to the Electoral Commissioner of South Australia and that, therefore, their positions as council members are likely to become vacant.

We heard that he had met with the Electoral Commissioner, who told him about the scenario and seemingly had assured the minister of the robust nature of the process that they had followed. We also heard that members' offices became vacant and they could make an application to the South Australian Civil Administrative Tribunal to have their positions restored, and about the concerns of ECSA that the window of one month for these members to start proceedings was closing. He used words like 'deeply disappointing' and 'outrageous' to describe the situation in which he sheeted all the blame at the feet of those individual council members for their failure to get their paperwork in on time.

Almost immediately after that statement, I started receiving phone calls, messages and emails from people from all around the state who had experienced issues with the way the election process had been carried out and the way the Electoral Commission online portal had performed. These stories came from a variety of people, including those who had successfully got their paperwork lodged—eventually. This has left me with too many unanswered questions, especially after some of the explanations that we have heard since from both the minister and the Electoral Commission.

What conversations had the minister had with the Electoral Commission about any concerns that there were around the local government elections? You would think that a minister whose core focus is local government may have asked a question to perhaps get an update, but apparently (and we heard again today) he only found out the day that he announced it in parliament, which was nearly two months after something should have been known about it being wrong and there being issues with the process.

How many complaints has the Electoral Commission had about failings with the online portal? How many phone calls did the Electoral Commission get from candidates frustrated with trying to upload their documents? How many documents had to be emailed in separately, texted in or even walked in to ECSA? The dates when the paperwork became overdue are pretty uncertain, and the words from the minister only make things more convoluted, but my understanding from advice on the act is that those candidates who were elected unopposed needed to have their form in by around 12 December.

The Local Government (Elections) Act provides that if a person fails to submit the return within that time the returning officer must as soon as practicable notify the person of that fact by letter sent to the person by registered mail, as there is only 30 days' grace after that period. You might think that 'as soon as practicable' might mean the day that it becomes overdue or perhaps the week following. It seems those letters were dated 12 January, seemingly the day on which some of these candidates actually lost their positions, with so many of those people only receiving that letter in the mail on the day of or after they had technically lost their positions. I hardly think that is 'as soon as practicable', as is a legislated obligation. How did that become so delayed out of the commission's office?

Has the minister been asking these questions? Seemingly, from today, it's hands off the wheel: 'Nothing to do with me.' Has he been continuing to simply blame individuals or the Local Government Association or the legislation, or the shadow minister? What a joke. How is it that the advice on the timing of reporting provided to members who were elected unopposed has been the same advice given to those members who had a contested election, even though the timing is

different according to the legislation? Had the Attorney-General, as the minister directly responsible for the Electoral Commission, received any reports or information from the commission about their concerns around a delay in receiving important documents?

We have received no clarity on any of these details and that is why, as shadow minister, I am calling on the government to instigate an independent investigation into all ECSA and Office of Local Government processes, timings, communications and other relevant information—so that there is clarity around responsibility, mistakes are not repeated and failings can be rectified. These unfortunate circumstances have unfairly put a blemish onto local government as a whole, and it is not good enough. It is not a joke like those across the hall seem to think it is. This whole scenario is deeply worrying, and perhaps it is time that Minister Brock should consider the future of his position.

SWITCH THE HEADSPACE MATCH FOR MENTAL HEALTH

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:22): I rise to talk about a pretty important issue for our community, that is, mental health. Out of this concern rose an idea called Switch the Headspace Match for Mental Health, which was held last Friday. It was designed to do two things: first of all, to raise awareness and funds for mental health, and to reduce the stigma; and to reach and educate the wider South-East community on mental health, aiming to encourage those who may not have traditionally sought mental health support and give them the ability to reach out.

An eight-person organising committee comprises Adam Todd, Adam Richards, Jesse Plunkett, Celeste Raymond, Shane Raymond, Matt Roscow, Luke Thomson and Aaron Davis. The initial idea started with three of those people: Adam Todd, Adam Richards and Jesse Plunkett. The idea was to have a fundraiser, and it originated during one of their podcasts. The idea grew, and the three of them recruited the help of their close friends and local social worker, Celeste Raymond, who was more than happy to help with the event.

After months and months of planning and hard work, and support from local businesses and community members, the team organised the venue logistics, branded footy guernseys, catering, bar facilities, live music, raffles, auctions and more. 'Switch the Headspace' was a mash-up between Headspace and Switch The Play—a mental health and wellbeing initiative by Celeste Raymond. Ex-football legends came to the Limestone Coast to play in a game to raise awareness for mental health. These included Dane Swan, Leon Davis, Shane Mumford, Jordan Murdoch, Brodie Murdoch and Winis Imbi.

Those legends, along with some local legends and a few politicians as well, came together to form two teams. I must acknowledge here the fantastic support of Coopers, and the Coopers family, who donated the guernseys for both teams and supplied a fair bit of the bar facilities as a fundraiser. Lots of local businesses also got on board with sponsorships; I know that Mick Lamond would not take any payment for the meat he provided, and sponsors promoted the event.

Last Friday, over 3,000 people attended East Gambier Football Club to watch the game. Final tallies are still coming in, but over \$30,000 of profit has been raised for the Limestone Coast Headspace, with further donations still coming in.

It was a fantastic night. I must admit I was a bit surprised by the pace of the game; sitting in full forward and having some extremely good players playing on me, I was able to get my hands on it a couple of times, but it was a good spectacle for all involved. In fact, over 3,000 people is probably the largest crowd some of them have ever seen—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BELL: We should have got you down there to play as well, actually. Just to sum up, one of the local legends, ex North Gambier premiership coach Winis Imbi, who had a brief stint at Essendon as well, said he did not hesitate to play for such a good cause. In his words:

[The decision] was reaffirmed as well when we were doing the smoking ceremony and I was a bit nervous playing again. Then when I saw a dad crying who had lost his son to mental health, that put it all in perspective for me. It also gave me some perspective of what it is all about, and it was so special to have Dane Swan, Shane Mumford and Leon Davis here to [impress the crowd].

Imbi also spoke about the importance of checking in on your mates and also speaking up if you are not okay and getting the help you need to get back on track. Mental health is such an important thing, and you just need to check in and ask your mate if he or she is okay.

RIPPLES COMMUNITY ARTS CENTRE

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:27): I rise today to talk about the 10th anniversary of Ripples Community Arts Centre in Lochiel Park in my electorate of Hartley. Over the weekend I had the privilege of attending that celebration.

A little over 10 years ago, the Ripple Community Arts Centre was born, believe it or not, in a garage by Dave, his wife, Judy, and their friend Pam, as well as some other local supporters. Great stories often have quite humble beginnings, and this humble trio of eager artists took on quite a considerable undertaking: to curate mosaics on several drains right around Lochiel Park. If you go there today you can see how those drains have been beautified right around that area.

The mission became not only to embark upon their own artistic ventures but also to engage other people in the arts all around Lochiel Park. A mosaic workshop would soon follow in the garage, and this was followed by many more workshops and various field trips together as a community. They had immediately left a great artistic footprint in the local community.

A couple of years later they had secured access to things like a local government grant and access to a former gym to expand their growing passion. In 2014, the Ripples art community became incorporated, officially becoming Ripples Community Arts Inc., a name we are most familiar with today. Incorporation is very important, because it means you can start applying for grants as well.

There is no artistic endeavour too extreme, too fringe, or too hard that Ripples will not have a go at. Ripples Community Arts had its first SALA exhibition in 2015, hosted in another garage and with around only nine to 10 people visiting. However, their last SALA exhibition was in Brookside Cellars with around 40 people visiting. It shows simply the outstanding growth they have accomplished.

Ripples Community Arts Inc has shown outstanding community engagement and has in turn seen unwavering commitment from its members. What was evident on the weekend was the warmth that the community brings, the positivity that the community brings, and I have been overwhelmed by the vibrancy and the wonderful dynamic that has been created in this part of my electorate.

They have a truly outstanding set-up now, and when I was there over the weekend, sir, you should have seen it. I saw a kiln shed, I saw a bronze-casting area, a forging area, a sculpture and ceramics area, and so much more, that would take a more artistic person to truly understand. All I can say is that what you have at Lochiel Park and at Ripples is a very strong community. It is so important for the fabric of our local area. Everyone who goes to Lochiel Park and sees Ripples is truly amazed by the contribution they make to our local community.

They host paints and textile groups and picture-framing groups—anything you can really imagine—and now they boast over 100 members. Of course, that is formal members but if you consider the people who get out and about and involved it is of course many more.

They have carefully crafted their identity, and they have undeniably earned their place as a significantly recognised cultural cornerstone in my local community. I want to take this opportunity to say thank you to Dave and his team. Thank you to the wonderful volunteers at Ripples. I wish them all the very best on their 10th anniversary and huge success for the many decades to come.

NARUNGGGA ELECTORATE

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:31): I rise today to make a quick contribution about the recently-held country cabinet that we hosted in our electorate of Narungga and outline some of the key issues that were hot topics at that country cabinet and some of the actions we are hoping to see take place as time proceeds, as well as the outcomes from that country cabinet.

I would like to commence by congratulating the government on the country cabinet process. It was my first time being exposed to a country cabinet. I have to say that I have formed the view that it is a tremendously beneficial thing for the community. We were able to show almost every minister

all the different issues, and they were able to see firsthand and hear directly from the horse's mouth about all the issues we have got going on, and more importantly all the opportunities that we have got for improvement in our electorate of Narungga.

From the outset I would like to congratulate the government on their country cabinet process, and thank them sincerely for coming to Narungga and seeing all those things. We were able to show them some really important things. I want to say thank you very much to the Minister for Human Services, because we were able to conduct a homelessness forum where we heard from local providers about the different challenges they face not only in providing public housing stock or permanent housing stock but also the situation when it comes to emergency houses. There were some quite harrowing recounts from different people, like domestic violence victims, who find themselves, through no fault of their own, short of accommodation with very little opportunity to find something in the meantime.

Another interesting topic was raised. Unlike in the city where a Code Blue or Code Red is declared and there are opportunities for people to find refuge, there is very little in, I suspect, most regional centres but certainly it is very hard in our part of the world for people to find refuge in those instances.

It was wonderful to hear directly from those people. I thank the minister very much for being there to hear directly from them, and I know that the announcement a couple of days later was a wonderful step in the right direction, and it will hopefully be a beneficial outcome for those of us in regional South Australia.

Importantly also we were able to get the Minister for Regional Roads and the Minister for Regional Development into a truck each, and they were able to travel down the Artherton to Kulpara road, a road that was recently voted the worst grain road in the state by Grain Producers SA. They were able to experience firsthand how narrow that road is, particularly when you have another truck coming at you from the other direction.

Again, one of the benefits of a country cabinet is hearing directly from those people who are affected and experiencing those things firsthand, and I am sure and I hope that those two ministers have had the opportunity to experience that in a truck and see how undulating that road is and how narrow it is for people who have to use that on a regular basis. I am hopeful that will lead to a wonderful outcome not only for the Artherton and Kulpara roads but the litany of other roads that we have around the electorate that are in a fair old state of disrepair.

We have made a wonderful start over the past few years in trying to get a lot of those roads fixed, and there are certainly a lot of appreciative people in the community, but unfortunately there is still a way to go in trying to ensure that we fix all of them, which I suspect will be a never-ending task.

In addition to roads, we owe a great deal of thanks to the Minister for Environment who visited Cape Elizabeth as guests of members of the Narungga community and in the presence of Landscape SA members to see the damage that is being done by the explosion in popularity of beach camping. It is wonderful to have so many people visiting the YP now, but the mass in which they are visiting and camping on the beaches, and the recreational activities that they are engaging in, is causing some issues for our coastline. It is causing some issues for the sand dunes around the coastline.

It was wonderful to have a discussion with all those parties—the minister, the Narungga community, the landscape board and myself and my office—about the steps that we might take in the future to protect that valuable asset, arguably the most valuable asset we have in Narungga, our coastline. Thank you very much for actually getting out on site and hearing directly from those community members.

Certainly not lastly, but last in this list, is health. I would like to thank the Minister for Health for visiting three of our public hospitals: Yorketown, Maitland, and then I was thrilled to join him at the Wallaroo Hospital to see the issues we have going on in our regional health system. There is wonderful progress being made at Wallaroo Hospital. There is a new rehab facility about to open. They are upgrading the chemo unit, so it should be open more often and, hopefully in the future, for

more people. Of course, there was a very welcome announcement relatively recently that the PAT Scheme will double, which is a wonderful thing for regional people.

I hope that the message taken away by the minister and the government is about the difficulty in accessing health care. Through no fault of their own, it is a very long line to get in to see a GP. Often, presentations to the ED can be quite a lengthy wait to be seen by what are increasingly locum doctors. Hopefully, the message taken away is we need to make sure we update the model of care to ensure people can access health care when they need it. I thank him for visiting and seeing that firsthand.

The government saw a great deal more than that while they were there. They were up and down the peninsula from Marion Bay to Port Wakefield, and I would like to sincerely thank them—the Premier, the government, all the ministers—for coming and hearing firsthand about the opportunities we have in Narungga.

Bills

FAIR WORK (FAMILY AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE LEAVE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:36): I was coming very close to the conclusion of my remarks, but just a brief recap: I was focusing on the impact that domestic violence has especially in regional communities, where the impact reverberates throughout the community given people often know the woman who is the victim and the children who are victims, members of family and other people who are known to the family. Not to diminish what happens in the metropolitan area, because it is all appalling, but the impact in country areas is sometimes greater.

I did also refer to the deeply disturbing statistics from Aboriginal communities, some of which are in my electorate. I did point out the figures in the Northern Territory. Alice Springs has received a lot of attention. In the intensive care unit at the Alice Springs Hospital, I think of the 14 beds 13 of those beds were taken up by Aboriginal women who had been severely beaten. Those numbers are deeply, deeply disturbing.

There is another issue that shows why this bill is important, along with a whole raft of other approaches. This bill does try to provide some support with the paid days off, and that is important. It obviously does not capture everyone, and specifically this bill is about state employees and those people who work for councils, building on the federal work that has been done by the Albanese government in relation to 10 days off on pay in the private sector.

One of the other deeply concerning figures, and it is something that has grown worse with the passage of time, is something that demonstrates the abject failure of housing policy at a national level and then feeding into the state level. Last year, 100,000 women sought assistance from homelessness services because of domestic violence in Australia. Around 30,000 of them were assisted, but it was not possible to assist the great number of people who required help.

The incredibly disturbing thing is that women were placed in this position of being homeless, often with children, having to find somewhere to stay—whether in a car, couch surfing, in a tent, a whole variety of outcomes that are incredibly damaging—and either doing that or returning home to the perpetrator of the violence. Of the numbers who returned home, 8,000 people were forced into that position because they had no option.

What we have seen over a number of decades is a massive reduction in public housing. I am not saying that public housing is the panacea or the answer, but clearly it is one of those elements that has to be seriously addressed. There is now movement at a federal level, there is movement at a state level, but given the massive build-up of need, this is going to take a lot of time and it always brings us back to the importance of housing.

I do not know whether this dark shift came about when suddenly housing, like so much else, was just seen as part of the financialisation of just about everything. Once upon a time a house was a home; there was that shift. What we have seen is profound market failure in addition to profound

government failure and that failure for government to invest in a variety of ways in public housing on behalf of the longer term public good. This has an impact also when it comes to domestic violence in Australia.

This bill, as I said, is part of a whole jigsaw of tangible and practical pieces when it comes to addressing some of the issues that we face when it comes to domestic violence. I reflect back in my lifetime that in this state, and I did refer to this, we were still living in a significantly patriarchal society. We still have misogyny. We still have some disturbing survey results that indicate, amongst some cohorts of young males, there has been a backward slip when it comes to misogyny, and I put that down largely to social media.

But in my lifetime, to just show you how bad things were, and there have been some improvements and thank God for that, but just to show how bad things were—and it is not all that far back, 1976. Some people might say that is a long time ago; that is ancient history. I assure you it is not. In this state, in 1976, rape in marriage was still legal. It was the Dunstan government that introduced the legislative reforms to make that a criminal offence in this state. It is worth reflecting that this was the first common-law country in the world to do that. Once again, South Australia was taking the lead. Some of those attitudes that allowed that to happen back then are still with us now.

Most men that I meet are great people, but there is still a significant minority who can be controlling, who can go from controlling, which is in itself bad enough and can be an indicator of worse to come, to being controlling and violent. The impact on women is profound. Other people have mentioned that sometimes men are victims of domestic violence, and that is true, but overwhelmingly it is women who are victims of domestic violence.

Of course, the other victims are if there are children in the household. It is said that what those children are exposed to and what it does to those children who are exposed has long-term consequences for children who live in households where domestic violence is an occurrence.

So it is incredibly important that this parliament, parliaments throughout the country and the federal parliament continue to do what we can in a legislative sense, and also that the broader community continue to do what they can to drive those changes to the culture until we get to the point where we do not see the number of women who are killed every year in this country: one woman every 10 days is killed in this country. I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (15:45): I am really proud to speak on this important piece of legislation. It gives public sector and local government employees access to family and domestic violence leave entitlements.

Fifteen days' leave can make an important difference in the lives of people fleeing domestic violence. Through collective bargaining between workers and employers, more than a million workers already have access to paid leave for family and domestic violence and we know the impact that entitlement can have.

The federal government has recently legislated for a further 10 million workers. Now it is time for South Australia to do its part. In doing so, we have chosen to take even bigger steps—legislating for 15 days. Prime Minister Anthony Albanese described this victory as 'the best example of bottom up change' that he could think of. This is the work across years of strong union women and activists being unapologetic in their pursuit of this lifesaving leave. I pay particular tribute to the Australian Services Union, for whom this leave entitlement has been their proverbial baby.

Both South Australia's ASU and New South Wales were trailblazers in this space in 2010. One of the cases where the ASU negotiated for paid domestic violence leave was at the Surf Coast Shire Council. At this time, it was the world's most progressive workplace agreement on family violence. Since then, millions of workers across many industries have been covered by similar agreements, supported by their unions, using the ASU template.

The ASU was not content to end there and took up the campaign to legislate for domestic violence leave in agreements across Australia, in our federal parliament and now here in the South Australian parliament. It is a proud legacy for a proud union and it gives me immense pleasure to pay tribute to their work.

In particular, I would love to thank the secretary, Abbie Spencer, the assistant secretary, Scott Cowen, Ella Waters and Daniel Spencer for their important roles in the passing of this legislation. Your local government workers will be thankful for your contribution in the most difficult time of their lives. I also place on record my thanks to the United Workers Union, who represent some of the lowest paid workers in the public sector. Your advocacy on behalf of these workers will change lives.

This law will not end domestic violence. It is a much harder task and there is a lot more to do, but it is an important step, because no worker should have to choose between safety and income. No worker should have to choose between income and medical care. Every worker has the right to be safe at work and at home.

Family and domestic violence leave can be used for any purpose relating to the worker experiencing family and domestic violence, including attending medical appointments, court proceedings, receiving legal advice and relocating residences. It is not hard to see how life-changing this could be in the journey of a domestic violence survivor.

I am privileged to be the Minister for Human Services, which encompasses so many female-dominated industries, but the care economy also hides the brutal reality of what many women face on a day-to-day basis. We know that disability support workers, early childhood educators, aged-care workers and many other women-dominated workplaces are paid poorly and have insecurity in their roles. We know that secure work and the confidence that your employer will support you during times of crisis means that women can continue to support themselves and their families and can take the steps they need to ensure they remain safe.

Since becoming the Minister for Human Services, I have worked every day to undo some of the work of the previous government, which enacted considerable damage along its four years. Many of our marginalised cohorts of people were left to fend for themselves during the global pandemic, and the former government failed to work collaboratively and proactively on so many issues in homelessness, domestic violence, cost of living, disability support and many other areas of my portfolio.

Since coming to government, I have committed myself to undoing this damage, and in so many ways this work is directly related to domestic violence. One of the first things we did was reverse the funding cuts to Catherine House. Across our term of government, we funded \$2 million to Catherine House, where many women experience a complex group of challenges, one of which is often domestic and family violence.

We have instigated our Older Women's Housing Taskforce. This goes to the heart of unstable housing, again often caused by domestic violence. Many women are affected by these issues together—domestic violence and homelessness. The journey we are on to end domestic violence has many travellers. I want to pay particular tribute to the Women's Safety Services SA, fondly known as WSSSA. They support women and their children who are experiencing domestic violence in our community. During difficult conversations like this, it is important that we recognise frontline workers and their support systems that already do exist.

WSSSA provides integrated responses to their clients through the provision of specialised, accessible and flexible models of service delivery that are informed by the lived experience of women and their children, responsive to the diversity of the lives of women and their children, easy to access, evidenced-based and high-quality, engaged in effective strategic partnerships, strong in advocacy and influence and supported by a sustainable organisation. We are so lucky in South Australia to have this important service to support women fleeing domestic violence.

I do meet survivors of domestic violence every day in my work, as do all members of this place, I am sure. I know that this important legislation will go some way to helping more people. One of the extraordinary days that I have spent was alongside the workers and participants of programs at the Zahra Foundation. This foundation is providing a real conduit for change for women. It is empowering women to take control of their financial situation, to take control of their decision-making and to improve the outcome.

I was really impacted by the time I spent sitting around the table with this diverse group of predominantly young women and predominantly mothers of young children, who are every day faced with decisions that are almost impossible to make in terms of providing safety for themselves and their children as well as a roof over their head. So I want to congratulate the Zahra Foundation on the work that they are doing which has been born out of tragedy.

I want to comment in regard to the member for Giles' contribution regarding housing. While this legislation will go such a long way to providing the capacity for women in the acute phase of domestic violence, in an acute experience that is impacting so profoundly on their life, to be able to make a safe choice to seek some treatment and some assistance, I think it is absolutely true what the member for Giles says about housing being at the heart of providing for a community that seeks long-term safety for its citizens.

We have drawn a line in the sand, and we have made a number of announcements around improving and increasing the supply of public housing, improving and increasing the supply of affordable housing, addressing the rental crisis and providing active and proactive solutions to women who are in unstable housing.

Only last week, during country cabinet, I met with a number of women who are survivors of domestic violence, women who are supporters of family members of survivors of domestic violence. To sit and listen to the stories of the instability of the journeying of the women from house to house, the swapping around of the accommodation arrangements to try to protect each other, it is pretty difficult stuff to listen to. It provides me with energy and a real determination to continue to ensure that we get the settings right to provide secure housing and the supports needed to ensure a safer future for women and families experiencing domestic violence.

Only in the last couple of months, we, along with the Homelessness Alliance partners in the north, have opened an accommodation service, a crisis accommodation service called Peppertree Place. It comprises eight units and provides accommodation, at any given time, for eight women and children as family units to seek some safety and some refuge as they recalibrate what it is to live together as a family in safety and begin a journey to secure longer term housing.

It is a much better environment than a hotel, a much better environment than a caravan park, a much more stable environment than a friend's couch, so I was very proud to open that recently, and we will continue to watch how that is going, and look for other opportunities to do exactly the same kind of work across other areas of South Australia. I know that this is not just a metropolitan issue; in fact, it is amplified in the regions. Again, last week's opportunity to talk with women and families was an excellent way to get more information and reaffirm the determination to do better in this space.

I also want to thank the many people who work in electorate offices who are often faced with providing that support for women who come to the office seeking advice about domestic violence. I know there are many young trainees, many young adults, working in electorate offices who are faced with this on a regular basis, and they do an extraordinary job providing support, advice and referral for people seeking advice and safety in crisis.

Before ending, I want to make a little callout to the member for Elder on her contribution, her very strong contribution, calling out the attacks that often happen on social media when members of parliament actually discuss or put up a post about domestic violence and its effect on women and families. None of us deny that there are occasions when domestic violence is inflicted on men. None of us deny that.

What we all want to take account of here is that the vast majority of the devastating cases, and the murders, occur against women every week, week after week. We do not deny this happens to men, and I think that the member for Elder, who is a fairly new member in this place and a young, powerful woman in her community, did an exceptional job of articulating that in terms of calling out the attacks that happen in regard to this issue. Please think before you start attacking what is actually a very important conversation as we journey towards bringing an end to domestic violence. I commend the bill.

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) (16:00): I rise to close this second reading debate and to thank all of the members who have contributed to this really important discussion and exploration of issues around this bill and, more broadly, around domestic violence and its impact on people and communities.

In every contribution, members shared the reasons that they support this bill and discussed technical aspects. What so many also did was share their feelings; share the experiences of people they know or experiences of their own; deeply and rightly acknowledge the courage of victim survivors; and recognise the intersection between economic independence, financial security and recovery and healing.

They also spoke about the incredible commitment of workers in the domestic violence services sector and about the way that those workers walk alongside women experiencing domestic violence. As well as providing particular supports and services, they are deeply committed to providing those services with compassion, in a way that ensures women are able and empowered to walk new pathways with dignity as they traverse that journey to recovery and to healing.

In members making these contributions, I think that they all exemplified the importance of us as members of parliament leading the way in speaking about domestic violence—and in doing so, in speaking, encouraging every person to speak and to ensure that every aspect of domestic violence is brought out from the shadows and that a light is relentlessly shone upon it until it is prevented and ended.

I am extremely proud to be leading the passage of this bill in this place and to work closely with our Attorney-General in the other place towards progressing this reform and others that make up our strong policy commitments that we took to the election last year. These are commitments that focus on amplifying the voice of those courageous victim survivors; commitments that focus on calling out the disrespect towards women and the gender inequality that underpins and drives violence against women, that focuses on shifting attitudes to ensure that that gender inequality is tackled as it should be.

These are commitments that focus on empowering our communities to be part of the solution, to be part of working together towards preventing and ending domestic violence, to bringing to life that oft-repeated mantra that domestic violence is everybody's responsibility. These are commitments that, as the member for Hurtle Vale just spoke about, speak to an understanding about the role that safety and security of housing plays in that journey of recovery and healing. Contributions also spoke to the need for us as a parliament and as a community to tackle the deep and complex intersection between child protection and domestic violence. These are commitments that absolutely speak to our government's desire to do all that we can to progress change that moves us towards a community where domestic violence is prevented and ended.

As I said in my remarks upon introducing this legislation, I am really grateful for the long-lasting efforts of union members and officials who have championed the right to paid domestic violence leave for a very, very long time. I again pay credit to the work of the Australian Services Union and the Australian Workers' Union who, for almost 15 years, have led the charge in rightly calling for family and domestic violence leave in the local government sector.

I thank those union members and, indeed, the members of other unions and officials, who have tirelessly advocated for this change for this step forward to support and empower women experiencing domestic violence. I am really proud to have been part of those efforts, alongside officials and brave workplace representatives who have relentlessly spoken up for their colleagues to have this crucial right.

Since coming into government, and for years and decades previous to this, it has been a great joy for me to hear the stories and experiences of women—women leading change in their fields, and those empowering the voices and autonomy of other women in the face of some of their hardest moments. As I said, I have thoroughly appreciated hearing the reflections of other members throughout this debate, sharing personal stories, stories that have been shared with them and comments on how this bill and the provision of leave will benefit women and workers—and benefit them it will.

This benefit is well known to me when in previous roles, working with workers and employers through different aspects of enterprise bargaining, the conversations held around the matter of domestic violence leave led to further conversations in the workplace regarding how everyone in that particular workplace could better support an employee experiencing domestic violence, what that workplace could do together as a workplace to progress change in addressing domestic violence more broadly and in raising awareness about it. As we continue to speak publicly about the scourge of domestic violence, each one of these contributions continues to raise awareness. They send a message to victim survivors that they are seen, and encourages those experiencing violence to reach for assistance.

Each of the aspects of legislative reform committed by our government, and other efforts to prevent and end domestic violence at their core are about, as I said, addressing gender inequality which we know sits at the centre as the root cause of this violence. We know all too well that achieving gender equality is the right thing for girls and women and it is absolutely the right thing for our entire community, as an equal future benefits everyone.

As members outlined in their contributions, I, too, am committed to ensuring that the voices of women and victim survivors are central to decisions made in relation to the prevention of domestic violence. Throughout the drafting of the National Plan to End Violence against Women and Children, launched in October last year, all states, territories and the commonwealth listened deeply to victim survivors and put their experiences at the heart of that national plan, which takes a whole-of-society approach to ending gender-based violence.

The voices of victim survivors are so incredibly important, and I am honoured to share some of their words in this place. Their call to action as outlined in the National Plan, Victim-Survivor Statement notes:

It is everyone's responsibility to end the perpetration of violence against women and children, and all victims of gendered violence.

The powerful statement goes on to say:

Too many of us are being re-traumatised trying to engage with systems that are meant to 'protect' us but fail. Systems that create barriers to access and have costs beyond our means because services are not designed for the realities of our lives. Instead, they perpetuate the same dynamics of power and control as our abuses. Systems that wait until the worst has happened before they respond, then blame us for not reporting or leaving.

We should not have to die to get your attention.

We should never be forced to choose between violence in our homes or being homeless and facing violence on the streets, or having our families torn apart in ways we never wanted and that cause further harm.

This is not safety.

As noted in our national plan, to reach our goal of a country where all people live free from fear and violence we need sustained, collective action across our community with every person, every organisation, using their power, their sphere of influence, to drive change. Actions cannot be left to governments alone. Each one of us has a role to play in reaching that aim of a country where all people live free from fear and violence.

As the biggest employer in the state, I am proud that we are leading in progressing legislation to enact 15 days paid domestic violence leave. Looking at the whole-of-society effort, our national plan highlights the role that businesses and workplaces can have as we work towards the aim of ending violence against women in a generation.

Key areas in that plan for workplaces include the prevention of gender-based violence through fostering gender equality in the workplace, designing products and services that are safe and prevent misuse whilst also focussing on perpetrator accountability, and providing leave entitlements for victim survivors such as paid family and domestic violence leave and paid parental leave.

This legislation is a key step in enacting our national plan and progressing towards our vision that by the time children born now are starting their own families, the society they live in will be free from violence. This vision is ambitious, but if we are all pulling in the same direction it is achievable. To achieve this kind of generational change we know we need a long-term commitment. The new

iteration of the national plan gives us a chance to emphasise the need for long-term action beyond the life of the plan. That is our shared national commitment, and all governments—as we are doing today—need to pull in the same direction and be united in our efforts to achieve that vision.

In closing, again I thank the many members who have spoken to this bill throughout the debate. I thank them for their words and for sharing experiences, and I thank each of them for their commitment to this cause as we all strive towards change that shifts attitudes and prevents violence against women and children.

I would also like to thank Hilary Wigg in my office, Elliot in the Office of the Attorney-General, Sanjuga Vas Dev and Sandy Pitcher from the Office for Women and the Department of Human Services respectively for their work towards this bill.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr COWDREY: In regard to clause 1, in terms of background information on how the bill was constructed, could the minister provide a list of those organisations, individuals or others who were consulted, including unions, in the construction of the legislation?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: Thank you for the question. With your indulgence, Chair, can I also just say that I feel terrible because there was another person I wanted to thank in the final sentence of my speech. Can I also thank Angas Oehme from the Attorney-General's office for his work towards this bill.

I will come to a specific answer to your question, but I do want to say that this piece of legislation has been discussed for a very long time by women's organisations, by domestic violence service providers and by organisations that play a role in ensuring the economic independence and financial security of women who escape domestic violence. They are organisations like the Zahra Foundation and the Women's Safety Services, so there has been a very long-term conversation.

Certainly, when we were in opposition and now in government I have discussed this bill with a range of those women's organisations, as well as the Working Women's Centre. Also, on 25 September the draft legislation was released for consultation between 25 September and 10 October 2022. It was also provided to public sector and local government unions, to the Law Society of South Australia and to the Local Government Association. We did receive several responses that suggested some technical amendments, which were of course also considered.

Mr COWDREY: Just as a point of clarification, did you receive submissions from each of those organisations you have listed, or were they just who the draft was provided to? I would just like some clarification.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: We did not receive written submissions from every single organisation, but for instance the Local Government Association contacted us. They did not provide a submission but did advise that they did not have any particular issues with the bill.

Mr COWDREY: Would you be able to walk us through for the benefit of the committee how you landed on 15 days? Why was it that number as opposed to a different number in terms of background to understand the thought process to land on that number?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: There were a few reasons. Obviously we wanted to have the best provisions we possibly could. Also, for a particular period of time public sector employees did have access to 15 days' paid leave through a public sector determination, and obviously we did not want to move backwards from that particular position.

Also, not all but a number of councils in their enterprise agreements have struck agreement around particular clauses on the provision of paid domestic violence leave. Some of those are less than the 15 days, but a number are actually higher. Some are at 20 days and others sit around 15.

As well as wanting to have exemplary legislation, we did not want anybody to go backwards or to have any derogation of those particular rights they had been afforded through particular industrial instruments or through that public sector determination.

Mr COWDREY: How closely, if at all, did the state government work with the federal government in the drafting of the bill?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: Obviously we considered the drafting of their legislation and where they landed, and we certainly did adopt particular provisions and had consideration of it along the way. However, as you have just stated, it is certainly not identical in terms of the provisions, but a number of the clauses are expressed in similar ways or go to the same issues.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

Mr COWDREY: I note that the federal legislation that was passed recently, as you have already alluded to, covering much the same subject matter and covering obviously the vast majority of South Australian workers, has come into effect for large businesses on 1 February 2023 and does so for small businesses on 1 August this year. When does the government imagine that this legislation will be operable in South Australia?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: The exact date is not determined, but what I would say is two things. Firstly, we would like to see it enacted as soon as possible; however, we are also cognisant of the need to give notice, particularly to councils and local government organisations, to make sure that they have the opportunity to make their arrangements around these particular provisions. We will be cognisant of that need.

Mr COWDREY: That was effectively my next question. In terms of transition time to implement the change in payroll system, coding or any of those things, is there a transition period of time that you are imagining is going to be necessary for, as you have referenced, local governments and local government organisations to be able to put themselves in a place to operably deliver the change?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: It is a really important question, thank you. It is our intention that we actually consult with the LGA about the length of time that is needed for the transition so that councils do have, as you and I have both said, that opportunity to make their particular arrangements around pay systems and other systems that may need to be changed. We will consult with them about the particular period that is required to do that effectively.

Mr COWDREY: Did they provide any indication to you in any of their submissions of how long they expected to need to implement it? Are we talking by the end of the year, or are we talking mid next year? Do we have any idea of time frame?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: As I said, they have not specifically given a position across local government. As I mentioned before, there are particular councils where they do have provisions in enterprise agreements, so different councils are in different positions in relation to what is provided. Having said that, we would anticipate that the transition period would be months rather than something that occurs next year.

Mr McBRIDE: Minister, do you have an understanding about the effect of these amendments on how many employees in South Australia will be able to access this process?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: There are two parts to the answer that I give you. First of all, there are around 130,000 public sector employees. Also, there are around 11,000 employees in local government. What I would say is we want the provision to be available to all those workers, and the reason we are moving this bill has been articulated well by various members. We want people to be able to access these provisions.

Having said that, with the second part of my answer, whilst it will be open to all those workers, what we also hope with this bill and a number of the other mechanisms that we are putting in place that we have committed to to tackle the scourge of domestic violence is that it will help to raise awareness about domestic violence in workplaces. I think every person in this house would agree

that we hope that, as we begin over time to see the prevention and eradication of domestic violence, it is a smaller number of people who actually need to use it because we hope that the prevalence of domestic violence begins to abate.

Mr McBRIDE: Thank you for the answer, minister. In regard to the local government employees—and I am not sure whether you want to combine the local government and the Public Service—does the government have any understanding of the extra cost implications with the leave, and obviously in the uptake of such a process, and how this will affect productivity and budgets?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: Again, it is a really important question and it is a difficult question for anybody to answer because none of us can predict right now exactly how many workers may need to access these particular provisions.

There are a couple of other things. I know that the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment is looking across government at how statistics about usage can be improved, particularly should this bill progress, which will be really important in terms of better understanding the prevalence of domestic violence which we all always strive to do.

In terms of productivity, I think that is a really interesting question because whilst a person who avails themselves of paid domestic violence leave then is not in the workplace for a particular period of time, what we know is that through the provision of this paid leave they are much more likely to continue their connection with the workplace, and to feel that they are supported and able to raise these issues in their workplace.

As I said, a really important component of this legislation is the provision of the leave but also the awareness-raising. Whilst there might be that impact where particular workers are away from the workplace, we also know that through offering paid leave that really important connection for the workplace—the understanding in the workplace and also for that particular worker in terms of their financial security at a time when they need it most—is actually secured.

Mr McBRIDE: At clause 2—Commencement, with the commencement of this where does this place South Australia amongst the other jurisdictions, other states, with their processes timewise and the need to support such a difficult issue and situation in our society? Are we at the top of the pendulum for being really supportive or are we at the bottom and low and perhaps we have the least days? I want to know what your thoughts are in regard to where the government has landed in South Australia and where it places us with the other states.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: Again, a two-part answer to your question. First of all, I think that here in South Australia we are doing really good and important work and taking steps forward because of the suite of policies and legislation that we are either progressing or have committed to progress here in South Australia.

As members would know, when we tackle domestic violence, it is really important that we do so from a range of angles including the legislative angle. Obviously, this bill, as I have spoken about many times in this place, is part of a suite of legislation that we have either moved or intend to move, but also it is really important that it sits alongside measures around prevention, tackling gender inequality, making sure that the connection between child protection and domestic violence is contemplated and understood.

So what I would say is that I think we are doing good work. There is more to go; there is still a way to go, of course. But as we contemplate this, in amongst the suite of policies and legislative changes, etc. that we are enacting, they are complemented by the national plan that is comprehensive and focuses on prevention, intervention, response, recovery and healing. As we as a state and other states respond to that, we are continuing with that effort in a holistic way, if you like.

In terms of the actual legislation, in light of the federal legislation being passed, a number of other jurisdictions we are aware are developing legislation. I can certainly, perhaps, come back to the house about exactly where each of those jurisdictions are up to at this moment because I do know there has been a flurry of activity in this space. I will check exactly where those deliberations are up to and I can bring an answer back to you.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

Mr COWDREY: I just wanted to put on record that it speaks for itself and is supported.

Clause passed.

Clause 4.

Mr COWDREY: Just in regard to the review function, if you compare the federal bill and the review function for the legislation and the act that is contained in that particular legislation, it is no different to many review functions that we have in many bills and acts that effectively from time to time will look at the operational effectiveness of the legislation against achieving the objectives of the act. What struck me as strange in this particular bill is that it appears that SAET is the only body that is able to initiate a review. Is that correct and is that the intention of the bill?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: There are two things. I feel like I keep having two answers to the question but I just want to make sure there is a really fulsome explanation. The first thing I would say is that in terms of other leave—and I think other provisions—but definitely other leave provisions like bereavement leave, carer's leave etc. that is actually standard in terms of SAET. At particular points in time, or particular reasons, or particular community desire they have the ability to review any of those provisions for leave in that same way that it is described here.

The other thing, though, that I would say is that none of this prevents another organisation from making an application to have a review of this particular provision and the quantum of the provision to SAET. Probably just the other thing—and I guess I am just pre-empting if there is a question on this—you would have seen for (a) and (b) that there is a provision around the two-year period where this will stand as is.

Mr COWDREY: The question was more given the focus of this parliament on this issue over a period of time and given that we essentially have a minister responsible for the issue, and have for some time, whether there was thought that the minister potentially had the power to review. Again, I will leave that because I think your answer was fulsome enough to cover the field for the purposes that we need.

The Hon. K.A. Hildyard: I can add something if you like on that point or not.

Mr COWDREY: I think it is okay. The other question I had in regard to this clause is around the explicit employer obligations that were contained in the federal bill but not in this one, particularly in regard to disclosure on payslips and how the leave was going to be presented. It was explicit in the fact that it was prohibited from being expressly stated as domestic violence leave in the federal bill. Is that something that is contemplated by this legislation and, if not, why not?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: The provisions in this bill do not constrain a particular organisation from determining that they will potentially display the leave as paid domestic violence leave or in any other manner in which that particular workplace determines.

Mr COWDREY: Do you think that is appropriate, given the inclusion of that in the federal bill? As more than half of employees in South Australia, should they take this leave, will be protected in the presentation of that leave on their payslips, is it appropriate for that protection not to be afforded to Public Service workers?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: In relation to these organisations that we are speaking about, they are obviously large employers, either the public sector or local government, with pretty sophisticated systems to be able to construct the description of this particular leave in ways that are safe for particular workers. But you do make a good point; it is something that we will continue to monitor. We would encourage workplaces to work with staff through their awareness-raising conversations as this is implemented about exactly how this will be displayed on their payslips, and we will certainly be monitoring how that works also.

Mr COWDREY: Perhaps by way of comment, if the minister did want to provide an amendment in between houses, I think we on this side would be happy to support any amendment in that vein if you did want to provide it in a more express manner.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

Mr COWDREY: Quite literally, the vast majority of the substantive aspects of the bill are contained in this clause, so I will try my very best to contain it to three questions. We talked earlier about the reasoning for 15 days and obviously the interaction with previously agreed entitlements that were there and not wanting to depart from that too far. Particularly in the second reading speech and in most of the commentary that I have heard publicly so far, there has been an argument about wanting to have consistency between entitlement for all workers in this area.

My question is both in regard to where we have arrived from a state perspective on public sector employees and those covered by the Fair Work Act and then obviously the federal bill and the provisions that are provided there. Is it sensible to have inconsistency between the public and private sector in regard to the level of entitlement for workers?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: Too right, there is inconsistency. However, I would say that I actually think it is important that we do proceed with the 15 days paid leave, because it is really important that the public sector does lead in terms of efforts to ensure that new provisions, etc., are made available to employees and that they are of a high standard.

The other thing I would say is that there is that other consideration, which I spoke about before, and that is that we certainly do not want anybody to be worse off as a result of the implementation of this legislation, and there are inconsistencies right across those councils that do have these provisions, bearing in mind a number of councils do not have them at all.

Mr Cowdrey: This overrides those, does it?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: That is right. So I am saying though that we do not want anyone to be worse off, if that makes sense. I understand there is that inconsistency, but it is really important that we do lead the way and that we certainly do not go backwards in terms of any provisions for workers.

Mr COWDREY: In that same vein, I think you described this legislation as exemplary legislation. Did the federal Labor Party not go far enough in their bill? Would you like to see 15 days across that? Did they not go far enough three months ago when they moved their bill?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: I am really, really proud that federal Labor has implemented the Fair Work Amendment (Paid Family and Domestic Violence Leave) Act. It is such an incredible step forward. It has been long awaited by many, many people and organisations, and it is just an excellent thing that that is now happening across the country, and that now we are making sure that everybody here in South Australia is able to access it.

The thing I would say about the federal jurisdiction that is different to our South Australian jurisdiction is, because of the coverage of workers under the Fair Work Act, it covers a range of private sector employers, so the small fish and chip shop to particular private sector businesses, Qantas, etc. Whereas in this bill, we are talking about similar workers—public sector workers, local government workers; it is very clear who the group is—and we are really clear about what those provisions already are in each of those workplaces. In each of the councils we are really clear. We are really clear in terms of the public sector.

As you would all appreciate, there is a multitude of different sized organisations in the federal arena, and there are all sorts of arrangements, of course underpinned by the Fair Work Act, so I do think that the step forward on the paid 10 days' domestic violence leave is an incredibly important one, and I am sure the commonwealth will continue to make sure that that is implemented well.

What I would say as well is that the federal government has done some extraordinary work to bring every state together over the past eight or nine months since they came to government, to have every state and every territory sign up to the national plan, and the national plan is a brilliant document that is guiding all of the states and territories in terms of the steps forward that we take.

Mr COWDREY: I potentially just have two final questions.

The CHAIR: That is okay. Given the scope of the clause, I might be a bit more lenient.

Mr COWDREY: It is just in regard to schedule 3B section 3. It introduces the reasonable person test around evidence that must be provided on request of the employer. I am just keen to understand how that interacts with the confidentiality provisions that are contained in section 5. From an operational perspective, to whom in the organisation—for the sake of simplicity let's assume this is a government department of some sort where an employee is in the unfortunate circumstances of needing to access this leave.

Is this simply managed by their direct report, by their HR manager or whomever the person feels the most comfortable in approaching, and how do the confidentiality provisions that are contained in the act cross over with the communication of necessary information to ensure that that reasonable person test has actually been met?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: There are a few things about confidentiality; it's a really, really important question. In every organisation there are particular requests for leave made now—whether that is public sector, local government, small business, however that is—and there are provisions around confidentiality in terms of the person that you make that application to, whether that is bereavement leave, carers' leave or sick leave. There are absolutely already confidentiality provisions in place, so that will continue to operate.

However, there are two other things I would say. One is that those confidentiality provisions also do not preclude a person who may choose to disclose particular information to that person, or indeed to other people in a workplace. Our expectation would be that the confidentiality provision is there, bearing in mind that leave provisions are already confidential in terms of the nature of leave that people apply for.

Also, as I said in the speech I gave before and in earlier answers, implementing this leave is also about raising awareness in a workplace. As I said in my speech just half an hour or so ago, if we are serious about bringing to life that mantra that domestic violence is everybody's responsibility, then we do need to have conversations in workplaces, etc., that build awareness.

When I say that, I am not suggesting that everybody knows. Of course I am not suggesting that that is disclosed. What I am suggesting is that we would expect workplaces and departments to actually work through who that appropriate person is that people can speak to about their particular experiences. In many places, that may be the HR contact, in other settings it may be a particular equal opportunity officer or designated representative in the workplace. That is something that we want departments and workplaces to work through in their context and in a way that continues to build awareness about everybody's responsibility in terms of preventing, and building awareness about, domestic violence.

Mr COWDREY: I guess where I was trying to go is where an employee comes in, discloses their situation and their need to source some leave to their immediate superior, who then provides the information that leave needs to be sought to the particular HR function at this particular organisation. The organisation then wants further details. Under the confidentiality provisions, it appears without consent of the actual person that that direct superior would not be able to pass on any further details to the HR manager. It is not unreasonable to think that that situation may occur.

In regard to the confidentiality provisions or in regard to the reasonable person test and the information that is being sought by the employer, is there anywhere where this may overlap and actually cause problems? That is one situation that clearly jumped out.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: Clause 5, which goes to the confidentiality issue, and then clause 3(3) are to be read in conjunction with one another. They are not exclusive. In your scenario, if a worker goes to the particular HR contact person and says, 'I want to avail myself of these particular leave provisions,' it is confidential. However, that does not stop the employer from asking and working with them to find out some information about why, or supporting evidence as is listed in the bill also.

Mr McBRIDE: Still on clause 5 point 2, minister can you please explain why the Canberra federal government would advocate 10 days and this state government thinks that 15 is better? Then consider that maybe 20 might have been better on top of that again. So I would ask you why did you

settle on 15? Secondly, do you have any idea in regard to the cost of those 15 days compared to the federal government 10-day rollout and what that would mean to the government?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: I feel I have answered it, but if there is anything else I will try to add some information. First of all, the 15 is about having the best legislation possible and making sure that we do set a good standard. I would also say that public sector employees have previously, through a public sector determination—not through an act that enshrines those rights forever—had access to 15 days' paid leave. Similarly, in local government there is one council that does 20, a number that do 15 and a number that do 10, so we wanted to make sure that we are lifting people to that standard and not taking away from particular rights.

Of course, those who have 20 paid days in an enterprise agreement will continue to have those 20 paid days in an enterprise agreement until such time that that agreement is renegotiated, expires or lapses. Those are the considerations that we took into account that people are already accessing in terms of the group of workers who are covered by this particular bill here in South Australia.

I would also go back to what I said before that, yes, there will be cost but we cannot absolutely say that this many workers in this particular place will avail themselves of this leave at a particular time because we do not know nor can we know exactly what particular experiences workers will go through in terms of that experience of domestic violence and what requirements they would have in terms of leave.

Mr McBRIDE: In regard to the whole rollout of this valuable and good amendment to employees, and finding themselves in this area, is there any way that the government has given consideration to it not going far enough when it comes to see the numbers, the days required, the sufferance that is perhaps exposed, or is there any way that the government has given consideration that the incidence is way higher than anticipated? I will be the devil's advocate here and dare to say that it perhaps could be used by some to rot or use incorrectly or for the wrong reasons. How does the government think that they would manage this perspective?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: I will just take your last point first, in terms of being the devil's advocate and speaking about whether particular people would misuse the leave—I think that is what you are putting forward, although I am not saying you are suggesting that. Sadly, it is the case that much domestic violence actually goes unreported and that there are many, many people who experience domestic violence who feel afraid, or do not feel comfortable, or who, sadly, feel embarrassed, etc., to raise these issues. My concern would be more about under-reporting, in line with under-reporting, more broadly, of experiences of domestic violence.

The other thing I will say is that we will, of course, monitor how this is being utilised, and think about the number of weeks and provisions, etc. As I spoke about earlier, we will also make sure we give, to local government in particular, that time to address any issues they may have in terms of implementation of the bill.

Mr McBRIDE: Still on clause 5, but moving to dot point 4, it picks up there that, with this leave entitlement, if an employee is on overtime, allowances or loadings, these will also be included. Is this consistent with federal policy, consistent with WorkCover accident-type policies? If it is not, why not?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: In terms of consistency with the federal act, yes, it is consistent. Given that this leave is absolutely designed to promote the safety of people experiencing domestic violence and also to ensure their financial security at a time when we need them to stay connected to their employment, continue to earn their wages, etc., it is important that they have access to leave entitlements that reflect their pay in its entirety so that they can rely on that to pay mortgages, drive their car, all those things that people spend their wages on. It is really important they are included. It is commensurate with the federal scheme in terms of paid domestic violence leave.

In terms of WorkCover, that is a much more complicated question. Depending on the type of work somebody does, when or where they have their particular injury and so on, there are circumstances where penalties, etc., are included and others where they are not. It is difficult to say

conclusively because there is a range of different factors contemplated in the return to work legislation.

Mr McBRIDE: It is perhaps appropriate to speak very positively, that hopefully this actually assists workers and families and the like. Obviously, with this legislation there could be huge amount of discovery, perhaps opening up a lot of closed issues in workers and families in South Australia. Is the government prepared for, has it given consideration to, the fact that there may be a greater need or requirement for specialist health workers—be that psychologists, counsellors or the like—to address these issues, to get these employees back into the workplace and create that happy family environment we so much desire?

What resources has the government considered in trying to address this? We already know that the health sector is under a lot of pressure from COVID and other ailments out there in the wider community.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: It is a really good question. Thank you very much. What I would say first of all is that you make a really good point that we do not introduce this type of legislation or anything to do with domestic violence, improving people's rights and protections, dealing with perpetrators or whatever the particular legislation is in isolation. There are always a whole lot of other departments, people and pieces of legislation that operate at the same time.

The first thing I would say is that I remember some years ago working with—and I cannot now remember whether it was still the Australian Central Credit Union or it had changed to People's Choice Credit Union—the employer and workers there to introduce paid domestic violence leave.

One of the things that we did there—which was incredibly important on that journey, because it was pretty early in terms of the journey of any workers in Australia accessing paid domestic violence leave—was to invite Maria Hagias, the CEO of the Women's Safety Services, and others, to work very closely with workers in that workplace and the employer to talk about what it means to have this provision in their workplace, and if somebody is requesting this leave what might be happening for them and how important it is that there is shared knowledge in their organisation (as well as providing the leave) and what other services and supports can a person who applies for leave be connected to.

That was a really important part of that process, because it was not just about the leave; it was also about, again, raising awareness and really giving people confidence and capacity to understand where else they could connect those particular workers who might apply for that leave to services and supports.

I would say that, in terms of other workers, we are constantly striving in a range of different ways to make sure that when a woman experiences domestic violence that, at the earliest opportunity, there are supports and services that provide prevention in terms of early responses and support, etc., and that there is also effort around really broad primary prevention in terms of raising community awareness.

Also there is a focus on early intervention through staffing, that is, having paid staff members in regional hubs, in 10 regional hubs. There is a process we are going through in terms of consulting about the criminalisation of coercive control and awareness-raising around that.

I say all those things because our work here in South Australia, indeed around the country and I would say also around the world, constantly focuses on how can we make sure that there is that shared effort across departments, across services with community to really make a difference in terms of understanding people's experiences and making sure that they are connected to the right support.

Clause passed.

Long title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (17:03): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

NATIONAL GAS (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (EAST COAST GAS SYSTEM) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 November 2022.)

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (17:04): I take the opportunity to speak in parliament about the National Gas (South Australia) (East Coast Gas System) Amendment Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you lead speaker?

Mr PATTERSON: I indicate that I am the lead speaker, if that keeps you happy. This amendment bill is another batch of reforms coming from the Energy Ministers' Meeting, this one from August last year. As was pointed out to me by one of the stakeholders we consulted with, it continues the trend of gas market reform delivering market transparency and increased powers to market bodies in an attempt to address gas supply issues—this has been going on over the last decade—rather than looking to find ways to increase the supply and get more gas into the actual market itself.

In terms of what the current gas market is like, it is based primarily on bilateral contracts between producers, retailers, infrastructure service providers and also larger users. These bilateral contracts have proved to be extremely reliable in ensuring contracted positions are met. Many if not all of the market participants mitigate their major supply risks through contracts, so you can see contracts are very important to the functioning gas market that is working in Australia.

As a result, though, this government intervention that this amendment bill is proposing into the gas market is a major change and may well result in unintended consequences. This uncertainty could very well have a significant effect on investment into gas production and gas infrastructure. That uncertainty comes at a time when the investment is crucial not only to South Australia's but to Australia's energy security.

More investment in natural gas and increasingly in renewable gas is going to be critical to addressing what is the fundamental issue in the east coast gas markets: the high prices and a challenging market for supply of gas that is occurring at the moment. In fact, more gas into the east coast gas market really is critical to keeping gas prices and ultimately electricity prices down—a lot of electricity prices are dictated by gas generation—for families, for industry and for business as well.

The reasoning that has been provided by the energy ministers for the changes that are being proposed in this bill stems from the fact that, unlike the National Electricity Market, which has well-established frameworks under which AEMO maintains reliability and supply adequacy, AEMO has limited powers and tools to identify and respond to supply and demand imbalances in the east coast gas market outside of Victoria.

This National Gas (South Australia) (East Coast Gas System) Amendment Bill is aiming to implement a framework that provides the Australian Energy Market Operator with the tools and power to monitor risks to supply adequacy in advance of those risks being realised, to signal those risks to the market and to seek a response. The amendments are meant to address the winter 2023 east coast gas supply adequacy concerns that have been raised by both the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) in their July 2022 gas inquiry interim report and also AEMO's Gas Supply and System Adequacy Risks report. Both those reports indicated gas shortages in the upcoming winter.

The amendment bill also allows AEMO to manage situations if adequate market responses are not forthcoming to ensure AEMO has multiple options to better manage the forecast threats for

winter 2023. It is that part of the bill, certainly, that the stakeholder feedback has some legitimate concerns about, around really trying to insert AEMO into the market, which is run by contracts.

In terms of the Australian Energy Market Operator and the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission, I mentioned their reports from July 2022, but even preceding those reports they have consistently highlighted the risk of domestic gas supply shortfalls going back in recent years. A lot of this stems from a fall in the southern reserves—those legacy gas fields in Victoria, for example—and the result has been an increasing reliance on gas from Queensland.

Over the last decade, the country has gone from a long-selling position, one where there is a fair excess of gas that is being supplied to one that is now short, so demand is exceeding supply. Alarming, this supply-demand balance is expected to deteriorate further, with AEMO forecasting the risk of substantial declines in production in the southern states from 2023. This is going the wrong way for a country that really is blessed with an abundance of gas on the east coast itself.

Exports are a significant factor; they are pointed out and they become a bit of a lightning rod in terms of why there is a shortage. But maybe if we just worked through that export sector in ways that it can be mitigated. As I said, the exports of LNG are a major contributor to the amount of gas required to be produced in Australia. This is done out of the three major LNG export facilities. They each have a gas processing capacity for that facility and the ones that have been built were built in response to significant export contracts by other countries.

Those gas processing plants, as I said, have capacity and they have a buffer between what their contracts are and what they can process. They can process more than what their contracts require. Approximately 90 to 95 per cent of their plant processing capacity is tied up to supply those contracts, so you can see there is that extra capacity for them. It can be used to supply into the international spot market and there are very high prices internationally at the moment which then are drawing and competing with the same pool as the domestic market.

This really has had the effect of coupling the domestic market to the international market as well. It was pointed out by a number of stakeholders that, if a country can increase its supply, especially so it is in excess of the LNG processing capacity of these plants, that excess supply can only go into the domestic market. In a way, by doing that, it can decouple international pricing from domestic pricing as well, which I think is a worthy aim for this country because, as I said, we have an abundance of gas. It is a frustration for all Australian users that we do not have that abundance equate through to lower prices at the moment. Certainly, in the past we have had that; that is where we want to go again. But there are complex factors around how we can move forward.

It is also worth pointing out in terms of these export facilities, that LNG is going to countries that have committed to net zero carbon emissions by 2050. They are using the LNG as a transition pathway to reduce their emissions because that then reduces their reliance on coal-fired power. When people talk about Australia and its gas and trying to reduce gas usage, just remember that there are countries that are significantly further behind Australia that are actually using gas to help with their transition to help reduce their emissions.

The point really should be always pressed home that, as to these carbon emissions, it is global warming: it is not Australia warming. We benefit as a country when global emissions go down, unfortunately global emissions are going a totally different direction to where Australian emissions are going. But we should really try not to back away from the fact that other countries that actually have a commitment to reduce their emissions are using Australian gas, therefore why should Australia not also take up that opportunity?

Why should we not look to make sure our domestic gas supply is over and above and being used to help Australia decarbonise in a sensible, methodical way? I bring that point home because, worldwide, we are seeing countries revert back to coal-fired power generation because of shortages in natural gas. The world's three biggest coal users have boosted their output recently. I think China's coal-fired power use has risen up by about 9 per cent. India's has gone up by about 16 per cent and the US is by 14 per cent.

Without natural gas, the world is reverting back to coal. We need these countries to work with gas and, as I said, countries that are using our LNG exports are looking to do that. If we can

increase the supply of gas into the domestic market, we will not be departing from pathways that other credible countries are using, which is part of their journey to net zero.

As I alluded to earlier, both the ACCC and AEMO cautioned that domestic gas supply adequacy has deteriorated substantially since early 2022. In July 2022, AEMO's gas inquiry report 2017-2030 noted that, under their 2023 progressive change demand scenario with high gas-powered generation, the east coast gas market could face a shortfall as high as 109 petajoules in 2023.

Similarly the ACCC forecasted in its July 2022 gas inquiry interim report that the east coast gas market is at risk of a 56 petajoules shortfall in 2023 unless more gas from Queensland LNG producers can be supplied to the domestic market. That potential shortfall, when you try to frame what 56 petajoules is, is roughly equivalent to 10 per cent of the east coast gas market's domestic demand. This is 40 petajoules higher than forecast in the January 2022 interim report. You can see that it jumped in July 2022.

This deficit means that the domestic east coast gas market has become more susceptible to external shocks and will continue to be susceptible until the core issue around the domestic supply of gas is overcome. That was a fragility in the market that has been building for a number of years. In 2022, of course, the global pandemic recovery was underway which meant that more gas was being used worldwide.

The gas resource availability impacts were therefore growing, and have been growing since 2021, and then unfolded significantly as a result of the Russian invasion of Ukraine, which substantially increased international demand for Australian gas. Concurrently, what happened in the winter of 2022—and which quite often is overlooked—is that there were significant coal generator outages on the east coast and this coincided with lower than usual renewable energy generation during the winter of 2022.

To make up for that shortfall, there was increased domestic gas demand for gas-powered generation. Where gas in Australia is typically used as a so-called peaker for these generators, with plants fired up when demand is strong in the evenings or on cold mornings, last winter many of these gas power stations were running around the clock, so there was a significant increase in the use of gas.

This confluence of factors, amongst others, led to record high spot prices during the middle of 2022 and resulted in interventions from AEMO to address supply adequacy risks. No-one wants to see that. There were really devastating impacts on business especially, buying it on the spot market. For that reason, this amendment bill seeks to try to avoid a gas crisis happening in 2023 as well.

As I said before, if domestic production meant supply increased so that it was over and above the excess of the LNG processing capacity—which, at the same time, was experiencing unprecedented global gas prices in these processing plants—then Australia would have been decoupled to much more of an extent from those big international prices. That excess gas over and above the plant capacity could then have made its way to the domestic market and domestic market prices would have been decoupled to much more of an extent.

What are the factors? Why are we seeing this deficit in terms of supply and demand? You would have to say that Victoria's moratorium on onshore gas development has played a big part. Their existing gas reserves are depleting, and they are not looking to replace them with onshore gas development. At the same time, New South Wales is going slow on some key projects in their state, such as Santos's \$3.5 billion Narrabri scheme. This really has not helped the east coast gas shortage. Both those states are significant users of energy. It is beholden on them to really do some heavy lifting for their states, rather than rely on gas from South Australia or Queensland.

That is not the case at the moment. It was in this environment that the energy ministers met in August 2022, looking to address the challenge that the east coast gas market could potentially face in the winter of this year. That saw this amendment bill drafted, but it was consulted on in a very short period of time. In fact, on 29 September 2022, while this was happening, the consultation period went on. At the same time as the consultation in September, east coast LNG exporters and the Australian government renewed and updated their heads of agreement.

Under the terms of the new heads of agreement, excess gas produced by the LNG exporters must be first offered to the domestic market for reasonable supply periods, with reasonable notice, on competitive market terms and at internationally competitive prices, before being offered to the international market. That was a way of circumventing the excess in production capacity of those LNG exporters. In fact, LNG producers committed to offer 157 petajoules of gas to the domestic market in 2023. Should that be taken up, that would overcome any of those projected shortfalls.

Talking of those shortfalls, in January this year the ACCC provided their updated gas inquiry report. The report itself outlined that the east coast gas market is still facing a shortfall, down a bit on their previous report, down to 30 petajoules in 2023, but only if the Queensland LNG producers export all of their uncontracted gas.

While this is an improvement since the July 2022 report, uncontracted gas demand and uncertainty about the level of demand and production still represents a key risk for the supply outlook in 2023. Having said that, LNG producers have a heads of agreement in place that they will step up to the plate and supply sufficient gas into the domestic market—under firm contracts as well, avoiding going on to the spot market. That is where we saw a lot of the pain last year.

The ACCC report identifies 146 petajoules of uncontracted gas that the LNG exporters are producing. The shortfall would occur if all of this went offshore. That reiterates what I said previously. If at least 30 petajoules of this can be contracted domestically for winter 2023, the predicted shortfall would be able to be overcome. However, there certainly still is uncertainty around what the final level of demand in 2023 will be, because it will be influenced heavily by what the gas demand will be for gas-powered generation. It is difficult to forecast what the gas-powered generation demand will be, because it does depend on the weather and on conditions in the electricity market.

I think a big hurdle for the market to overcome is coming up very quickly, which is the massive coal-fired power station in Liddell closing down in New South Wales in April this year, just preceding winter. This may well cause increased gas-powered generation over a colder winter as well. They are not out of the woods just yet.

I think we have been talking around figures of between 30 to 50 petajoules as a shortfall predicted over those three reports by the ACCC where there is available uncontracted gas in a nation which does, as I said, have plentiful gas, so you would expect that this shortfall will be overcome in the short-term. I think it is also the longer term that we need to have an eye on as well, and certainly that is the more problematic information that has come out of the recent ACCC report, and it relates to what those longer term forecasts are.

That report, the ACCC report, outlined that without additional gas supply, transportation and storage infrastructure, there remains significant risks to domestic energy security over the medium to long-term. Even under the most optimistic scenario, for a fast as possible shift to electrification, which would see a reduction in demand for natural gas, the ACCC report warns that ongoing use for residential, commercial and industrial purposes means forecast production will not be sufficient to meet both domestic and export demand as soon as 2027.

Further to that, a domestic supply gap of some 300 petajoules is forecast to emerge in New South Wales and Victoria alone by 2034. Putting that into perspective, 300 petajoules equates to more than half the existing east coast demand for natural gas this year. This is going to place continued upward pressure on prices into the domestic gas market, and also at the same time place pressure on the electricity market through the role that gas-powered generation will likely play in meeting certainly peak electricity demands, and also maintain stability of the east coast energy system as well.

Again, getting back to what I said previously, you have Victoria's moratorium on onshore gas developments, and you have New South Wales's go-slow on key projects, such as Santos's \$3.5 billion Narrabri scheme. These are already having massive impacts on gas shortages, which will continue into the future. Victoria is saying, 'Oh, we won't try to produce our own gas, but we are still happy to use it,' and via this bill try to force gas into that market, to try to amplify their green credentials. The point is: you have other countries who have committed to 2050. They are using gas as well.

The actions of Victoria are really disrupting the gas market. That has big impacts here in South Australia as well. As I said before, it is incumbent on both New South Wales and Victoria to develop their own gas industry. They need to open up their gas fields to help solve this east coast gas crisis, fundamentally.

It is important, and it is certainly important that governments continue to support the efficient, competitive and timely development of new sources of gas supply and infrastructure from both the existing basins, such as the Bowen, Surat, Cooper and Otway, and those not connected to the grid as well, including the North Bowen and Galilee basins, which are in Queensland, and also the Gunnedah Basin in New South Wales, which is the site of Santos's long-delayed Narrabri project.

These will need investment in new pipelines. Just as an example, if there was a 450-kilometre pipeline built that is all that is needed to link what is 150,000 petajoules of gas in the North Bowen Basin into the southern pipeline network, and this would effectively allow gas molecules to flow right from Townsville all the way down to Hobart as well.

We need to have investment certainty for the gas market because you can see just an investment such as that really would go a long way to unlocking and helping stabilise the east coast gas market, and so those concerns around investments that this bill potentially could bring up are of concern. If companies are not certain about investing because contracts could be broken, then that is a concern, and you can see what the effect is by that example there.

Averting shortages on the east coast, which will otherwise put upwards pressure on both domestic gas and electricity prices, requires more than 450 petajoules of new gas development for the domestic market, according to the ACCC. At these levels of gas shortage, you know when you are talking about 450 petajoules, the powers that are being put in AEMO's hands via this current amendment bill would just be overwhelmed. It speaks to much more fundamental economic basics of needing to return to a position where the supply of gas is needed to significantly overcome this shortfall. Regardless, we find ourselves at the moment with an amendment bill trying to insert AEMO into the gas market, amending the national gas laws, and that is what has been approved at the Energy Ministers' Meeting.

In terms of a time line, on 12 August 2022 the Energy Ministers' Meeting agreed to take a range of actions to support a more secure, resilient and flexible east coast gas market. Energy senior officials undertook consultation between 26 September and 21 October, seeking stakeholder comments on the proposed regulatory amendments, including the draft bill, draft regulations and what the initial set of minister-initiated rules would look like.

I made the point earlier that this consultation period is incredibly short. Previous bills that I have spoken on here that have come through and arrived in the South Australian parliament have had consultation—some for periods in excess of five years. That is probably really going down and making sure there are no unintended consequences, but you have that on one side compared with what we have here, which is a rushed consultation. A lot of the stakeholders feel pushed into a corner and, as a result, have genuine concerns around unintended consequences. That is what we do not want to see, because we do not want to try to give a reason for these companies not to invest when investment is so crucial.

On 28 October 2022, the Energy Ministers' Meeting agreed to the amendments to the national gas law to extend AEMO's functions and powers to manage reliability and gas supply adequacy for the east coast gas market over winter 2023 and also beyond. I think the 'beyond' part is where there were significant concerns from stakeholders—whether there was a need for the remit to be ongoing.

Regardless, on 30 November 2022 the Minister for Energy and Mining introduced the National Gas (South Australia) (East Coast Gas System) Amendment Bill 2022 into the House of Assembly in South Australia. As has been said previously, South Australia is the lead legislator for these national energy laws and we now see these changes for the east coast gas system being introduced. The convention for such changes to the national energy laws is that these legislative amendments are supported by the opposition, so I indicate that the opposition will be supporting this bill.

I reiterate, labouring the point a little, that the time frame for this suite of reforms was unusually short in comparison to national energy law and rule amendments that we have previously considered here. The government will be beholden to take responsibility for that, to manage that. As I said, even though we offer bipartisan support in terms of it coming from the energy ministers' council, the government is beholden to understand that there are risks involved here and also that there are a multitude of questions that arose from the rushed nature of the reform. I would like to get some answers to those questions during the committee stage, indicating I would like to go into committee when the second reading speeches have been completed.

The bill itself has some key elements. They include function and rule-making, transparency, signalling, directions powers, and cost recovery and competition. If we look at function and rule-making, AEMO's new east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy functions are proposed to encompass:

- monitoring trends in supply and demand across the system;
- identifying, communicating and publishing information about actual or potential threats to reliability and adequacy of gas supply within the east coast gas system;
- reporting to energy ministers on these matters; and
- giving directions and trading in gas (and any associated services) to maintain or improve the reliability and adequacy of gas supply in the east coast gas system.

There will be other functions conferred on AEMO by the rules for the purposes of the new east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy functions.

The bill also provides a head of power for regulations to be put in place. It is intended that those regulations will specify the relationship between the operation of AEMO's east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy functions, or a provision of these functions, and a law of a participating jurisdiction in the event of inconsistency. It also goes on to look into the extent to which a relevant entity is or is not required to comply with an east coast gas system direction in circumstances where the direction is inconsistent with a law of a participating jurisdiction. Also, the regulations are looking to the extent to which an east coast gas system direction is not valid in circumstances where that direction is inconsistent with a law of a participating jurisdiction.

Regarding transparency, to ensure AEMO has the necessary information to undertake its new function, the draft regulatory framework sets out additional disclosure obligations on certain industry participants over specific forecast periods. In addition to those explicit additional disclosure requirements, the regulatory framework enhances AEMO's ability to seek specific information relevant to the exercise of its functions from a wide range of entities, including gas producers, pipeline operators, storage providers and large users.

Signalling is another aspect of this bill. It provides AEMO with significant flexibility into how it will undertake its monitoring and signalling functions, the idea being that where there is an emerging risk or a system threat it can be identified, whether that threat is over a short or longer term. Having a signalling framework will allow AEMO to notify the market and seek market responses to address the threat. That is in terms of identifying threats.

As I spoke about before, another aspect to it is directions. That is, where there are concerns from stakeholders, the idea behind it is that where the market does not or cannot respond to AEMO's signalling of an actual or potential threat emerging, this bill provides comprehensive directions powers. Those proposed powers would allow AEMO to instruct a range of entities to take specific actions to maintain or improve the reliability and supply adequacy of natural gas across the east coast gas system. These powers have been made broad to ensure AEMO can take actions to manage the risk of gas supply shortfalls in the winter of 2023.

AEMO will be empowered to exercise a range of directions powers relating to reliability and supply adequacy, including to maintain and improve the reliability of the supply of natural gas with the east coast gas system and to maintain and improve the adequacy of supply within the east coast gas system. AEMO's directions may relate to the operation, maintenance or use of any equipment

or installation, the control of the flow of natural gas or any other matter that may affect the reliability or adequacy of gas supply within the east coast gas system.

AEMO must, before making an order relating to an east coast gas system reliability and supply adequacy function, consider the extent to which the persons of the class to which the proposed order is addressed may make representations about the terms of the proposed order, and invite those persons to make representations to the extent that AEMO considers possible in the circumstances.

Of course, breaking contracts and ordering these directions will certainly have cost implications. There are cost recovery and compensation considerations brought into this bill. AEMO can already recover costs from all or a specific subset of market participants in relation to the exercise of AEMO's powers, but the bill provides additional cost recovery flexibility in relation to AEMO's directions powers. At this stage, noting the time, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

At 17:39 the house adjourned until Wednesday 22 February 2023 at 10:30.

*Estimates Replies***ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS**

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing:

There were no new administrative units created, abolished or transferred.

EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing:

Since 22 March 2022, there have been no executive roles created.

EXECUTIVE TERMINATIONS

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing:

Since 22 March 2022, there have been no executive positions abolished.

EXECUTIVE TERMINATIONS

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing:

Since 22 March 2022, there have been no executive positions terminated.

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing:

The expenditure on contractors and consultants with cost above \$10,000 between 22 March 2022 and 30 June 2022 is presented below.

Engaged after 22 March 2022:

Contractor/Consultant	Reason for engagement	Method of appointment	Cost (excl GST)—22 March to 30 June 2022
Belair Turf Management Pty Ltd	Contracted to provide maintenance and Landscaping services at ORSR sites	Direct Negotiation	21,697.27
Bentleys (SA) Pty Ltd	Consultation for Feasibility Study into the Netball SA Stadium—Stage 2 Redevelopment	Direct Negotiation	32,200.00
Mcgregor Tan Research	Contracted to provide professional services to coordinate and facilitate sport participation research	Direct Negotiation	30,000.00
Ngs Earthmoving	Contracted to provide Earthworks at Eagle Mountain Bike Park	Direct Negotiation	21,100.00
Peter May Fencing	Contracted to construct fencing at State Sports Park	Direct Negotiation	30,200.00

Contractor/Consultant	Reason for engagement	Method of appointment	Cost (excl GST)—22 March to 30 June 2022
Peter May Fencing	Contracted to construct ball protection fencing at Women's Memorial Playing Fields	Direct Negotiation	30,850.00
Peter May Fencing	Contracted to construct fencing at other sites across various other contracts	Direct Negotiation	33,110.00
SA Irrigation & Landscaping	Contracted to provide landscaping services at Mile End Precinct	Direct Negotiation	16,544.81

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing:

The estimated total cost to be incurred in 2022-23 for consultants and contractors is \$3.1 million.

The estimated total cost in 2022-23 for each consultant or contractor that has already been engaged at a total estimated cost above \$10,000 is presented below.

Contractor/Consultant	Reason for engagement	Estimated Cost 2022-23 (excl. GST)	Method of appointment
Belair Turf Management Pty Ltd	Contracted to provide maintenance and Landscaping services at ORSR sites	41,375	Request for Quotation (RFQ)
Chris Turtur Services	Contracted to provide track maintenance services at Adelaide Super Drome	33,000	Direct Negotiation
Cleanscope	Contracted to provide cleaning services at SA Athletics Stadium	38,000	Direct Negotiation
Cleanscope	Contracted to provide cleaning services at Womens Memorial Playing Fields	15,602	Direct Negotiation
Diverse Information Solutions	Contracted to provide archiving & record management services	20,000	Pre-existing contract
Hays Specialist Recruitment	Contracted to provide temporary staff	20,000	Government Contract
Iss Facility Services Aust Ltd	Contracted to provide cleaning services at Adelaide Super Drome	25,000	Direct Negotiation
Laninau Pty Ltd	Contracted to provide physiotherapy/massage services to SASI	11,000	Pre-existing contract
Leading Edge Physical Therapy	Contracted to provide physiotherapy services to SASI.	21,500	Pre-existing contract
Mel Consultants Pty Ltd	Consultation services in support of the Adelaide Superdrome Wind Tunnel Facility—technical specification review (capital)	150,000	Pre-existing contract
Olivia Warnes	Contracted to provide nutrition services to SASI	65,000	Pre-existing contract
Peter May Fencing	Contracted to construct fencing at State Sports Park and Women's Memorial Playing Fields	20,000	Request for Quotation (RFQ)

Contractor/Consultant	Reason for engagement	Estimated Cost 2022-23 (excl. GST)	Method of appointment
Riggs Digital	Contracted to provide professional services relating to website development and maintenance	15,000	Pre-existing contract
SA Sports Federation Inc	Contracted to deliver coaching and officiating Professional Development courses to the Sport and Recreation sector	33,398	Request for Quotation (RFQ)
South Australia Police	Contracted to provide security services at ORSR facilities	17,000	Government Contract
Sports & Arthritis Clinic	Contracted to provide medical services to SASI (Dr Geoffrey Verall)	59,000	Pre-existing contract
Spotless Facility Services P/L	Contracted to provide soft services at ORSR facilities	355,000	Request for Quotation (RFQ)
Spurrier David J	Contracted to provide physiotherapy services to SASI	15,000	Pre-existing contract
Surf Life Saving South Aust	Contracted to deliver the VACSWIM program	472,000	Public Invitation to Supply (ITS)
Ventia Australia Pty Ltd	Across Government Contractor for facilities management services	400,000	Government Contract
Liam Nottle	Contracted to provide physiotherapy services to SASI	15,000	Direct Negotiation
Pernix	Contracted to deliver a Salesforce CRM Current State Review including roadmap planning	10,000	Direct Negotiation
URPS	Contracted to facilitate Women in Sports Taskforce Forums including preparation of summary report	9,085	Direct Negotiation
KPMG	Contracted to provide a Benefit-Cost-Analysis for new SASI-ORSR Mile End	35,000	Direct Negotiation

GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing:

The budgeted expenditure on goods and services for the financial year 2022-23 and each of the years of the forward estimates period is as follows:

	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
	Budget	Budget	Budget	Budget
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Supplies and Services	6,366	6,203	6,052	5,700

At the time of writing, the horizon year rollover process had not been completed for the 2026-27 financial year.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing:

The budgeted FTE related to communication and promotion activities, and their cost is as follows:

	2022-23 Budget	2023-24 Budget	2024-25 Budget	2025-26 Budget
Communications—FTE	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Communications—Cost (\$000)	205	209	213	217

At the time of writing, the horizon year rollover process had not been completed for the 2026-27 financial year.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing:

The budgeted cost of government-paid advertising, including campaigns, across all mediums in 2022-23 is \$10,000.

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing allocates funding across a range of programs. The government has undertaken a review of the grants funding programs.

Those programs already opened as at 14 August 2022 are:

- 2022-23 \$2.7 million, 2023-24 \$2.735 million, 2024-25 \$2.771 million and 2025-26 \$2.808 million for the State Sport and Recreation Development Program to provide financial support to eligible state sport and active recreation organisations to help ensure a sustainable and thriving sector.
- 2022-23 \$700,000, 2023-24 \$718,000, 2024-25 \$735,000 and 2025-26 \$754,000 for the Performance Pathways Program to provide financial support to state sporting organisations and select national sporting organisations in Olympic, Paralympic or Commonwealth Games sports to develop and operate their performance pathways.
- 2022-23 \$3.029 million, 2023-24 \$3.105 million, 2024-25 \$3.182 million, 2025-26 \$3.262 million for the Active State Collaboration Program which provides financial support to programs that address inactivity levels and promote inclusion through participation, community, partnering, and innovation.
- 2022-23 \$398,000 and 2023-24 \$126,000 is funded through the Active State Collaboration Program for commitments made from the former Partnerships Program to a range of organisations.
- \$10 million per annum in 2022-23 and over the forward estimates to Sports Vouchers Subsidy Program to provide opportunities for children aged from reception to year 9 to receive up to a \$100 discount on sports or dance membership or registration fees.

Other funding programs will be formally announced or opened in the coming months.

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2022-23 and across the forward estimates for the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing—Administered Items:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000	2025-26 Estimate \$000
Sport & Recreation Fund	The Office has responsibility for two Administered funds; both of which are created and governed by legislation. Monies in the funds are transferred to Controlled and applied to sport and recreation activities as prescribed in the relevant legislation and approved by the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing.	4,536	4,578	4,605	4,633
Recreation and Sport Fund		-	-	-	-

ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Department for Child Protection:

No administrative units were created, abolished or transferred to another department or agency between 22 March 2022 and 30 June 2022.

EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Department for Child Protection:

Between 22 March 2022 and 22 July 2022, there were two executive appointments to existing executive positions, following merit-based selection processes:

- Chief Human Resources Officer with an annual salary of \$237,092 and a total remuneration package value of \$270,000 p.a.
- Chief Information Officer with an annual salary of \$221,720 and a total remuneration package value of \$245,000 p.a.

EXECUTIVE TERMINATIONS

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Department for Child Protection:

Between 22 March 2022 and 22 July 2022, no executive positions were abolished in the department.

EXECUTIVE TERMINATIONS

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Department for Child Protection:

Between 22 March 2022 and 22 July 2022, there were no executive termination payments made within the department.

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Department for Child Protection:

As required by Department of the Premier and Cabinet Circular PC013—Annual Reporting Requirements for 2021-22 information relating to expenditure on consultants and contractors including the vendor, total cost and nature of work undertaken, will be detailed in annual reports published by agencies.

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Department for Child Protection:

The estimated total cost for engagement of consultants and contractors in 2022-23, where engagement was after 22 March 2022, is \$472,715.72.

The following is a summary of external consultants that have been engaged since 22 March 2022 at a total estimated cost above \$10,000, the method of appointment, the nature of work undertaken, and the estimated cost for 2022-23.

Consultancies	Method of Appointment	Reason for Engagement	Total Cost 2022-23 (excl GST)	Estimated Total Cost of Work (excl GST)
Nil	-	-	-	-

The following is a summary of contractors that have been engaged since 22 March 2022 at a total estimated cost above \$10,000, the method of appointment, the nature of work undertaken, and the estimated cost for 2022-23.

Contractors	Method of Appointment	Reason for Engagement	Total Cost 2022-23 (excl GST)	Estimated Total Cost of Work (excl GST)
Hay Specialist Recruitment (Aust) Pty Ltd	Request for Quotation (RFQ)	HR—Multiple short term staffing	\$172,414.70	\$252,993.82
Objective Corporation Ltd	Direct Negotiation	Professional services—ICT services	\$14,701.93	\$73,710.00
Fujifilm Business Innovations Australia Pty Ltd	Request for Quotation (RFQ)	Professional services—ICT services	\$95,512.93	\$154,289.00
Health Safety Environment Aust	Direct Negotiation	Professional Services—Respirator fit testing	\$65,841.36	\$123,636.36
Greencap—Naa Pty Ltd	Direct Negotiation	Professional Services—Respirator fit testing	\$14,700.00	\$50,000.00
Aushealth Corporate Pty Ltd	Direct Negotiation	Professional Services—Respirator fit testing	\$109,544.80	\$135,454.55

GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Department for Child Protection:

Page 92 of the 2022-23 Agency Statements, Budget Paper 4, Volume 1 provides the Department of Child Protection's budget for supplies and services for 2022-23.

Forward years have not yet been formally released.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Department for Child Protection:

Table 1 shows the total budgeted FTE to provide communication and promotion activities for 2022-23 and the forward estimates:

Table 1: FTE employed in communication and promotion activities

Unit/Branch		2022-23 Budget	2023-24 Budget	2024-25 Budget	2025-26 Budget
Communications and Engagement Unit	FTE	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	\$	616,440	625,687	635,072	644,598

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Department for Child Protection:

The department's total budgeted cost of government-paid advertising, including campaigns, across all mediums in 2022-23 is \$34,000, which is predominantly for advertising to support the recruitment of additional foster carers.

Additionally, as an open and transparent government, marketing communications activity reports and annual media expenditure details are proactively disclosed. The reports list all marketing campaigns over the cost of \$50,000 and budgeted expenditure for approved campaigns and are disclosed on the DPC website:

<https://www.dpc.sa.gov.au/about-the-department/accountability/government-marketing-advertising-expenditure>.

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Department for Child Protection:

The following table provides information on grant programs/funds for 2022-23.

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2022-23 Budget \$000
CAFFSA Family Matters	Further the aims of the Family Matters Campaign in South Australia and support collaboration with the SA government on implementation of Family Matters related activity.	182
CAFFSA (Child and Family Focus SA) Policy Officer	Engage a Policy Officer to undertake policy activity that will support the child and family services sector (child protection).	109

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2022-23 Budget \$000
Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017—Section 169 Review	To support CAFFSA member organisations to participate in the section 169 legislative review of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017.	41
NAIDOC SA	To fund NAIDOC SA community events that celebrate and recognise the achievements, culture and language of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. The event also provide an opportunity for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal participants to engage from across the state.	25
Care Leavers Australia Network	Provision of services to South Australia Care Leavers including helping members access counselling, access files and records, contact other services including support with Centrelink and housing.	15
Healthy Development Adelaide	Healthy Development Adelaide (HDA) was established in 2004 as an initiative of the University of Adelaide and seeks to link research, service delivery and policy development in the physical, psychological and social health of infants, children and adolescents. The organisation is supported by a partnership of South Australian (SA) organisations including DCP in recognition of the role of HDA in leading emerging child and youth research and connecting research, policy and practice.	8

Within the Department for Child Protection, grants are agreed upon on a year by year basis and as a result forward years' information is not available.

ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Office for Women within the Department of Human Services:

Between 22 March 2022 and 30 June 2022, no administrative units were created, abolished or transferred to another department.

EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Office for Women within the Department of Human Services:

Since 22 March 2022, no executive appointments were made in the Office for Women.

EXECUTIVE TERMINATIONS

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Office for Women within the Department of Human Services:

Since 22 March 2022, there were no executive positions abolished in the Office for Women.

EXECUTIVE TERMINATIONS

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Office for Women within the Department of Human Services:

Since 22 March 2022, there have been no executive terminations in the Office for Women.

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Office for Women within the Department of Human Services:

As required by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet Circular PC013—Annual Reporting Requirements for 2021-22 information relating to expenditure on consultants and contractors including the vendor, total cost and nature of work undertaken, will be detailed in annual reports published by agencies.

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Office for Women within the Department of Human Services:

The estimated total cost for engagement of consultants and contractors in 2022-23 is \$0.

The following is a summary of external consultants that have been engaged at a total estimated cost above \$10,000, the nature of work undertaken, and the estimated cost for 2022-23.

Consultancies	Purpose	Total Estimated Cost
N/A		

The following is a summary of external contractors that have been engaged at a total estimated cost above \$10,000, the nature of work undertaken, and the estimated cost for 2022-23.

Contractors	Purpose	Total Estimated Cost
N/A		

GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Office for Women within the Department of Human Services:

The budgeted expenditure on goods and services for the financial year 2022-23 and each of the years of the forward estimates period is as follows:

	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Total goods and services	306	181	180	162

The reduction in the budgeted goods and services between 2022-23 and 2023-24 reflects time limited funding and specific activity associated with the National Partnership on Family, Domestic and Sexual Violence Responses 2021-23.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that, as the Office for Women is a division of the Department of Human Services (DHS), any communication and promotion activities are provided by the broader department.

The total budgeted FTE for DHS communications and promotion services which includes activities for the Office for Women is:

Table 1: FTE employed in communication and promotion activities

Unit/Branch		2022-23 Budget	2023-24 Budget	2024-25 Budget	2025-26 Budget
Communications and Engagement	FTE	12.8	9.8	9.8	9.8
	\$m	1.7	1.4	1.4	1.4

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised that for the Office for Women within the Department of Human Services:

As an open and transparent government, marketing communications activity reports and annual media expenditure details are proactively disclosed. The reports list all marketing campaigns over the cost of \$50,000 and budgeted expenditure for approved campaigns and are disclosed on the DPC website:

<https://www.dpc.sa.gov.au/about-the-department/accountability/government-marketing-advertising-expenditure>

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (21 June 2022). (Estimates Committee B)

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): I have been advised:

The following table provides the requested information on grant program/funds under my responsibility for the 2022-23, 2023-24, 2024-25 and 2025-26 financial years—*Controlled*:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000	2025-26 Estimate \$000
Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence					
Status of Women	Supports the full and equal participation of women in the social, political and economic life of the state. Includes addressing violence against women, equality for women in every aspect of life, and women's economic empowerment.	18831	2650	2716	2784

The following table provides details, including the value and beneficiary, or any commitments already made to be funded from the program or funds mentioned in the previous answer.

The Office for Women delivers funding to programs with funding provided through:

- State government funding
- National Partnership on COVID-19 Domestic and Family Violence Responses
- National Partnership on Family, Domestic and Sexual Violence Responses 2021-2023
- Department of Human Services.

Grant	Beneficiary	Purpose	Total Contract Value (GST ex)
Office for Women	Australia Day Council of SA Inc	2021 Inspiring South Australian Women's Award	\$11,818.18
Office for Women	Nunga Mi:Minar Inc	Individual Safety and Support Packages Grant	\$20,000.00
Office for Women	Baptist Care (SA) Incorporated	Safe Journey—Journey Safe	\$291,000.00
Office for Women	Catholic Family Services	Community Prevention Responses	\$200,000.00
Office for Women	South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute Limited	Trauma Responsive Therapeutic Support Model Grant	\$200,000.00
Office for Women	Women's Safety Services SA Incorporated	Safe and Well Kids	\$554,082.00
Office for Women	Ngaanyatjarra Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Women's Council (Aboriginal Corporation)	Individual Safety Support Packages (ISSPs) for Aboriginal Women	\$77,600.00
Office for Women	Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Services of SA Incorporated	Therapeutic Accommodation Program (TAP)	\$194,000.00
Office for Women	Relationships Australia (SA) Inc	Safe and Well Kids	\$1,681,220.00
Office for Women	Women's Safety Services SA Incorporated – For SA Domestic and Family Violence Alliance (SADFVA)	Safe at Home	\$646,896.00
Office for Women	Zahra Foundation Australia Pty Ltd	Extending Financial Counselling	\$97,000.00
Office for Women	Neami Limited	Safe and Secure Housing Program (SSHP)	\$3,208,600.00
Office for Women	Women's Safety Services SA Incorporated	Work Safe Guardian App	\$300,000.00
Office for Women	Kornar Winmil Yunti Aboriginal Corporation	Regional Women's Safety Contract Program	\$145,488.00
Office for Women	Women's Safety Services SA Incorporated—For SA Domestic and Family Violence Alliance (SADFVA)	Individual Safety Support Packages (ISSPs)	\$1,212,496.00
Office for Women	Women's Safety Services SA Incorporated	Specialist Women's Domestic Violence Workers for a Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme	\$1,457,847.00
Office for Women	Alexandrina Council	Regional Safety Hubs—Goolwa	\$77,600.00
Office for Women	Gawler Community House	Regional Safety Hubs—Gawler	\$77,600.00
Office for Women	Catholic Family Services (Centacare)	Regional Safety Hubs—Mount Gambier	\$77,600.00
Office for Women	Catholic Family Services (Centacare)	Regional Safety Hubs—Berri	\$77,600.00
Office for Women	Uniting Country SA Ltd	Regional Safety Hubs—Port Pirie	\$77,600.00
Office for Women	Yarredi Services Inc	Regional Safety Hubs—Port Lincoln	\$77,600.00
Office for Women	MOUNT BARKER FAMILY HOUSE INC	Regional Safety Hubs—Mount Barker	\$77,600.00

Grant	Beneficiary	Purpose	Total Contract Value (GST ex)
Office for Women	Centacare Catholic Country SA Limited	Regional Safety Hubs—Whyalla	\$77,600.00
Office for Women	Murray Bridge Community Centre Incorporated	Regional Safety Hubs—Murray Bridge	\$77,600.00
Office for Women	Kornar Winmil Yunti Aboriginal Corporation	Regional Safety Hubs—Port Augusta	\$77,600.00
Office for Women	Uniting Country SA Ltd	Individual Safety and Support Packages – Coober Pedy	\$38,800.00
Office for Women	Women's Emergency Services Coalition of South Australia Incorporated	Women's Domestic Violence Peak Funding Grant	\$510,707.00
Office for Women	Women's Safety Services SA Incorporated	Domestic Violence Serial Offender Database	\$108,000.00
Office for Women	Working Women's Centre SA Incorporated	Working Women's Centre	\$1,264,601.00
Office for Women	Kornar Winmil Yunti Aboriginal Corporation	Domestic Violence Perpetrator Response Model	\$1,039,180.00
Office for Women	Women's Safety Services SA Incorporated	Women's Safety Contact Program	\$5,378,611.00
Office for Women	Women's Safety Services SA Incorporated	Non-government representation in Multi Agency Protection Service (MAPS)	\$1,795,796.00
Office for Women	No to Violence	Statewide Perpetrator Response	\$1,140,000.00

Note—The table above incorporates grant funding and not-for-profit funded services agreements, but excludes fee-for-service contracts. The total contract value represents total amounts across the total contract term, which in many cases extends across previous and future financial years. The values do not include any indexation amounts that may be payable under the contract.