

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 23 March 2023

The **SPEAKER (Hon. D.R. Cregan)** took the chair at 11:01.

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.

Parliamentary Committees

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: RIVERLAND FACT-FINDING VISIT

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (11:02): I move:

That the second report of the committee for the Fifty-Fifth Parliament, entitled Riverland Fact-Finding Visit 7-9 November 2022, be noted.

In November last year, the Natural Resources Committee conducted a fact-finding visit to the Riverland, the first trip away from Adelaide for the committee. This is the committee's report of that visit. On the trip I was joined by my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee: the member for Gibson and the Hon. Nicola Centofanti MLC, a Riverland local. We were also accompanied by the member for Chaffey, as the local MP, for parts of the visit.

The committee visited the Riverland as part of its general statutory function to take an interest in and keep under review the protection, improvement and enhancement of the natural resources of the state; however, the committee was also keen to hear about the big issues that affect the region, namely water management and fruit fly.

The trip's timing was quite remarkable. As the committee prepared for the visit, Australia was having its second wettest spring on record. Communities upstream in Victoria and New South Wales had just experienced heavy rain and consequent flooding, and their water was heading our way. Flow projections for South Australia were increasing daily. The Murray was steadily rising and expected to peak around Christmas time. Then, the Riverland was also inundated with rain, with Renmark recording an astounding 95 millimetres on 23 October, with localised flash flooding.

As a committee, we were able to see the Murray and its flood plains at their most magnificent. During our three days in the Riverland, the committee met with staff from PIRSA, the Department for Environment and Water, local government, growers, ecologists, scientists, rangers and native title holders.

When we first reached Renmark, we met with Jan Whittle and Tony Herbert from the Department for Environment and Water, who took us on a tour of the work being carried out by the department in the region. We were impressed by the upgrades being made to Bookmark Creek and felt privileged to be able to see the breathtaking Pike Floodplain from its blocking banks.

The next day, the committee headed to Murtho to visit the almond farm of Drew and Caren Martin. As well as offering an insight into almond farming in the area, the trip to Omega Orchards allowed the committee to hear firsthand the concerns felt by the community, particularly irrigators, as the waters rose.

The Martins took the committee down to their pump house on the river, allowing the members to see the work they had carried out to prepare for the high flows. They had laid rocks around the base of the pump house to stop erosion as the water rose. But their other major concern was the possibility that the power would be cut to their pump house during the floods. Pleasingly, I can report that this did not happen, thanks to some levee work organised before the waters peaked.

The next day, the committee headed to Calperum Station, a parcel of former pastoral land the size of Kangaroo Island that now hosts important ecological work as well as accommodation, education and training programs, and recreational offerings like canoeing. Calperum and neighbouring Taylorville Station are also home to the Riverland Rangers program, which began in 2010 employing a team of six Aboriginal rangers. This program is part of the national Indigenous rangers program, supporting Indigenous communities to manage Indigenous protected areas.

Julie Robertson, the general manager of business and development at Calperum, gave a detailed description of how they currently manage the station and shared with us the master plan that has been prepared with the assistance of Barb Cowey from PIRSA, which will hopefully ensure the future of the station. The station is privately owned and operated and, as many here would appreciate, is run on a very tight margin.

To ensure the future survival of the station's operations, there is a need to expand its revenue base beyond being predominantly education-based to include more ecotourism. The team have and continue to apply for various grant programs to support upgrades to the station facilities to attract the ecotourism market and allow the station to work with more operators in this sector.

At Calperum, the committee also met with Sheryl Giles and Fiona Giles from the River Murray and Mallee Aboriginal Corporation, the native title holders of the region. My colleagues and I greatly appreciated hearing about the extensive and diverse work that they do with various groups and individuals since they received native title determination back in 2011. They have recently collaborated with Flinders University academics researching frontier conflict in the area, including an exciting discovery of artefacts in 2021 such as a serrated mussel shell estimated to be 6,000 years old.

During our time in the Riverland, it was fantastic to return to locations that I had been involved with during my time as agriculture minister to see them flourishing some seven years later. Mr Richie Roberts from RNR Farms credits receiving round 1 and 3 SARMS grants for giving him the courage to grow blueberries—a fruit not typically associated with the Riverland—on a commercial scale under shade cloth. His farm now supplies blueberries to all the major supermarkets in South Australia in the summer months. If you pick up a punnet of blueberries with your weekly shopping in November and December, chances are they came from RNR Farms.

Seven years after signing off on funding for the Australian Almond Centre of Excellence, it was great to visit the 60 hectare site with the committee. South Australia won the battle with Victoria to host the national research centre and we helped fund the establishment of the experimental and demonstration orchard for almond research and development.

The centre is a great collaboration between federal and state governments, researchers, industry and the horticultural sector. Researchers are pushing the boundaries on tolerance, almond size and growing conditions that has the rest of the world looking at how we are leading globally.

It was also pleasing to return to the Loxton Research Centre after being involved in its redevelopment under SARMS back in 2017. It remains a valued research and innovation hub for the region and Australia. The committee was pleased to hear about their collaborative work with the local community, such as a recent drone challenge with Riverland high schools, where students were asked to respond to a simulated infection on a demonstration citrus orchard using drones.

Also at the research centre, we heard from local grower and Chair of the Riverland Fruit Fly Committee, Jason Size, and Biosecurity SA's Incident Controller for the Fruit Fly Emergency Response Program, Rob Baker. Jason and Rob gave the committee a thorough presentation on PIRSA's fruit fly eradication efforts and the aggressive action being taken to hold onto South Australia's fruit fly free status. This is so important in maintaining our state's clean, green image and competitive advantage. More may need to be done in the future to convince our federal colleagues of this importance and the international advantage and point of difference it provides over our competitors.

The final stop on the trip was Renmark Paringa Council, where the committee spoke with Tarik Wolf and Tim Pfeiffer about the work that was being done to upgrade the council's 38-kilometre levee system. They showed the group the sophisticated mapping software being used to examine

the levee system, which is used together with consultation with the Department for Environment and Water to allow them to pick up levee defects and prioritise remedial work.

Renmark's position on the floodplain makes it more vulnerable than neighbouring areas and challenges lie with the levee system being located on a mixture of council, Crown and private land. The lack of easements on private land presented concerns, but landowners realised the gravity of the situation and were largely cooperative. This is something the council, possibly with the assistance of state government, will need to consider when looking at future management and maintenance of the levee system. The committee then had the opportunity to inspect the levee works being undertaken behind the Renmark district hospital.

The spirit of collaboration throughout the Riverland stood out to me and other members on the trip. It was clear from all the people the committee spoke with that they share a deep love of the region and want to ensure the safety of the community in uncertain times.

In January this year, committee staff checked in with some of the people we spoke to to see how they fared following the peak flows. It was heartening to hear from Tim Pfeiffer from Renmark Paringa Council that the local community had shown the council great love and support on social media and even more heartening to hear that largely the parties that the committee visited back in November were spared any significant damage to their properties or livelihoods by the floodwaters.

The committee thanks all those who shared their knowledge and experience on the trip and also in the months following when they were contacted by committee staff to see how they were affected by the floods. I would also like to extend my thanks to my fellow committee members who were on the trip, the member for Gibson and the Hon. Nicola Centofanti, and, as I mentioned before, the local member, the member for Chaffey. It was great to catch up with him in his local region that I know he is so passionate about. I would also really like to thank the committee staff who do a tremendous job, Alison Meeks and Dr Amy Mead, for their support and work in making this a most worthwhile trip.

In closing, I encourage all members of this house to take a trip to the Riverland to see this rare occurrence—the beauty of the River Murray and the floodplains in their full glory. I commend this report to the house.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:13): I would like to make a brief contribution to thank the Natural Resources Committee for making the journey up to the Riverland. I am hoping that they gained a lot out of it. The member for Mawson has just given quite a descriptive brief on what they saw and the challenges that the region faced not only through the most recent high-flow event that turned into a flood event but what the day-to-day challenges are: being a food producer, dealing with biosecurity issues and dealing with the vagaries of weather. I think there was a bit of a mixture of all of that in that trip.

I would also like to thank the Riverland businesses, local government and institutions that played host to the committee. I think their input was valuable and it made the trip quite valuable for committee members and staff to understand what the challenges were and the way the locals responded.

I guess first cab off the rank for me was day 2 when the committee went out to Omega to have a look at Drew and Caren Martin's nut farm. I think everything looked pretty kosher; everything looked pretty comfortable when they got there, but that was not to be in the coming weeks. We saw a significant rise in the river levels, particularly up near lock 6, particularly below lock 6, where the Martins' pumping station is.

It was really quite a contrast to see what was on the edge of the river, what we thought would have been the river coming up to the door of that pumping station. That was definitely not the case. We saw levee banks being built, we saw gensets and diesel tankers brought in to deal with the ongoing need for pumping up to their farm, which was some kilometres away. But it did give a good understanding to the committee of what the preparation needed to be for that forthcoming flood event.

There is also Brendan Sidhu. He is an industry leader, an industry chair, who was also at the farm, and he gave an insight into some of the diversity that the industry is looking at, whether it be looking at some of the newer technologies, self-pollinating varieties of almonds or some of the catch-

and-release methods, dealing with food safety and biosecurity but also some of the vagaries around pollination.

Obviously, many of us would know that pollination is a vital necessity when it comes to good food production and the amount of pollination needed to have a successful crop. We know that the bee industry is dealing with a number of disease issues at the moment, and that has certainly impacted on the supply of bees to that industry. It is right across the board, actually. Any broadacre horticulture is dealing with some of those vagaries. I think all of that was explained pretty well by Brendan, by Drew and by Caren, and I think people went away with a much better understanding of some of the challenges but at the same time what preparation was needed to deal with some of the challenges living on the edge of a river.

Also, I think it needs to be said that we moved on to RNR Farms. Richie Roberts is a good friend of mine, and the farm that we visited was my old citrus orchard. We saw a little bit of citrus there, but the majority of the farm has now been converted to protected cropping. Underneath that protection is, of course, as the member for Mawson has said, a very valuable commodity now, blueberries.

Blueberries are very labour intensive, with huge inputs, because all of the plants are grown in bags hydroponically and it has to be very closely monitored. Those plants are watered up to eight times a day. It has to be kept away from frost, it has to be kept away from sun and wind and it has to be kept away from birds. We saw there, when we looked at the expanse of that property under cover, the inputs that went into that.

We were also lucky enough to visit the pack house to look at what are very small berries. You have to pick a lot of them to make a tonne. I know that Richie is approaching some 30 tonnes per year, and that is a significant production line that he has achieved in quite a small amount of time. That does show what the region is about, and that is diversity, adopting technology, adopting new techniques.

We are now seeing more and more crops going under cover, dealing with the vagaries of climate, dealing with the challenges with growing a successful crop. Richie has protected those crops a number of times from significant hail and from significant sun damage as well as achieving water savings under that cover. I think that was also a very valuable visit and a valuable exercise.

As was stated, the brand that those blueberries come under is an international brand, Driscoll, that is also supported by the Costa Group which is a massive employer in the Riverland in many, many industries—not only citrus, avocados and berries but we are looking at table grapes, mushrooms and quite a varied range of horticultural commodities. That business is quite valued and varied so that they can deal with the vagaries of commodity prices and weather impacts. I think it really was a very valuable exercise.

I did not visit the Loxton Research Centre but, as has been stated, I am very pleased that the former government saw fit to reinvest into the research centre. We have seen a conversion, in conjunction with the federal government, from the old research centre—which has now been turned into a business centre—and the newly-built research centre, which is now a control centre, by and large, for fruit fly, the world's most invasive pest or insect. The region is really struggling at the moment to keep that pest under control.

Sadly, we are seeing a significant continuation of outbreaks. For those of you who do not know, the majority of these outbreaks are being detected in people's backyards; they are not in commercial orchards. What we are seeing and experiencing is extreme hardship with the cost in treating fruit to get it to market. The reputation that the region has as a pest-free area is now being questioned by some of our international markets.

Every Riverlander is playing their part, every grower is suffering the consequences of many of those detections being in people's backyards. I would urge people in their backyards to pick up fallen fruit and to make sure that they manage those few trees that they have in their backyards because it is impacting on many, many hundreds of thousands, if not millions of trees that are commercial businesses that are being dragged down by a few trees that are being impacted by the Queensland fruit fly.

Along the way, the Natural Resources Committee visited Calperum, which is managed by the Australian Landscape Trust. Currently, the interconnector is going past that station, so it is changing the view of the landscape. There were many other opportunities and the committee saw the construction of the levee banks, the 38 kilometres that needed to be either upgraded or rebuilt to keep Renmark safe and dry. I think the community and local government have done a great job in rallying together the local businesses that came together and built the levees successfully to keep the community dry and safe.

I commend the Natural Resources Committee for going up to the Riverland for a fact-finding mission, and I am hoping that, under invitation, we will see them again in the not-too-distant future.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (11:23): I would like to thank the member for Chaffey for his contribution and, again, pay tribute to the passion that he shows for his community along the river, and all the really hard work that he and other members along the river have undertaken in the past six months during the time of the high-water event and flooding that they have gone through. I wish them and all of their communities the best in the recovery post floods.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: SAPOL APY POLICE POST CONSTRUCTION

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:24): I move:

That the 26th report of the Public Works Committee, entitled South Australia Police APY Police Post Construction, be noted.

The public works submission from South Australia Police (SAPOL) proposes to construct two new police stations, police housing and associated infrastructure at Fregon and Pipalyatjara in the APY lands. The proposal includes an option to build a third police post at Indulkana, subject to provision of budget through the state budget process.

The APY lands cover an area approximately 93,000 square kilometres in the state's north-west, adjoining the Northern Territory and Western Australian borders. The APY lands are part of the NPY lands, home to 26 remote communities and homelands, which extend some 350,000 square kilometres across the borders of South Australia, the Northern Territory and Western Australia.

The remote environment of the APY lands, with vast geographical distances between communities, creates a unique set of complexities and challenges. Policing the communities while meeting the needs of staff working in isolated locations is one such challenge. The proposed works aim to address this challenge and better support communities, government and non-government agencies working in isolated communities, ultimately allowing SAPOL to place the right number of police in communities at the right time. In addition, the new and modern accommodation proposed is designed to reduce SAPOL members' exposure to health risks associated with working in isolated conditions.

SAPOL describes existing police facilities in the three communities as basic sheds in 'extremely poor condition', with no ability for expansion. The proposed works will replace the aged infrastructure with more robust permanent structures that can withstand the harsh environmental conditions. Construction plans utilise modular buildings that combine office, accommodation and storage facilities to reduce the need for on-site labour.

For each of the three locations, the project proposes the construction of one police station with interview rooms, a reception area or front counter and workstations, three or four individual short-term accommodation apartments for visiting criminal investigation, domestic violence and crime scene officers, pilots and relief staff, and a carport to serve both the police station and accommodation.

Currently police officers are deployed from the communities of Umuwa, Mimili and Amata to provide support in Fregon, Indulkana and Pipalyatjara. As a result of the extended travel times, officers can be challenged by fatigue and have limited time on site. Constructing police accommodation in the three communities will enable officers to remain on site for extended periods, increasing police visibility and accessibility. The facilities will also provide a suitable and comfortable

area for community members to conduct general police business, such as providing statements and participating in interviews.

A major objective of these works is to improve the wellbeing, safety and security of APY communities. By providing appropriate police infrastructure, SAPOL can increase policing services in the APY lands. These works form part of a whole-of-government approach to working with communities in the planning of infrastructure and assessment of regional priorities.

The title to all lands, including the sites for the projects in the APY lands, has been vested in the APY pursuant to the APY Land Rights Act 1981. Final approvals from the traditional landowners were obtained, allowing a final anthropology submission to the APY Executive Board in December 2021. On 24 December 2021, SAPOL received approvals for the construction of the three police posts. The Crown, in consultation with SAPOL, is preparing a lease document with APY to ensure SAPOL contractors have access to the three sites and SAPOL has authority to use the required land. The authority of the Minister for Police and the APY Executive Board will be sought to ratify the lease once it is finalised.

The tender process for engaging the construction contractor is being managed by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT). Construction is scheduled to commence in May 2023, with practical completion in June 2024. However, the proposed construction period includes the extremely hot summer months; therefore, the actual construction time line may differ from that currently proposed. DIT has confirmed that additional time is required to complete construction, given the remote location and market conditions, with a more accurate time line to be agreed upon with the future contractor.

SAPOL considers the critical issue in implementing a successful construction program to be the approvals process, and this is actively being monitored and managed by DIT. Required approvals include, but are not limited to, receipt of the State Commission Assessment Panel approval, as well as the finalised land lease arrangements with the APY Executive Board.

The total budget currently available to deliver both the Fregon and Pipalyatjara work packages, excluding GST, is \$7.62 million. The estimated cost to deliver a third police post at Indulkana is \$3.34 million, with the total cost to complete all three police posts estimated at \$10.31 million. This results in a current budget shortfall of \$2.69 million, excluding GST. However, this is being pursued as part of the budget process.

SAPOL affirms that engagement and consultation have been key themes throughout their concept planning works and ongoing consultation with various stakeholders will continue during the design and construction process. SAPOL has consulted the three communities in respect of the proposed sites and facilities to be provided and has received approval to construct.

Consultation has also been undertaken with SAPOL members and executive stakeholders through the SAPOL governance structure. SAPOL also reports that appropriate interdepartmental consultation has occurred. The Department of Treasury and Finance has confirmed funds are available in the state budget for the Fregon and Pipalyatjara works.

The committee has examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Ms Karen Kochergen, Director, Infrastructure and Assets, SA Police; Mr Shane Addison, Detective Superintendent, SA Police; and Mr John Harrison, Director Buildings Projects, Department for Infrastructure and Transport. I thank all the witnesses for their time.

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

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (11:30): I welcome this 26th report of the Public Works Committee and their recommendation. As the shadow minister for police, corrections and community safety, it is an opportune time for us to remember just how challenging it is to be policing, especially in our regional and remote isolated areas.

We know that safety in the APY lands was terribly thrust into the spotlight by the tragic murder of outback nurse Gayle Woodford at Fregon in March 2016. I cannot believe it has been seven years since that event. It was one that rocked the community of South Australia, and especially those of us in regional and remote South Australia. It is always important to make sure that we keep in context the challenges involved in working within isolated communities. Thus, as I said, I welcome this report from the Public Works Committee. Investments such as this are necessary to keep our community safe.

I recognise the unique nature of policing within a community with a significant Indigenous population and the need to be engaged directly with Indigenous elders and community leaders as a part of policing within such communities. It is a whole immersion into a community when you are policing in isolated parts of South Australia, and that includes a lot of the community policing, the proactive policing, those relationships that are really important with community.

Those of us who are engaged with regional South Australia certainly see the challenges of recruiting and retaining our police force. It is happening across the state at the moment. We see the public reports about how challenging it is to actually be recruiting and retaining people within our police force but that is no more pertinent than within regional and remote South Australia.

As the member for Flinders, I see that prominently within some of my communities, especially those that have additional challenges with policing. I have been hearing directly from communities and police within Ceduna, Port Lincoln, and also further abroad from my electorate, from Port Augusta, Whyalla, as well as our remote and regional communities such as through the APY lands and outback South Australia.

Investments such as this into making sure that people are equipped to keep our community safe really does highlight the importance of officer support through not just the infrastructure but also the facility and the services to make sure that we are actually retaining a police force within regional and remote South Australia.

I know that there is a fine balance that always needs to be had, but the two pillars of policing, especially within our regional and remote communities, are, firstly, keeping our community safe and, secondly, keeping offenders accountable for their actions. It is always at the pointy end of policing within our regional and remote communities. It is an ongoing challenge.

As I said, I see it predominantly within my electorate. I also hear about it as the shadow minister for police, corrections and community safety, that we need to have a police force that is adequately armed to actually enforce the laws which we put in place in this place to keep our community safe.

The minister has a task, absolutely. The minister needs to make sure there is adequate police force staffing. He needs to make sure there is appropriate funding put in to keep our communities safe, especially within regional South Australia. I hope this recommendation from the Public Works Committee about investment is just one of a number of steps that will see the government continuing to invest within our regional, remote and isolated communities and making sure that there is enough support for those communities and for the services such as the police force that are within them. I commend the report and the recommendations.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (11:35): I would just add a few words in support of this very worthwhile initiative. I do not have to go on at length. It has been well covered by the members here. A lot of the sentiments expressed by the member for Flinders I would fully agree with. We know that when it comes to police recruitment and retention it is a challenging time, and it is especially a challenging time in regional communities and our more remote communities.

The challenges of policing in the APY lands should not be underestimated. The more that we can do to ensure that police are able to stay on land for extended periods of time in order to build relationships is probably one of the most important things with most communities but especially with remote Aboriginal communities.

There have been challenges over the years in the lands and the tragic loss of life. We know that police can make a difference, but it is about that long-term commitment. When you think about what they are expected to do, the APY lands are an area the size of England. There are various

estimations of the population, especially given the significant movements over the last two years. We usually operate on a figure probably at the maximum close to 3,000, but it is often significantly less than that.

Imagine an area of land the size of England with less than 3,000 people scattered over incredibly remote communities and the challenges then for the police who work up there. Indeed, there have been some excellent officers over the years who have generated a lot of respect from the communities that they have served in the APY lands. That was all based upon that long-term commitment to those communities. Some of those people have gone on to manage organisations that are now still heavily involved in the APY lands.

Investments like this are important in the APY lands. As I said, there has been a lot of movement of late. There always has been historically, but there has been a number over the last couple of years, some of it COVID related; there are other factors at work as well. The more that we can do to establish relationships in the APY lands and establish relationships in some of the other communities—Ceduna, Port Augusta and even, to a lesser degree, some of the people coming down to Whyalla—the better. If we are going to get on top of some of the issues, we need to be doing all we can to ensure positive relationships between police and Aboriginal people in our remote communities.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (11:39): I thank other members for their contribution to this very worthwhile and worthy project. I thank the member for Florey for his leadership in the inquiry, and the member for Flinders and the member for Giles.

I rise briefly to commend SAPOL and the Department for Infrastructure and Transport for their work to date. On all the very reasonable and worthwhile contributions made by other members to this matter around the complexities and very unique challenges that remote policing finds, that is also replicated in building construction projects like this in incredibly remote communities like the APY lands and, particular to this project, Fregon and Pipalyatjara.

Having had the privilege of spending some time in the community last year, it was entirely clear to me why these projects were so necessary. It has not been without some significant cost pressures and construction management pressures that have brought us to this juncture. The state government in its first 12 months—in our first budget delivered in the year 2022 and also in the Mid-Year Budget Review handed down in December 2022—committed a further \$5.4 million to this collective project largely on the basis of a series of headwinds that have found construction costs escalate right across the private and public sector.

As I have already said, unique challenges find this project being constructed and completed in such remote parts of South Australia as the APY lands, and I very much look forward to the support of this house. I thank the Public Works Committee for their recommendation to proceed and also very much look forward, as I am sure other members in this place do, to the start and ultimate completion in early 2024 of these very important police posts.

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:41): I take this opportunity to thank members for their contributions to the debate. Whilst I would like to thank the Minister for Police for his contribution, I would like to particularly thank the members for Flinders and Giles for their words. As we all know in this place they represent very remote parts of our state, and I know that the policing complexities of the remote areas of this state are issues that are very much front of mind for them, so it is quite pleasing to see them contribute to this discussion.

I would like to thank the members of the committee for the way that they conducted themselves during the inquiry, and for the very professional way that they asked questions and also contributed to the discussion before the committee. I would also like to take this time to thank committee staff for all the support they provided. I commend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

*Motions***AUKUS SUBMARINES**

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (11:42): I move:

1. That in the opinion of this house, a joint committee be established to inquire into and report on matters relating to South Australia's contribution to the AUKUS agreement, and particularly to consider—
 - (a) how to ensure that all submarines are delivered on schedule;
 - (b) education and training initiatives to build the future workforce;
 - (c) the role of the South Australian industry;
 - (d) opportunities from emerging technologies;
 - (e) the progress of task forces and working groups;
 - (f) interstate and international partnerships; and
 - (g) any other relevant matters.
2. That in the event of a joint committee being appointed, the House of Assembly shall be represented thereon by three members, of whom two shall form a quorum of assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.
3. That a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

It gives me great pleasure to be able to move this motion today and to do so in a bipartisan spirit. There is absolutely no doubt that the AUKUS agreement is one of substantial transformational significance to Australia as a nation, but of course in a much more significant way to the state of South Australia and to the city of Adelaide. We do hope that this transformational project will have statewide benefits not only to the capital city but also to regional South Australia as well.

The opposition is calling on the Malinauskas Labor government to support this motion that would establish a bipartisan joint committee into the AUKUS submarines build and the anticipated benefits to South Australia to ensure that our state and our state's population, both now and well into the future, are poised and prepared to receive the benefits that will inevitably flow from such a significant defence project.

We know that this project is going to extend beyond the life of this government, beyond the life of multiple governments. In fact, it could be a project that lasts for as long as this century, if not longer. This week in parliament, we heard from the Premier that he foresaw the transformational extent of this project transcending not only parliaments but generations within South Australia. The Premier, to quote him, said:

We are capable of doing this, but it is going to require long-term effort and it is going to require ongoing bipartisanship, which I know exists in this place, to commit ourselves to this effort. The honest truth is: of course this project is going to outlast the life of this government, but it will outlast the life of the next one too, and the one after that, and the one after that, and the one after that. This is a 100-year project.

So I am very hopeful of bipartisan support for this joint committee. I think it is a great opportunity for politics to be removed out of this, for the demonstration of true bipartisanship and for parliamentarians representing communities, industry groups and sectors across this state and the regions of South Australia to come together to scrutinise, to challenge where appropriate and to ensure that in the state of South Australia our government departments, our industrial sectors and our population are well placed to maximise the benefits of AUKUS and those submarines being built here in South Australia.

The first Australian SSN-AUKUS is not expected to be delivered before 2042 at the earliest. Even that is an ambitious time line, which the Premier has also mentioned. We expect at least 9,500 jobs, promised to South Australia under the AUKUS agreement, but that figure could in fact be much greater if South Australia is properly prepared, if we have the skills in place and if we have the strategic foresight to ensure that we can maximise the benefit, from a jobs perspective, of this project.

It is for that transformational reason that the opposition want to see a bipartisan parliamentary joint committee established to keep on top of the AUKUS submarines build and, as I foreshadowed, to make sure that we are best prepared as a state for the huge journey ahead and to ensure we get everything out of it that we can.

This project, this initiative, is a defence initiative that largely, from a strategic point of view, operates at a federal level, with relationships being built between the United Kingdom and between the United States of America. But to maximise the benefits of this project to South Australia, this state, its governments, its industry and its people are going to have to be at the forefront of lifting our capacity, of building resilience into our workforce and of developing our skills so that we can get the benefits from this.

We believe, based on the comments of the Premier in recent days, that the government will certainly be open to considering this bipartisan support for a joint parliamentary committee. It is my view that this committee should last well into the future. It should become a committee that is seen as part of this place, a committee that transcends governments and politics and allows true bipartisan commitment to the AUKUS deal.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SPORTS INSTITUTE NEW WORK

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Brown:

That the 24th report of the committee, entitled South Australian Sports Institute New Work, be noted.

(Continued from 23 February 2023.)

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (11:50): I rise today to make a contribution in relation to the Public Works Committee report tabled in the parliament in regard to the South Australian Sports Institute new work project, the 24th report of that committee. There is a line in the executive summary of this report in reference to the current facilities of the South Australian Sports Institute at Kidman Park that says that the current facilities 'no longer meet the needs of a contemporary elite training program'. Despite my immense love for, and time that I have spent down at, those facilities over the last 20-odd years of my life, I do not think that that statement could be any truer.

SASI, as it is colloquially known, celebrated its 40-year anniversary last year on the site that was previously Kidman Park High School on Valetta Road at Kidman Park. There has been a range of leadership—although very stable leadership, I would say—at the South Australian Sports Institute over the last 40 years, with only a very small number of directors ever having had responsibility for the institute. Much has changed since the days of Charlie Walsh having athletes on stationary bikes, running VO₂ max tests in the back of what were old transportable buildings at the back of the old high school. It certainly has come a long, long way over that 40 years, but this is the dawning of a new era for the South Australian Sports Institute to shift the facilities up to Mile End and to create a new, contemporary home for the institute for the years to come.

The timing of this build is also significantly important, given the fact that our country will be hosting Olympic and Paralympic games within a near 10-year horizon. It is an opportunity to refresh these facilities and to give South Australian athletes the very best chance to make those teams, to give the representation of South Australia on that level—which has always been well above our population share, both in terms of representation and medals—every chance.

What I am also excited about is the fact that we have been able to do this in partnership with UniSA for many years. The uni has had a pretty significant human movement program and a large interaction with SASI activities, but to formalise that in both the sense of the agreement moving forward and with a shared facility is, I think, a good step forward as well. To have that skill set even further entwined and integrated with the day-to-day operations of SASI is a good thing.

I know that the current director, Wes Battams, has been chipping away at this proposal. I think it has probably been in the Director of SASI's drawer for give or take 25 years, at a minimum, to set up a new home for the institute. Having travelled across the years to the comparative facilities

interstate—whether that be down at Olympic Park with the New South Wales Institute of Sport, whether that be down at Albert Park in Victoria where the VIS is set up, or any comparative facilities between the QIS, Western Australian Institute of Sport or the AIS—it is fair to say that our facilities have started to lag, both in their presentation and their fit-for-purpose nature.

I know the member for Cheltenham and I probably spent a little bit too much time in what was a retrofitted bath with ice straight out of the ice-maker rather than a temperature-controlled recovery pool. It certainly was a little bit one way or the other, depending on how much ice came out of there that day, or how generous Mal was feeling in his recovery sentiments for the day. It is definitely something that I know the athletes here will look forward to.

It did push SASI to have to split off parts of their program over the last couple of years. Obviously, with the build of the new state aquatic centre there was the opportunity for the swimming program to have recovery facilities and a gym facility at that centre, which was obviously very well welcomed by that program, but given the geographic spread of where the majority of programs operate and the fact that Kidman Park is, or has been, very central, the majority of programs have still utilised those facilities at Kidman Park.

To see new and refreshed facilities, both in terms of the day-to-day programs and also a step forward in terms of the wind tunnel and research capacity that SASI will have, and the ability to show leadership from a research perspective, I think is something that will be welcomed by the organisation moving forward.

This is, I think, one of the things that the former government will see as a legacy item, in particular given the opportunity that we will have to move South Australian athletes into those Olympic and Paralympic teams at the upcoming Olympics and Paralympics to be held here in Australia.

While it will be disappointing, particularly as the local member, to see SASI depart the outer western suburbs, move to the inner western suburbs and leave the electorate, it is obviously clear that it is a necessary and revolutionary move that will set SASI and in particular our elite athletes up to achieve what they need to achieve in the many years to come.

I support the report and the recommendations that come from it made by the Public Works Committee and look forward to seeing work get underway and to seeing an organisation that has supported so many of our elite athletes over the last 40-odd years continue to do that well into the future.

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:57): I would like to thank those members who have contributed to the debate. I think it is very beneficial for the house when discussing a project of this type to have the benefit of hearing from members who have contributed to sport at an elite level, so I particularly thank the member for Colton for his contribution.

I would also like to thank the member for Hartley, who I know has contributed to the debate but of course did not contribute at an elite level in sport. Nonetheless, I will say that he has certainly contributed more to sport than anything I have done during my time, so I thank him for his contribution. With those few words, I recommend the report to the house.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Florey, for that important clarification.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:59): I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Sunday 26 March 2023 at 11.05am.

Motion carried.

*Bills***FIRST NATIONS VOICE BILL**

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Speaker, I bring your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Third Reading

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (12:00): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Over the course of the last couple of days, we have seen a rather thoughtful and historic debate in this place on this exceptionally important bill in the life of South Australia, particularly for the Indigenous community. I thank all members who contributed and look forward to the third reading contributions.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (12:01): As members know, the committee stage of the bill was undertaken over the last two sitting days and concluded at the end of sitting yesterday. I commend the process, as I would do regularly. The committee stage, I hope, will elucidate, for the medium term, matters of substance that characterise the difference between the Liberal opposition's view in relation to the bill and the reasons for its opposition, and the alternatives in terms of engagement to the parliament that have been long on the public record, including of course the bill that was before the last parliament, the Aboriginal Representative Body Bill of 2021, introduced by the then Premier Marshall in his capacity as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs.

I do now, as I did at the time that I reintroduced that bill not quite a year ago, pay tribute to the work of the member for Dunstan, who, as Premier, took responsibility for the portfolio as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs throughout his time as Premier of South Australia, and his dedicated engagement with—and I will single out just two—the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council, with whom he was frequently engaged, seeking views and exchanging views, seeking counsel and working towards improvement, and secondly and relevantly for the purposes of this debate, the work led by then Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement, Professor Roger Thomas, whose work has been the subject of reflection in the course of the debate on that bill in 2021 and 2022, and, again, in the course of the committee stage on this occasion.

So that there can be no confusion or doubt about that matter, the views about a model of engagement, a model of reform towards improved engagement and improved outcomes, has been long on the public record, and reflecting the sincere and considered work of the former Premier, the Aboriginal Advisory Council and, as I have indicated, Professor Roger Thomas.

But we are where we are, and we have made it clear that we oppose the bill because it provides for a bad model, a poor model, that will be—particularly in terms of the form of engagement with the parliament—almost necessarily incoherent with the process of parliament. In that sense, as the Unit of Public Policy at the University of Adelaide among many others have observed, it renders that form of engagement unambitious in circumstances where a more productive model of engagement via a meat and potatoes process of work with a dedicated committee is a matter that is well and truly on notice to the government.

As I say, we are where we are, and I want to be certainly, if not the first to acknowledge, among those who would make the plain observation that as we conduct ourselves in this space there is inevitably learning to be done. There is inevitably improvement that can be made over the course of what I hope will be a pathway towards going somewhere new together. That is what is necessary. I have been fairly emphatic about it in the committee stage to say, 'When you've got a better model available, and you choose to go down another path, well, that's the choice that the government has made.'

Now, having said all that, I want in my brief remarks at this third reading stage to pick up and to repeat and thank the Hon. Dennis Hood for his remarks in another place not so very long ago. Dennis Hood made the observation in his third reading contribution in another place—he made it very clear—that he, like me, like all of us on this side, opposes the bill, and that remains our position. But he said, and I endorse, that it is clear to see that the government has the numbers. It has the

numbers in this place and the bill will pass. I maintain that it ought to do so in an orderly way. There is plenty of opportunity for that to occur today in the course of the ordinary parliamentary sitting day today, and I understand that that is not the government's intention. But it will pass, and it will pass shortly.

I want to make clear that for me it is and remains my intention to support the outcome and to get behind the process. It is not my preferred model, and that has been made clear in a whole variety of ways, but I also emphasise, as Dennis did, that the disagreement here is about the way of achieving what we all want, which is improved outcomes for our Aboriginal people in the state of South Australia. They have no doubt faced very difficult circumstances, and they have not had the improvements that all of us have sought to see over a substantial period of time now.

It is with that very much in mind that, as legislators here in the parliament, if we are embarking upon an exercise endeavouring to achieve improvement that we do so with an attitude that is characterised by humility and with respect and with diligence and that we make sure that the product of our work in this place actually holds out the prospect of improvement in those circumstances of longstanding that are well known.

We almost have a model, and I want to emphasise again to those members of our Aboriginal community in South Australia: I am not an Aboriginal person and I seek to work with, to engage and to better understand. I will put my shoulder to the wheel. I do not believe this is the right model; it is not the right approach, but I will support it and I will do all I can as one individual member in here and as the member of our party with responsibility for improvement in this portfolio area to do all I can to ensure its success.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan) (12:11): I rise to speak at the third reading of this important piece of legislation which the government has brought to this chamber. I am always pleased when there is any piece of legislation or any debate or any contribution that involves Aboriginal affairs here in this place.

We have a huge amount of work to do. There is no doubt about that, but South Australia has historically been a leader in terms of Aboriginal affairs and reconciliation and we have had many highlights. We have also had many lowlights. I think of the original legislation for the Aboriginal Lands Trust brought here by former Premier Don Dunstan, the member for Norwood. This was fantastic leading legislation. I think of the work of Dr David Tonkin, when he was the Premier of South Australia, with the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Land Rights Act.

We were the first place in the country to apologise to the stolen generation. That was the work of Dean Brown, former Premier of South Australia. In fact, we did that 11 years before the federal parliament got around to apologising to the stolen generation. This is a very, very difficult area of public policy. It is not for the faint-hearted. It is one of the reasons why I took on this important portfolio when we came to government.

Too often, the very important area of Aboriginal affairs and reconciliation is left to a junior minister in government but, in fact, this area of public policy requires the entire cabinet working together. When I was the Premier and therefore Chair of cabinet I took it upon myself to develop a whole-of-government action plan which still remains in place today. Every single minister, I believe, has a responsibility to advance the cause of reconciliation and practical outcomes for Aboriginal South Australians.

Whilst we are reflecting on some firsts, I would like to remind the parliament of the very origins of democracy in South Australia, where at our very first democratic elections in here after we had responsible government, Aboriginal South Australians had the same voting rights commensurate with the white settlers. This is extraordinary. In fact, they only lost those rights in 1901 when we became a country and at the time of Federation it was determined that Aboriginal Australians would not be added to the roll. They were not added to the roll again until 1967 but, importantly and I think proudly, all of those Aboriginal South Australians who were on the roll at the time of Federation remained on the roll. So we had the unique situation in South Australia—not just with women but with Aboriginal South Australians—that they remained on the roll for the rest of their lives. The next tranche did not come until 1967, much to our shame as Australians.

There is a huge amount of work to be done. When we were in government, we moved to establish an Aboriginal representative body, which built on the work of the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council, which had served our state well, but new models need to be determined. Of course, we now have a further model in front of the parliament at the moment. I am pleased that we are having these discussions.

Obviously, I did support the work that had been done by the former Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement, Dr Roger Thomas, and the work that he had done to establish the model that was ultimately presented to my cabinet and therefore this parliament. I think he did extraordinarily useful work—2½ years of consultation—which he presented as the first Aboriginal voice on the floor of this parliament in our history.

It was a proud day for us and a day when the former Speaker, the member for Heysen, agreed to fly the Aboriginal flag and the Torres Strait Islander flag in this chamber for the very first time. We did this without debate or rancour, as has occurred in other jurisdictions, which I think speaks to the sophistication and also the great sense of responsibility that we have here in South Australia.

For the rest of my time on this earth, I will certainly be one who will argue and advocate for practical responses to the situation that we have—Closing the Gap, as it is now referred to—on a national basis. I certainly will be doing everything I can for practical and ongoing reconciliation. When this piece of legislation ultimately passes, which it most certainly will, I will be one who does what I can to practically see it implemented and of course be a success.

With those words, I am very grateful that we are discussing these important matters. Sometimes we will disagree on the precise way in which we can practically develop this response. Time will tell, so let's see what happens, but I certainly, once this does ultimately pass—I cannot be here on Sunday because of a prior engagement—will be doing everything I can to make sure that this piece of legislation is ultimately a success for the Aboriginal people of South Australia.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (12:17): I rise to close the debate. I thank the member for Heysen and the member for Dunstan for their contributions. I would also like to acknowledge at this point the member for Dunstan's interest in this policy area, which I know is longstanding. In his time as opposition leader as well as premier, he demonstrated an ongoing interest in the area of Aboriginal affairs. I think the member for Dunstan is right to conclude that the overall majority of members in this house share a sense of responsibility that advancement in Indigenous affairs is a collective responsibility from which no-one is immune and that is certainly a sentiment that the government feels as well.

There has been an extraordinary amount of work undertaken to get us to this point. Throughout the life of this government, quite literally, there has been an effort to pursue the first Indigenous Voice to any parliament in the nation. It has been a substantial undertaking to translate the ambition into a piece of legislation that has now been brought before the house.

I would like to acknowledge a few people who have been particularly important to that effort. It is always a risky task when you start singling out individuals, but there are two I would particularly like to acknowledge. The first, of course, is the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, who is also the Attorney-General, the Hon. Kyam Maher. This is a subject the Attorney-General is more than just passionate about; it is something he feels deeply. That sense of commitment to his people was omnipresent in all of the efforts he has undertaken to get us to this point.

The other person, of course, is Mr Dale Agius, who was the commissioner who under-led the vast amount of community consultation, particularly with members of the Indigenous communities, that has informed the government's bill. It is important I think at this point to acknowledge that everything the government has sought to do in the development of this model and this bill is to make sure it reflects the will, the hopes and the aspirations of Aboriginal people in our state.

The passage of this bill will mark an exceptionally historic moment for Indigenous affairs in South Australia and, indeed, in the nation. It will mark a historic and significant moment for our democracy too. Arguably, this is probably the most substantial change we have seen to the operation of our parliament in our democracy in decades, so it is important that we get it right and we

acknowledge the significance of this event in an appropriate way. On that basis, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (EDUCATION, TRAINING AND SKILLS PORTFOLIO) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 March 2023.)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (12:22): I think where I got up to in my remarks, before seeking leave to continue on Tuesday, was to thank those people who had made a contribution to the debate: the members for Morialta, King, Elder, Adelaide, Gibson and Waite, who all made excellent contributions, I thought, particularly some excellent observations around the importance of taking action around truancy and absenteeism.

That, as I think I commented on and which was echoed by those speakers, is always a priority but particularly one now as we enter the post-pandemic phase. I think the disengagement of young people escalated in—it was sped up by the nature of—the pandemic, and many kids who I think might have been at risk of becoming disengaged were hurried into that process. So the more we do now the better in terms of tracking the absenteeism and chronic truancy of students across our system, and then using that data to work out what kind of support we need to give them specifically and, of course, their families as well.

We know that issues around absenteeism and truancy are often a symptom of other things that are happening in their lives and at home with their families. Those might be issues around mental health or dysfunction, sometimes domestic and family violence that is occurring in the house. We need to make sure that the response we have is fit for purpose for different students, taking into account that they are not all going to have the same causes in terms of why they are not coming to school regularly.

So I am pleased the changes that are proposed in this bill will in no small way go to tackle that. I do not think there is much more than I need to mention here, other than that I appreciate the—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: What's the name of the ESB?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Yes, the member for Morialta did challenge me to speak about the Education and Early Childhood Services (Registration and Standards) Board.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: Hear, hear!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: The only reason I can say that is because the member for Morialta is correct, it is an infamous acronym. We used to call it the EECSRS board. It had another name which had a swearword in the title, only because of the fact that it was so difficult to remember. It was in no way a reflection of the functions or the professionalism of the board—it is a doozy—but, of course, now it is the Education Standards Board.

I want to thank the member for Morialta for his support on this—it is greatly appreciated—and all the speakers on this side who spoke I thought very honestly about why these kinds of things are important. Although this is a portfolio bill and these amendments could be characterised as minor, which for the large part they are, they are nonetheless important and will make a difference out there in our schools and our learning institutions. With that, I will end my remarks.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (12:26): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CIVIL ENFORCEMENT) BILL*Second Reading*

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (12:26): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise to introduce the Statutes Amendment (Civil Enforcement) Bill 2022. This bill amends the Enforcement of Judgments Act 1991 and the Sheriff's Act 1978 to implement a number of recommendations of a review undertaken by the Courts Administration Authority into civil enforcement processes here in South Australia.

The courts review was undertaken in 2017 by a review panel which included representatives of the judiciary and the Courts Administration Authority, representatives of the Sheriff's Office and the then president of the Law Society, representatives of the Attorney-General's Department and relevant solicitors with experience and expertise in civil enforcement proceedings. A further supplementary report was also prepared by the Sheriff's Office.

The courts undertook the review with the intention of modernising and streamlining civil enforcement procedures here in South Australia in line with other Australian jurisdictions. An earlier version of the bill was passed in the other place in 2021 but, further to that, lapsed in the other place. This bill differs from the 2021 bill in two important respects: to afford protection for vulnerable judgement debtors, and a matter the government expressed concern about during debate in 2021. These additional protections for judgement debtors sensibly and equitably balance the interests of both debtors and creditors.

The reforms progressed by this bill are as follows: the bill inserts a new provision into the Enforcement of Judgments Act to enable a judgement creditor to serve a notice to be termed an investigations notice on a judgement debt or prior to an investigation summons. Where monetary judgement has been ordered by a court against a judgement debtor, section 4 of the Enforcement of Judgments Act allows for the court, upon application by a judgement creditor, to investigate the judgement debtor's means of satisfying the debt.

The investigation hearing is usually the first stage of enforcement proceedings and requires the court to issue a summons for the debtor to appear before the court for examination and to produce any documents relevant to assessing the debtor's capacity to repay the judgement debt. Failure to appear for an investigation hearing may render the debtor liable for arrest.

The courts review of civil enforcement procedures considered the use of investigation hearings to be unnecessarily adversarial and an inefficient use of the court's time and resources as the initial stage of the enforcement process. It was recommended that investigation hearings be replaced wherever possible with an informal process to allow creditors to attempt to directly obtain information about the financial circumstances of the debtor without the need for court attendance.

The proposed investigation notice is modelled on part 38 of the Uniform Civil Procedure Rules of New South Wales. Unlike the New South Wales examination notice, the investigation notice will not be a compulsory first step before a court-summonsed investigation proceeding. Rather, the incentive for debtors to comply with the informal notice will be reduced court costs, since the costs of formal court investigation proceedings are otherwise added to the amount of a judgement debt under section 3 of the Enforcement of Judgments Act.

It is anticipated that introducing the investigation notice option will encourage a collaborative approach to resolving the judgement debt, reduce costs of parties and their use of court resources, as well as expedite the enforcement process. As a protection for the privacy of information provided in investigation notices, the bill has been amended in the other place to include an offence of using this information for a purpose other than the purpose for which it was provided. The bill will also amend the Enforcement of Judgments Act to expand the scope of garnishee orders as a means of enforcing judgement debts, but with further threshold protection for a judgement debtor.

Subsection 6(2) of the Enforcement of Judgments Act only permits garnishee orders to be made against a debtor's salary or wages with the debtor's consent. The courts review considered

this requirement to be outdated and inconsistent with current civil enforcement procedure in other jurisdictions, noting that South Australia remains the only jurisdiction to require a debtor's consent to a garnishee order attaching salary or wages.

In relation to concerns about potential financial hardship being caused to low-income earners and welfare recipients as a result of garnishee orders, section 6(4) of the Enforcement of Judgments Act requires the court, before making a garnishee order, to take into account evidence of the necessary living expenses of the debtor and any dependents and other liabilities that may affect their means of satisfying the debt. It is appropriate that section 6(4) be retained to preserve the court's discretion to set an appropriate amount for a garnishee order, which has regard to the individual circumstances of the debtor.

However, to provide additional threshold protection for a judgement debtor in circumstances where the requirement for their consent to the garnishee order is removed, this bill provides that the debtor must be left with an amount that is at least 90 per cent of the national minimum weekly wage, as fixed from time to time by order under the commonwealth's Fair Work Act 2009. Since the national minimum wage is a before-tax amount, the bill provides that the threshold protected amount is 90 per cent of that amount in order to approximate the after-tax equivalent amount. This is an improvement on the 2021 bill, and one that will provide the most vulnerable members of our society, where they find themselves judgement debtors, with a baseline level of protection.

As a further protection for judgement debtors with fluctuating income, the bill has been amended in the other place to insert an express provision to require the court to take into account the fluctuating nature of a debtor's income and ensure that any garnishee orders do not reduce the net weekly amount of any wage or salary received by the judgement debtor from the garnishee to less than the designated safety net amount prospectively during the period to which the order or orders relate.

A further amendment is made to section 6 of the Enforcement of Judgments Act to make it clear that garnishee orders may be made against funds held in a term deposit, regardless of whether the term deposit has matured. While the bill makes it clear that a garnishee order attaches to the term deposit amount at the time of making the order, it also provides that the payment of the garnished amount need not be made before the term deposit matures.

Section 6(5) of the Enforcement of Judgments Act allows the court to authorise the garnishee to retain an amount from the money subject to a garnishee order as compensation for the garnishee's expenses in complying with the order. This will ensure that in cases where a financial institution, the garnishee, incurs costs in terminating a term deposit early, the financial institution is able to recover the costs of complying with that order.

These provisions strike the right balance in respect of section 6, clarifying that the garnishee orders can attach and so giving certainty to judgement creditors but staving off the unduly harsh effects that forced early maturation of term deposits could visit on judgement debtors.

The bill amends section 7 of the Enforcement of Judgments Act to empower the Sheriff by written notice to require a judgement debtor or third party to provide relevant information or documents disclosing the interests of third parties in real or personal property subject to a warrant for seizure or sale.

Section 7 of the Enforcement of Judgments Act enables the court, upon application by a judgement creditor, to issue a warrant of sale, authorising seizure and sale of a judgement debtor's real or personal property, or both, to satisfy a judgement debt. However, before a warrant for sale can be executed, the Sheriff must establish the extent of the defendant's interests in the property and the proprietary interest of any other third parties as well as their written agreement as to the proportions in which the net proceeds of the sale will be divided.

Despite these requirements, the Sheriff has advised that financial institutions, for example, a bank that holds a mortgage over a property, are increasingly refusing to provide details of their proprietary interests due to breach of privacy concerns. This has made it extremely difficult for the Sheriff to establish the judgement debtor's interest in the property subject to the sale order. This amendment to section 7 should address this problem.

The bill also amends section 7 of the Enforcement of Judgments Act to clarify and broaden the Sheriff's powers to eject persons from, and proactively direct persons not to enter, land where the Sheriff is exercising a warrant for the sale of the land to enforce a judgement. At present, section 7(3)(a) authorises the Sheriff to eject a person not lawfully entitled to be on the land but does not authorise the Sheriff to issue a direction to prevent a person from entering the land that has been seized for sale.

The Sheriff advises that this had led to situations whereby the Sheriff, having already ejected a person from the land at the time of seizure, has been unable to lawfully direct a person to stay off the land or remove the person from the land until the person has re-entered the land, for example, during an open inspection. These amendments will address this deficiency in the Sheriff's powers.

This bill also amends the Sheriff's Act 1978, as requested by the Chief Justice, to give the Sheriff an express power to request the Commissioner of Police to provide assistance with respect to any enforcement of judgement. The amendment, inserting a new section 9DA into the Sheriff's Act, will also provide for a police officer rendering such assistance to have all the powers of a Sheriff under the Enforcement of Judgments Act.

While reservations about the Sheriff's Office have been expressed in the past, the new Sheriff and State Courts Administrator have the government's full confidence. The new reporting practices of the State Courts Administrator to increase accountability, transparency, and visibility to parliament have gone a long way to throwing light on the practices of the Sheriff's Office. The government has confidence that the new leadership team will continue to work to restore trust in the Sheriff's Office, which provides a vital service for South Australia.

The amendments in this bill will impact positively on the administration of justice and are long overdue. They strike the appropriate balance between judgement creditors who have had their day in court and won, and judgement debtors who may be in perilous financial situations. The efficiencies and modernisations that the bill offers will contribute to the swift and effective operation of our courts. I commend the bill to members and seek to have the explanation of clauses inserted without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Enforcement of Judgments Act 1991

3—Insertion of section 3A

This clause inserts proposed section 3A into the principal Act.

3A—Investigation notices

Proposed clause 3A makes provision for an investigation notice requiring a judgment debtor to answer material questions and provide for inspection by the judgment creditor of specified documents.

It also states that if information or a document is provided to a person in accordance with an investigation notice, a person who uses the information or document for a purpose other than assessing a judgment debtor's means of satisfying a judgment is guilty of an offence.

4—Amendment of section 6—Garnishee orders

This clause amends section 6 to provide for the making of certain payments (including in the form of salary, wages or money held in a term deposit) to the judgment creditor.

5—Amendment of section 7—Seizure and sale of property

This clause amends section 7 of the principal Act so that a warrant may include a requirement for the judgment debtor to provide the sheriff with information relating to the interests of third parties in property owned by the debtor as well as a requirement for any such third party to provide relevant information to the sheriff.

The proposed amendments to section 7 also set out a series of powers (including powers of direction) that the sheriff may exercise in relation to a warrant.

Part 3—Amendment of *Sheriff's Act 1978*

6—Insertion of section 9DA

This clause inserts proposed section 9DA into the principal Act.

9DA—Sheriff etc may be assisted by police officers

Proposed section 9DA provides that the sheriff or deputy sheriff may be assisted by a police officer in the performance or exercise of their statutory functions. Proposed section 9DA makes specific provision for a police officer to be taken to have the powers of the sheriff under the *Enforcement of Judgments Act 1991*.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (12:40): I rise to indicate the opposition's support for the bill and also that I am the lead speaker for the opposition. Given the circumstances of the bill and its life in the previous parliament, the opportunity to rehearse the circumstances in which the bill was developed and the subject matter of the bill has been taken by a number of speakers both here and in another place. Going back to May 2021, as has been observed, the bill in substantially identical terms, with the exception of the two significant changes that the minister has just adverted to, was introduced and passed in the other place in June 2021 and was introduced in this place and spoken to in the second reading by the Attorney in June 2021 but did not progress further.

We know that it arises as the result of the CAA's review, with the objective of streamlining, modernising and making more practical the enforcement processes in South Australia and to line it up with other jurisdictions, so it is important to recognise that good work, leading as it has to these, hopefully, practical reforms to improve the process for parties seeking enforcement.

It has been observed that this new regime is based largely on part 38 of the Uniform Civil Procedure Rules as applied in New South Wales, with the exception that there is a voluntary step and that the practical importance of that is that one would expect there to be an opportunity to take up a step prior to a court-enforced process where the opportunity is to avoid incurring costs.

Of course, in the civil jurisdiction, parties are, if not wholly then certainly in most circumstances, as concerned to conduct themselves expeditiously with a view to minimising mutual attrition by taking advantage of processes that will minimise costs and provide an opportunity to get to an end of whatever the entanglement might be, and that extends to dealing with the process of enforcement.

I note the additions, the two changes, that have been made, one with a view to providing a baseline or bottom line in terms of the capacity for somebody to retain at least 90 per cent of the national minimum weekly wage from time to time, and what appears to be a measure for the avoidance of economic waste perhaps, insofar as not requiring the early termination of a term deposit in circumstances where that might lead to avoiding benefits to either party because of the measures that might be taken by the financial institution on the early termination.

I perhaps just note that, in terms of enforcement, where a judgement creditor is well within their rights to expect that the judgement debt be paid, that should be recognised as hopefully auguring in favour of the interests of the creditor and mutually in the interests of actually achieving the outcome of meeting the relevant judgement. We will see how that works in practice.

The point that I would emphasise is that, wherever we are talking about the role of the civil courts dealing with disputes that are at one level or another about money, and between civil parties, then the process itself should be characterised, as far as possible, by practical measures that can empower parties to behave reasonably to avoid the use of court resources, but also to avoid the court getting in the way of achieving reasonable and practical outcomes.

We in the 21st century ought be a million miles away from comparisons to a *Bleak House* analysis of civil procedure, but somehow we are not. We are, not only in terms of this discrete aspect of the work of the court, but in the more substantial work that goes on in civil litigation, too often still seeing the process loom as the deciding or heavy factor in circumstances where there is a genuine dispute around contested facts. Wherever possible, we ought to be looking for ways to provide those practical mechanisms by which the process does not get in the way of coming in to land at a practical

outcome that serves both litigants and, in the interests of all South Australians, provides an efficient use of those scarce resources of the court.

It is with those words perhaps that I hopefully add something to what is already on the public record in terms of the debate in 2021, and what we have already seen here in this new parliament. I continue to indicate that I offer my wholehearted commitment to more practical measures being applied and investment being made towards more practical outcomes, particularly in this area of civil procedure. With those words, I endorse the bill and look forward to its passage through this house.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (12:48): I also rise today to speak in support of the Statutes Amendment (Civil Enforcement) Bill. As has been mentioned, it seeks to amend the Enforcement of Judgments Act 1991 and the Sheriff's Act 1978. Civil enforcement in Australia involves a process of enforcing or executing a court order or judgement. That can include enforcing orders for the payment of money or transfer of property or goods, or the specific performance of an obligation.

The South Australian civil court system obviously has different courts and tribunals with jurisdiction over different civil matters. The civil courts in the South Australian jurisdiction to which this bill applies are the Magistrates Court, the District Court and the Supreme Court. The civil enforcement process involves several steps, including issuing of a warrant of execution or an order to seize property, registering, and enforcing an interstate judgement and enforcing foreign judgements. The civil enforcement actions in South Australia can also involve alternative dispute resolution methods, such as mediation or conciliation. These methods provide options for parties to resolve disputes outside of court and can be less costly and time-consuming than going through the courts system.

This bill implements recommendations from the review of the civil enforcement processes undertaken in 2017 by the Courts Administration Authority. As has been mentioned, it seeks to balance the interests of judgements awarded to creditors after winning their day in court against debtors who might find themselves in positions of severe financial hardship.

These amendments follow on from the previous government's introduction of a similar bill in May 2021, where it was proposed that some of these legislative changes proceed. Two changes have been made to the bill that differ from the previously introduced bill. They put in place steps to ensure that a judgement debtor is not disproportionately disadvantaged.

The term 'judgement debtors' refers to individuals or entities who have been ordered by a court to pay a sum of money to a judgement creditor because of a court order. A judgement debtor is a person or a company that is legally obligated to pay the judgement amount to the judgement creditor. Judgement debtors may have failed to pay a debt or may have been found liable in a legal proceeding, and the court has ordered them to pay an amount.

In terms of the changes, the first removes the requirement to obtain the judgement debtor's consent to garnishee orders over wages, which is consistent with other Australian jurisdictions. When talking about garnishee orders it is probably worth mentioning how they work in practice. A garnishee order is serious, as it is a court order that has been made to allow creditors to recover debts from a third party, such as a bank or an employer. The debt can be repaid in a number of ways, including taking money directly from a debtor's bank account or from their salary.

The process usually works by an applicant who is owed a court-ordered debt, known as a judgement creditor, applying for a garnishee order to be made to retrieve the debt against the judgement debtor. The court can make the garnishee order, which is then served by the applying party to the garnishee. The garnishee is not the judgement debtor; it is usually their bank, or their employer or a third party that owes money to that judgement debtor.

Essentially, the order compels the garnishee to pay the judgement creditor money to make good the debt owed to them by the judgement debtor. A garnishee order can enable the judgement creditor to recover debt from the judgement debtor's wages and salary. That is the most common type of garnishee order.

Once a court makes the garnishee order, the judgement creditor serves the order on the debtor's employer. The employer then takes that sum of money from the debtor's wage to pay the creditor. This wage withdrawal may continue until the entire debt has been repaid or until the court orders otherwise. The employer is required to leave the judgement debtor with an amount of money to live on. That amount is called the weekly compensation amount.

The court can also make a garnishee order to recover debt lump sum payments from bank accounts. Unlike garnishee orders for wages, this type of order usually directs the garnishee, being a bank or other financial institution, to repay the debt outstanding in a single lump sum. The banking institution can put a freeze on the bank account as it processes the garnishee order, which means the judgement debtor may be unable to access their account for a period of time, usually two or three working days. This bill seeks to legislate a minimum amount of weekly wages that must be preserved for the judgement debtor. The minimum amount must be equal to 90 per cent of the national minimum weekly wage.

Another amendment within the bill makes it clear that garnishee orders may be made against funds held within the judgement debtor's term-deposit accounts. However, the amendment provides clauses that payment cannot be required before the term deposit has matured, as that may incur charges and fees, therefore disadvantaging the judgement debtor further.

Other amendments remaining unchanged from the previous bill include, in relation to the Enforcement of Judgments Act 1991, an amendment enabling judgement creditors to serve an investigation notice on a judgement debtor, therefore ideally avoiding the need for a court-summonsed investigation proceeding.

There is an amendment to empower Sheriffs by the issuance of a written notice to require a judgement debtor or a third party to provide information or documentation disclosing interests of third parties or property subject to a warrant for seizure or sale. There is also an amendment to broaden the Sheriff's powers to eject and direct persons not to enter land that has been ordered under a warrant for sale. An amendment to the Sheriffs Act, to allow the Sheriff to enter into arrangements with the Commissioner for Police to enable and empower police officers to assist and/or exercise the Sheriff's duties, is also in this bill.

The government moved an amendment in the other place, with the support of the Greens, to ensure courts take into consideration the circumstances where the judgement debtor's income may vary, such as casual or seasonal workers. The government have also supported the Greens' amendment in the other place to create an offence provision where a person uses the information obtained through an investigation notice for an improper purpose, thereby ensuring greater protections for litigants' personal and financial information.

As the Minister for Small and Family Business, I am actually quite encouraged that some of these protection measures are in place. Some small businesses, particularly sole traders, can find themselves in very difficult situations leading to judgement debts. Being able to get these amendments through the parliament assists those sole traders in not necessarily being pushed to the point of closing their businesses, which are obviously their livelihoods, so I am certainly in favour of these amendments. I commend this bill to the house.

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (12:56): I rise to support the Statutes Amendment (Civil Enforcement) Bill 2022. This is a bill that seeks to find some balance between the interests of creditors and the interests of debtors. In part, there are some benefits in these changes for creditors, but there are equally some elements of this bill that tilt favour, or display some nuance or compassion, towards those who are debtors and find themselves before the courts with rulings against them.

As previous speakers have mentioned, this bill would amend the Enforcement of Judgments Act 1991 and the Sheriff's Act 1978 to implement recommendations that arose out of a review of civil enforcement processes in the state, undertaken way back, now, in 2017 by the Courts Administration Authority. It is important, of course, that we do review what is going on in our courts from time to time, because efficiency is all-important in our courts.

We all know all too well that in both the criminal and the civil jurisdiction there are longer waits than those who are using the courts would like, and so it is incumbent upon our court system,

but also us here, to look at what sort of efficiencies we can deliver, and also to review what is fair for people participating in the court system. Those things do change. Certainly when we are talking about matters of finances, we have seen great change over the years in the way that finances are delivered with the advance of technology. So it is fitting that that review was conducted way back in 2017 and that we are now standing here to implement some of those recommendations.

As has also been mentioned, the previous government introduced the previous version of this bill, the 2021 bill, which of course lapsed with the closure of parliament. I thank those opposite who put their time and effort into this, including those who are no longer here serving in this parliament, and also those public servants under the previous government who put time and effort into putting these changes together and forming this bill that comes before us now. The bill, of course, lapsed. It passed the Legislative Council in 2021 but did not progress beyond the second reading stage in the house prior to the election.

As I mentioned, the approach taken in this bill seeks to balance the interests of judgement creditors, who have had their day in court and won, and judgement debtors, who sometimes may find themselves in a position of financial hardship. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Petitions

THEBARTON OVAL/KINGS RESERVE TREES

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining): Presented a petition signed by 27 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government not to provide public funding to Adelaide Football Club (AFC) to develop the Thebarton Oval/Kings Reserve Precinct unless there is commitment from the AFC to adopt an alternate design which would preserve almost all of the 150 mature native trees that exist on the western half of Kings Reserve.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Independent Commission Against Corruption—Evaluation of the Practices, Policies and Procedures of TAFE SA—Corrigendum

By the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport (Hon. A. Koutsantonis) on behalf of the Deputy Premier (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Aboriginal Lands Trust—Annual Report 2021-22

By the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport (Hon. A. Koutsantonis) on behalf of the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Green Adelaide—Report on consultation on a prescribed levy proposal for the Central Adelaide and Dry Creek Prescribed Well Areas

Landscape Board—South Australian Arid Lands—Consultation Report on prescribed levy proposal for 2023-24 (Levy equalisation)

Environment and Water, Department for—

Report on the Prescribed Levy Proposal—New water levy in the Central Adelaide and Dry Creek Prescribed Wells Areas in the Green Adelaide, Hills and Fleurieu and Northern and Yorke landscape regions

Report on the South Australian Arid Lands Landscape Board Prescribed Levy Proposal

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

Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017—Review of—Report—February 2023

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call questions without notice, I recognise the presence in the gallery of year 11 students from Our Lady of Sacred Heart College, who are guests of the member for Enfield. As well joining us today are year 12 students and two teachers from St Michael's College, who are guests of the member for Colton. Welcome to parliament.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:02): I move:

That standing and sessional orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable me move a motion of no-confidence without notice forthwith in lieu of question time.

The SPEAKER: An absolute majority is required and is present, the motion is accepted. Is it seconded?

An honourable member: Yes, sir.

Motion carried.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:02): I move:

That the time allotted for the debate be 60 minutes in lieu of question time.

Motion carried.

No-confidence Motion

MINISTER FOR HEALTH AND WELLBEING

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:03): I move:

That this house has no confidence in the Minister for Health and Wellbeing and that this house calls on him to resign for his failures as Minister for Health and Wellbeing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Badcoe!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Elder!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Florey!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Badcoe and the member for Elder are on their final warnings. I sense that it is going to be a lively session in advance of the Easter break. The leader.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will start again, so that all members might be able to hear this. I move:

That this house has no confidence in the Minister for Health and Wellbeing and that this house calls on him to resign for his failures as Minister for Health and Wellbeing, including in particular for walking away from the government's central election commitment to fix ramping.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Frome!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The central election commitment, provided to the South Australian community by the Labor Party in the lead-up to the 2022 state election, the central commitment—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Adelaide!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —the pivotal commitment was that 'Labor will fix ramping'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is warned.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: It was unequivocal, it was simple.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: It had no asterisks, there was no nuance, it was absolutely ironclad. They said, 'Labor will fix ramping'. That is what the South Australian people were promised at that election. It was Labor's central promise and it was heard loud and clear—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey is warned.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —on thousands of election posters, along highways, in streets, in the suburbs and towns that make up this state. Thousands of flyers entered letterboxes, on our social media feeds: 'Labor will fix ramping', 'Labor will fix ramping', 'Labor will fix ramping'. On the pre-polls before the election, on polling day, around polling booths: 'Labor will fix ramping', and on the doorsteps right across this state. The member for Newland told residents in Tea Tree Gully that, 'Labor will fix ramping'. The member for Elder told residents in St Mary's—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —that 'Labor will fix ramping'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The member for Waite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Florey!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —told residents in Lower Mitcham that, 'Labor will fix ramping'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The member for Davenport told residents in Aberfoyle Park—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —that, 'Labor will fix ramping'. The member for Adelaide told residents—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —in Prospect that, 'Labor would fix ramping', and the member for King told residents in Golden Grove that, 'Labor would fix ramping'.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: It was unequivocal, absolutely unequivocal. But what has happened—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Cheltenham!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —what has happened in the 12 months—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Florey!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —since the state election? The first anniversary, and what do they have, apart from chortling and laughing and smugness and arrogance? What is the practical outcome?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Florey is warned for a final time.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The outcome is that ramping has gotten much, much worse in this state under those opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: It turns out that governing is a lot harder than selfies and slogans. It turns out that the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —slogans and the selfies concocted around fixing ramping—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —were fraudulent—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —because in February 2022—

The SPEAKER: Leader, please be seated. Members, I appreciate that this subject matter encourages a very willing contribution to debate; nevertheless, it is difficult for the member speaking to be heard. Members to my left and to my right, the standing orders, of course, are in force. The leader.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. If we look back at ramping statistics in February 2022, 1,522 hours were spent on the ramp.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: And what was it in February 2023?

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: It was 3,036 hours—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Waite!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —a doubling of ramping—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier is called order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —under this incompetent Labor government and this portfolio area, led by an incompetent minister. Ramping has skyrocketed. The Premier promised South Australians that he would fix ramping, but ramping has gotten worse than ever under their leadership. So what are they doing instead?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Clearly, things weren't going in the right direction—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Newland will depart under 137A, to be joined by the member for Elder, and the member for Florey will also depart. That is Florey, Elder and Newland—137A, for 15 minutes.

The honourable members for Florey, Elder and Newland having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The leader has the call.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Those residents of Tea Tree Gully and Melrose Park would be so disappointed that their representatives cannot stand up for them today, cannot pay attention to some home truths when outlined about the failure of their government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: What about McLaren Vale? What about Myponga?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is warned.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: What about Cape Jervis, Parndana, Kingscote?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: This man is also—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —in complete denial. So what happened—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson will depart under 137A. Reflections on the presence or otherwise of members are contrary to the standing orders.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley can join him—15 minutes, 137A.

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

The SPEAKER: The leader has the call.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. So with increasing media scrutiny, with the confidence of the South Australian public diminishing, what did we have this week? Clearly, and you can just imagine it up there in the Premier's Delivery Unit—the dream factory—Rik Morris pulling out the whiteboard and writing on it, 'We can't fulfil this one. We can't deliver this one. What will we do?' Let's look over here. Let's change the election commitment. We didn't make that promise. We can't keep the promise, so let's tell South Australians that we didn't make the promise. In this alternate reality that Rik Morris and the crew are trying to create here—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morphett!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —we are having a completely different election promise.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Reynell! Member for Cheltenham!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: This week, the health minister conceded that he can't deliver on his promise to fix ramping. The Premier has been avoiding media scrutiny. They are trying to pull the wool over the eyes of South Australians, and what do we get? We get a completely different commitment: 'We didn't promise to fix ramping. That was never anything to do with us.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Giles!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: It is about response times now. This is about ambulance response times.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Frome!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: 'Forget the ramping thing, look over here'—smoke, mirrors, selfies, slogans—'no, no, we were all about ambulance response times.' This is a dramatic backflip. This is a moving of the goal posts of historic proportions, and it is an extraordinary, extraordinary capitulation—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —on their central election promise.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Morphett! Member for Badcoe!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Those opposite, and the health minister in particular—he laughs. He laughs at people ramping. He has capitulated on the Labor Party's central election promise.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has the call.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has said this week, and I quote:

The government—

We will want a bit of silence for this one. The Minister for Health and Wellbeing, and I quote, said this week:

The government has no target for a reduction in the number of hours ambulances spend ramped outside hospitals.

End quote. Does anyone recall that on the corflutes up and down highways and streets in the lead-up to the election? Not only is ramping not fixed, it is worse than ever, and we have seen the most arrogant backflip in the history of this state government. But don't just take my word for it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Let's look at that auspicious publication's editorial today—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —in *The Advertiser*. The editorial was an excellent read this morning.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader will be seated. Please take a seat. Order! Members, it is as predicted a lively session. I appreciate, as earlier mentioned, that of course it is subject matter that encourages spirited contributions. The Leader must be heard. The Leader.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Thank you, Mr Speaker, because of course it is not my words now, it is those of others; perhaps a more learned analysis of the situation. So *The Advertiser's* editorial today, and I quote:

...the problem for the government is that, in light of its preposterous denials this week that it ever set a ramping target when the issue was the centrepiece of its election campaign, this too looks like trickery.

Frankly, it's going to be hard to believe anything Labor says about ramping from now on...

There must be many swinging voters around the state feeling like they have been hoodwinked.

Labor's promise was to fix the ramping crisis, not the response time crisis. Will Goodings today said:

An absolute rolled gold, clear as a bell, cast-iron promise that Labor will fix ramping. No asterisks, no caveats; they were going to do it. Now, over the past few months we have seen a crab-walking exercise where several nuances and caveats and provisos are being layered onto the nature of this challenge.

Let's hear what Matt Abraham has to say:

It has dawned on the government they're not going to be able to fix ramping and they promised to fix ramping. That's what got them elected.

David Penberthy today said that there were two versions of the poster that were up everywhere across South Australia. One said 'Labor will fix the ramping crisis' and the other—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —just clear as a bell said, 'Labor will fix ramping.'

Paul, from Blakeview, called into FIVEaa today and said, 'Get your priorities right, Premier.' David Bevan, on 21 March said:

It's a year since the Malinauskas government was elected on the promise of fixing ramping and, of course, it's worse now than it was when they were elected.

Of course, let's hear what the Deputy Premier of South Australia had to say. On 19 March, asked whether she was satisfied with progress on Labor's promise to fix the ramping crisis, she said, and I quote, 'An impossible question to answer.' The question before us today is does this house—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —have confidence in the health minister? He has no confidence in his own ability to fix the ramping crisis. That is very clear with his desire not to answer questions on it or his dramatic changing of the goalposts, but the more—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —important question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —is what do South Australians think of this? Do South Australians think this is all just a storm in a teacup—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Adelaide!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —to quote the Minister for Health and Wellbeing—a storm in a teacup?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Elizabeth!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Or do South Australians want better from their government? Perhaps South Australians want what they voted for. Perhaps South Australians want ramping to be fixed. Perhaps South Australians want the ramping crisis to be fixed. Perhaps those living in Belair want ramping to be fixed. Perhaps those in O'Halloran Hill want ramping to be fixed. Perhaps those in Adelaide want ramping to be fixed. Perhaps those in One Tree Hill—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —want ramping to be fixed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Davenport! Member for King!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: There are less marginal seats to go through now so I will not do that.

The Hon. B.I. Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Wright!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The truth of the matter, though, is that when it comes to this minister it is not just the situation with ramping. That might be the primary concern we are addressing today, but what about the other concerns? What about his dismissive statements—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Taylor!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —around the provision of pillows in hospitals. When the member for Schubert asked him a question about this a few weeks ago—nothing to see here—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —that's not a problem.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: What about the 93 year old who spent 23 hours in The Queen Elizabeth Hospital emergency department without a pillow, without sheets? How do you think he felt about the dismissive tone of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing? What about the families of the children who have suffered at the hands of the debacle unfolding with the Women's and Children's Hospital with the cochlear implants?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: That of course extends over a period of time but it was the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —Minister for Health and Wellbeing's quasi coverup over recent months which has further exposed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —this state to liability for this scandal, because he went slow on it. He failed to take the action—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Badcoe!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —that he should have, and vulnerable children have suffered at his hands.

The SPEAKER: The leader. The member for Badcoe and the member for Chaffey will depart for 15 minutes under 137A.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader has the call.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: It is the hundreds of patients ramped in our hospitals that we are speaking up for today. It is people like the 93-year-old gentleman stuck in an emergency department at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital without a pillow. Do you know what his family were told when they asked for a pillow? They were told, 'Pillows are like a precious commodity around here.' Pillows are like a precious commodity—that's what his family were told by staff at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital in the last 24 hours.

It is for the children who have been impacted by the go-slow approach of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing with regard to investigating the cochlear implant—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —scandal at the Women's and Children's Hospital.

The Hon. N.F. Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale is warned for a final time.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: South Australians deserve better. South Australians expect better. If the health minister has no confidence in his own capacity, in his own ability to deliver on key commitments that his party made in the lead-up to the 2022 state election, perhaps, just perhaps the

Minister for Health and Wellbeing should consider his future. I have no confidence in him; we have no confidence in him.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Waite!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: People living in Hawthorndene have no confidence in him either. People living in Flagstaff Hill have no confidence in him either.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Waite!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: People living in Salisbury Heights do not have confidence in him either.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Adelaide!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: He is embattled, he is beleaguered, and the clock is ticking for the Minister for Health and Wellbeing in South Australia. He must resign, and if he does not resign the Premier must sack him. This house should not have confidence in the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. He has let South Australians down and he must resign.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: This government has confidence in the health minister. This house will demonstrate its confidence in this health minister. We say that with certainty because everybody in this place knows that not only—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —is this minister committed to the substantial task that he has inherited but he has a plan to fix the ramping crisis. This motion, at its essence—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Frome! Member for Morialta!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —demonstrates an extraordinary level of desperation amongst the opposition and its leader. Desperation, sir—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —that is best demonstrated by the opportunity this motion presents to make clear the contrast in substantive policy that exists between the politics of the opposition and the plans of the government. It is worthwhile remembering—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —it is worthwhile South Australians contemplating—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta! Member for Hammond! Member for Morphett!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —just how bad a situation those opposite managed to create over the course of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton! Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —four years of government. The moment that those opposite got elected, they got to work—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Schubert! Member for Frome!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —doing what Liberals do best: cut after cut after cut to the public health budget in this state. Hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton! Member for Schubert!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —immediately extracted out of the state budget in public hospitals with patients and health workers left to pay the price.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert will depart under 137A. If there was any doubt about it, she was using her hands to project her voice, which must mean that the chamber is in disorder.

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! You will depart under 137A for 15 minutes.

The honourable member for Schubert having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The Premier.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Once they established their regime of substantial cuts throughout the public hospital system, the next great idea that the then government had was to bring in the corporate liquidators to start to run the most substantial part of our hospital system in the Central Adelaide Local Health Network. It wasn't doctors, nurses and health leadership professionals running our health system but rather the corporate liquidators.

Then something happened. Then we had a global pandemic in 2020. When the rest of the world rapidly turned its mind to 'What can we do to improve the state of our public health system? What effort and resources can we reallocate to public health during a time of truly unprecedented crisis?' what do those opposite do? Well, they maintained the cuts—they maintained the cuts—and then what they decided to do—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morphett, order! Member for Waite!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —was to make health workers redundant—make health workers redundant!

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The member for Morphett—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Davenport!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —sat there at the cabinet table when the decisions were made to make health workers redundant during the course of a global pandemic. There is nothing more precious in this state or anywhere in the nation—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morphett! The member for Waite and the member for Morphett will depart under 137A for 15 minutes. I anticipate other members may now be returning. Welcome back, member for Florey.

The honourable members for Waite and Morphett having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The Premier.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: There is nothing more precious in this state or anywhere around the country at the moment than a health worker dedicated to looking after patients. During the course of a global pandemic, those opposite thought it a good idea to make health workers redundant. Why was that occurring? It was occurring, of course, because the person who was really in charge of health policy during the life of the former government was not the health minister but was, rather, the Treasurer of South Australia who thought it was a good idea to make health workers redundant in a pandemic and then go into war with every health worker he could get his hands on.

It was the Treasurer who was running health policy in this state during the course of the last government—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: No, that was you.

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —the Premier was asleep at the wheel.

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

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

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: They are not my words but the words of the now Leader of the Opposition—and the Leader of the Opposition of course was busy capitulating—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —to the Eastern States. What an extraordinary situation. So, going into the state election in March this year, South Australians were left with a very clear—

Mr Cowdrey: You're so confident in Chris you're not even going to talk about him.

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

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —and simple choice: a plan to invest record sums into our health system and recruit a lot more workers to be working within it or no plan at all except for a city basketball stadium—and the people of South Australia spoke, and they spoke loudly. Since then the Minister for Health has been hard at work—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Flinders, member for Hammond, member for Colton!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —implementing all of the government's policy, which is extensive, employing hundreds of additional nurses, employing over a hundred additional doctors, already opening up 200 additional beds in the system—

Mr Cowdrey: Why are you changing the plan then? Why change?

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —with more to come, employing hundreds more ambulance officers, and getting to work actually seeing those commitments delivered. During the course of the last 12 months alone—

Mr Cowdrey: Commit to the target then.

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —in only 12 months, we have seen ambulance response times substantially improve to the extent that increasingly, when South Australians dial 000 in their time of need, their confidence levels have dramatically escalated—

Ms Pratt interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Frome!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —that the ambulance will roll up on time. Disputes with health workers have been resolved.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Other organisations outside of the public health system—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hartley!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —have been the beneficiary of this Minister for Health's dedication by hearing their calls and applying additional resources to them. The list of those is extensive, but the one thing that has been more important than anything else is doing the little things that make a difference as quickly as possible, like employing 16 additional doctors in the women's and kids' hospital now, while at the same time planning for a Women's and Children's Hospital that is not just going to suit us for the next two or three years but set us up for the next hundred. This health minister is capable—

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —of making the tough and hard decisions, not to just get us to the next election but to make sure that young people, in the 2030s and the 2040s, can have confidence in a public health system that is looking after them.

Mr Cowdrey: Why change the target then?

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Whether it be compulsorily acquiring—

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Flinders!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —additional land in the western suburbs for The QEH—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is warned.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —or compulsorily acquiring land at the Lyell McEwin Hospital—

Ms Pratt interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Frome!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —this is a minister who has the foresight to think ahead of the game into the long term, of getting a lot more beds in the system, a lot more people working within the system but then making the long-term investment decisions to set us up—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —which is the exact sort of person you want in charge of the health system. This minister is not only dedicated—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey, order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —to delivering on our election commitments, he is going above and beyond that to ensure that the next generation of South Australians will be the beneficiaries of his leadership.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hartley!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: But more than that, this motion presents the opportunity for us to not just contemplate the policy and the plan but the man himself. What I know about the Minister for Health (the member for Kaurna) is that he is probably the hardest working person in this place. Seldom do I wake up in the morning and not be in receipt of a text message—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —from the Minister for Health, who has been monitoring the performance of our health system throughout the course—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Frome!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —of the evening.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Every single time that someone in this state has drawn to the minister's attention of not being in receipt of the highest possible care—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: That's because he's so worried about the Labor Party, that's the only reason.

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —it's the minister himself who is rapidly picking up the phone to get in touch with someone to learn about their experience, to put the human context on someone who is in our health system. That occurred as recently as this morning, when the minister heard Therese on FIVEaa radio and was quickly dialling her number to be in touch with her, and to understand her experience. Then, within hours of speaking to Therese, this minister is down at The QEH, seeing firsthand the situation to make sure it's addressed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hartley!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —deploying his leadership skills, his power and authority, not burying his head in the sand—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —but getting to work, making sure that health patients are being looked after. This is the sort of person that we want in charge of our health system. He has got the resources, he has got the plan, he has got the human experience to make sure that South Australian patients are having their concerns addressed. We know that turning around the health system will take time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: We know that we are seeing results, but there is a long way to go. There is no resiling from the fact that health is our number one priority.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: We have a policy that stands in stark contrast to that of the Leader of the Opposition—

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley! Member for Florey!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —who is only filled with desperation and politics at a time when South Australians expect so much more from people who work within this house.

The SPEAKER: It is most certainly a spirited debate, but with members returning to the benches and the benches now being replenished, the level of noise in the chamber is increasing. One departure under 137A is not an inoculation against further departures in the same session. Members, please be warned.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): It is an extraordinary thing to be lectured by the Premier, the man who closed the Repat, about services for South Australians when it comes to our health system. It is an extraordinary thing to be lectured by the Premier, the man who defended Transforming Health as the health minister.

It is an extraordinary thing to be lectured by the Premier, who appointed the architect of Transforming Health who, as an adviser in John Hill's office, as an assistant minister for health, whose record on the history of South Australia's health system is very tarnished to start with as the Minister for Health in this place, to serve the people of South Australia, to deliver what was, prior to the election, Labor's number one priority for the people of South Australia: to fix ramping here in South Australia.

If the Minister for Health has no confidence in his ability to fix ramping in South Australia, as he has made it very clear all week that he has no confidence of that nature, why should anyone in this house have confidence in his ability to do so? The fact is they have changed the metric by which people of South Australia are expected to judge this government.

We saw last Friday the CEO of SA Health, Dr Robyn Lawrence, not once, not two times, but three times in the Budget and Finance Committee being asked: what was the promise that she was being tasked with delivering for the people of South Australia? What was the mandate that the government had? She said, straight after her opening statement, 'I have a clear mandate to reduce ramping and improve access to care for patients.' She said just minutes later:

...we have an ongoing piece of work to improve the ramping situation. Certainly the initial target as we move forward is to reach the levels that we saw back in 2018, and I think we would all like to see ramping minimised even beyond that.

She was asked: what was the clear commitment? She said, 'I think the commitment is to return to our 2018 levels of transfer of care—in three years.' That was on Friday.

On Saturday, we had the then Acting Premier, the Deputy Premier, go out and front media, giving the government their one-year report card on how they were going on their election promises. She gave them 48 per cent of election promises delivered. It was notable in the press release that there was no mention of ramping. Everyone before the election knew ramping was the number one priority.

The Premier told *The Advertiser*, a significant journal of record in this state, what his number one priority was going to be: it was going to be to fix the ramping crisis in South Australia. When asked what that meant, the chief executive tasked with fixing this issue, said that it was reducing the transfer of care. What did South Australians think reducing ramping meant? I reckon they meant reducing ramping.

What did Labor backbenchers think reducing ramping meant? Well, the member for Elder said, 'The last 17 months I've been out in our community with my team, listening to you about our

priorities, ending ramping being first one.' She went on to say, 'I am committed to this and more.' That was on 17 February last year.

The member for Newland on 22 February said, 'The Malinauskas Labor government will recruit more nurses, improve care and safety, reduce the burden on public hospitals to fix ramping.' The member for Gibson described Labor's policies as 'Labor's comprehensive plan to fix the ramping crisis'. She went on to say they will stop on the 25 February—stop the ramping of ambulances. So you can see it; it is here in full technicolour on her Facebook page.

The Minister for Human Services can stop gesticulating. She said 'a comprehensive plan to stop ramping'. The Minister for Child Protection on her Facebook on 25 February talked about 'stop ramping of ambulances'. The member for Badcoe talked about her poster waving. She said, 'Lots of honks! Lots of support for Labor's strategy to stop ramping!'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Badcoe! Member for Colton!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: On thousands and thousands of posters on poles in suburbs and cities, in towns and the CBD of Adelaide, the Premier was saying that he had the right priorities: 'Labor will fix the ramping crisis'.

Labor MPs told their electors, when they were putting themselves forward to be elected to this house to represent their constituents, they would fix ramping. Not one of them in that said that there was an asterisk saying that it would be within four years and certainly not one of them said that it was going to be judged by how long it took a category 1 or a category 2 ambulance to arrive. No. They said they would fix ramping.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: They said they would fix ramping, and every South Australian knows that that meant—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is warned.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —the number of ambulances' hours on ramps outside hospitals waiting for their patients to be moved into hospitals receiving the care they need in the environment they are supposed to be receiving it. That is what Labor's promise was and everyone in South Australia knows it. The constituents who were told by the member for Badcoe—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —by the member for Gibson, by the member for Newland, by the member for Adelaide, Elder and all of the others who are being asked to support their minister today. Those members know that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —they told their constituents that the promise was to fix ramping, the promise was to end ramping, the promise was to get ambulances off the ramps. That's what they said, that's what South Australians believed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for King! Member for Adelaide!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: And for them to now come out this week, having worked out that they can't deliver that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Davenport!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —the health minister clearly on Monday morning, having told his cabinet—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe! Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —that that they were not going to be able to achieve that goal, they now expect all South Australians to believe this nonsense that that was never the promise. They expect all South Australians to believe that they never said that. You know, there is somebody who reminded the parliament a couple of years ago of George Orwell in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* when he wrote:

...if all others accepted the lie which the Party imposed—if all records told the same tale—then the lie passed into history and became truth.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Just because people in the government plan for the next three years every day to repeat the rhetoric that they never promised to fix ramping, just because members of the government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —the Premier is indeed asking members of his backbench—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —to show loyalty to the health minister above their own constituents, that does not mean they should do so.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Each member of the Labor Party who put forward materials saying Labor would fix ramping, each member of the Labor Party who told constituents at the door that they were going to fix ramping—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —every single one of them has a responsibility to deliver for their constituents what they promised, and what they promised was to fix ramping. And now that they know that their health minister has no plan to fix ramping, now they know their health minister is telling people that what they thought they heard they did not hear, that what they believed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —was the promise was not the promise.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Those members have a responsibility to their electors. Their responsibility to their electors is more important than their responsibility to the Premier or the health minister and they have a duty to vote with the opposition to support this motion, and the health

minister should fulfil his duty to resign from this position which he has no confidence in himself to deliver.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members to my left and right, there is more noise in this chamber with 47 members than there is in the House of Commons with 600.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:37): This motion by the opposition really is not about the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, it is about the Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Colton and the member for Florey will depart under 137A for 15 minutes. Member for Florey, it is no inoculation to have been asked to depart only once, but twice in one day is an achievement.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morialta is warned for a final time, as is the member for Mawson.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Leader of the Opposition has wasted the first 12 months in his role. This motion is a distraction.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is a distraction from the coverage and criticism he has received. I know it bothers him, you can tell, moving around in his seat; he does not like it. Unfortunately, for the government, we cannot save the Leader of the Opposition, as much as we would like to. The weird and silent tactics he has employed over the last 12 months have convinced everyone it is not a matter of if but when. Tactically, he has failed again. He has failed again—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Cheltenham!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —not just because of the iron rule of arithmetics in this house, which is the numbers because the motion will not be carried, but because he has failed to make the argument. The only way you can make an argument for a no-confidence motion for any minister is to offer the alternative to replace that minister. But he stands on no platform.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No health policy at the last election of any note or any worth, and since the election no health policy or alternative of any note.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: All he wants to do is to tear down the people who are attempting to fix the mistakes that they left behind.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Frome!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We are seeing plenty from the opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have to say, given the quality and quantity of questions from members opposite, especially the Leader of the Opposition, to me this is a lazy attempt to make a point. No question time in lieu of this motion means what? No questions, no scrutiny. They can't put their argument.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: They can't put an alternative.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: All they want to do is tear down.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: But you can smell the relief from the opposition benches that there's no question time today.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It wafts down from the second floor, the staff up there, just happy. They don't have to write any more questions.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Happy that there is no question time.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Where is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —the contrasting? Where is the policy alternative the Leader of the Opposition will point to as the alternative? Is it the policy platform of the last election? They can't get rid of that fast enough!

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: They can't get rid of it fast enough. Is it a new policy platform that they are standing on to claim that they have a better plan? Nothing! Silence.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Davenport!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Nowhere.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Chaffey is on a final warning. The member for Hammond and the member for Adelaide will depart under 137A for 15 minutes.

The honourable members for Hammond and Adelaide having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of Government Business.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It would be better use of the parliament's time to hold a question time, but the truth is that the opposition hate question time. The answers they receive humiliate them and they know it—they know it. Their questions don't cut through. Their strategy is weak, ill-disciplined and uncoordinated.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta! The member for Unley!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: To use the words of the Leader of the Opposition, 'Don't believe me.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morialta!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: 'Believe a paper of note, believe the paper of record.' Let's read the editorial about Speirs' head in the sand.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Oh, you know, the one that you liked quoting so much today.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morialta!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Let's read the editorial.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Oh, don't worry! It reads:

If David Speirs has a political motto, it seems—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morialta, the member for Morphett and the member for Davenport will depart under 137A for 15 minutes.

The honourable members for Morialta, Morphett and Davenport having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: I should remark, as there are a number of members presently out of the chamber, that should there be—

The Hon. N.F. Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hurtle Vale! I should remark, as there are a number of members not presently in the chamber because of the exercise, unfortunately, of 137A, that should there be a division they are permitted to return for that purpose. The Leader of Government Business.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir. Given the Leader of the Opposition was so quick to point out editorials—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, he is. Well, I will read one of my favourites:

If David Speirs has a political motto, it seems 'ignorance is bliss' might be it. Or perhaps 'no news is good news'.

It goes on to say:

Given that Mr Speirs—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Flinders!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:

career appears in peril, perhaps his performance, in the eyes of his partyroom, and the public—

The SPEAKER: The member for Frome! The member for Unley! The member for Flinders!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:

might improve were he to be a little more engaged.

End quote. How do you become more engaged? You offer a political alternative, you offer a policy. How dare the Leader of the Opposition—

The SPEAKER: The member for Flinders.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —get up in this house and waste the time of this house with a no-confidence motion that will fail, without even the ability to offer an alternative? What does he really expect the public to see here? He wants the minister to resign but offers no alternative policy position.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader! The member for Unley!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That just shows he is bereft of any belief in any policy. If you believe the Leader of the Opposition, he was the Treasurer default. He was the one who was going to be the Treasurer in waiting. He was one of the most experienced cabinet ministers around the table, one of the most trusted advisers—just ask him. Just ask him—he'll tell you. It was him. It was the Premier, Rob Lucas, David Speirs and daylight. Just ask him.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson! The member for Unley is warned for a final time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Apparently, he has gone from, 'I was strapped into the back of a car watching dad asleep at the wheel'—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —to, 'I was a key strategist in the last government.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So one of the two is true.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: But of course, if he was who he says he was—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —that means he was the architect of \$400 million worth of cuts—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —he was architect of the redundancy, he was the architect of cancelling elective surgeries, he was the architect of proposing a brand-new basketball stadium instead of attending to health. He can't have it both ways.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Cheltenham!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Either he is a genius in the background or he was strapped into the seat in the back of the car.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Frome!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He can choose.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Flinders is warned for a final time. Leader of Government Business.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: But he will not choose because the truth is he has no plan and he knows he does not need to develop it because he ain't going to make it, no matter how hard I try to keep him here. All of us are committed to keeping him there. If this motion was reversed and it was a no confidence motion in the Leader of the Opposition, all of us would get up and walk across the floor to support him.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We would be right behind him—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —because we know—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Elizabeth!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —there other forces lurking in the background. Some say it is time for Tarzia. Some say there is another—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —a voice crying out in the wilderness for another greater to come whose sandals we are not fit to even carry.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It could be Basham; it could be.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It could be Basham, although I have got my money on the kid at the back there.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He is ready.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He is tanned, he is ready, he has the chambray shirt, he has the chinos, he has the boots: he is ready to go, out of central casting—ready to go.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley is warned!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have known the Minister for Health since he was a staffer in the federal government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the leader!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I know no-one who has more empathy and caring for the people he serves. Not only does he work hard—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: You need to broaden your circles then.

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —he is a good and decent person who cares terribly about our entire state.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He wants our health system to succeed. He worries about it, he cares about it, he fights for it. He is the best person to lead our health portfolio.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He is the best person to do this job. He has our complete confidence and we will see it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Frome!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —by the non-aligned members of this house and how they vote. Let's just see who lasts longer: the Minister for Health or the Leader of the Opposition.

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:47): It is absolutely no surprise that I rise to support this motion of no confidence in the Minister for Health. I absolutely do so because not only has this house lost confidence in the Minister for Health but the people of South Australia have lost confidence in this Minister for Health. Just 12 months on, they have absolutely dropped their number one election commitment; they cannot keep their number one central promise.

I understand that this is so hard for those opposite to understand because it was the member for Newland, the member for Elder and all of those opposite who went to their constituencies, who looked them in the eye and said, 'We will fix ramping in South Australia.' You could not drive anywhere—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs HURN: —up hill, down dale: 'We will fix ramping'. They said it at press conferences, they said it at their street-corner meetings, they said it everywhere. In fact, 12 months in—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Taylor!

Mrs HURN: —and the government, even the government, for the last 12 months have been talking about this key metric—

Members interjecting:

Mrs HURN: —exactly—what would be their key metric to fix ramping in the state. Transfer of care—

Members interjecting:

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

Mrs HURN: —then it all changed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs HURN: It happened on ABC radio—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs HURN: —on Tuesday of this week. And guess what it coincided with?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Giles!

Mrs HURN: The worst 10 months of ramping in South Australia's history. The worst ramping in South Australia's history—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Waite!

Mrs HURN: —and it is South Australians who are absolutely paying the price. And guess what they say? Guess what they say? It was South Australians who got it wrong. It was South Australians who misunderstood—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs HURN: —the posters that said, 'We will fix ramping'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier is called to order! Member for Newland!

Mrs HURN: I don't know what was happening, but—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale!

Mrs HURN: —when I was driving up hill, down dale I didn't see, 'We will fix response times'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs HURN: I didn't see that. What I did hear those opposite say, and the ads that they paid for, is 'Vote Labor like your life depends on it because some day it just might', and 12 months in—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs HURN: —things have never been worse.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe and the member for Hurtle Vale, although a minister, but now not required for question time, will depart under 137A for 15 minutes or until the conclusion of this debate.

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

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert.

Mrs HURN: And then they have the arrogance, the minister has the arrogance, to go on radio and say, 'This is all a storm in a teacup. South Australians got it wrong.' They believe that they have hoodwinked South Australians, and guess who is not buying it?

Honourable members: South Australians.

Mrs HURN: South Australians. South Australians are not buying it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Elder!

Mrs HURN: Now, I really do understand that this is difficult for those opposite.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Maybe we should have an election.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

Mrs HURN: This is really difficult for those opposite to see—really, really difficult—because when you come into government you should have a level of goodwill. There should be a level of goodwill that occurs when you are elected, a generous portion—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs HURN: —and this type of thing erodes confidence in government, just like that. And guess what kicks it away forever and ever? Telling South Australians that they were the ones who misunderstood, that they got it wrong. But there is one chance of redemption—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Wright!

Mrs HURN: —for Labor, one chance, and that is to sit down with their constituents, to sit down with paramedics—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Taylor is warned.

Mrs HURN: —and apologise—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Taylor! Member for Frome!

Mrs HURN: —apologise to South Australians because it is time for Labor to say sorry. It is time for Labor to say, 'We are so sorry that 12 months on we just forgot to tell you that things would double—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Taylor! Order!

Mrs HURN: —that things would get worse before they got better—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Taylor!

Mrs HURN: —and we are so sorry that we played the biggest role ever in South Australia's worst ever—

Members interjecting:

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

Mrs HURN: —fear campaign just so that you would vote for us, and we are so sorry that South Australians are still dying waiting for an ambulance.' And do you know what, Mr Speaker? So many South Australians voted for the Premier, they voted for the minister, based on this promise, and South Australians will never forget. South Australians know what they voted for, and South Australians absolutely expect for that to be delivered.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Newland! Member for Waite! Member for Mawson!

Mrs HURN: And how can we have confidence in a minister who just this week, 12 months in, has walked away, is attempting to wave the white flag—it is all too hard. And you cannot do the big things; you cannot even do the small things—pillows. There are no pillows in the hospitals.

An honourable member: Luxury.

Mrs HURN: Exactly. None of that. There is no linen. You cannot get the basics right. We do not have confidence in this minister.

Time expired.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (14:53): I thank the member for Schubert for her contribution. In fact, I was glad she got one being left 5½ minutes out of 30 minutes of the debate time, but nothing says more about the modern-day Liberal Party than that. Nothing says more about the Liberal Party than that, only allowing a female shadow minister for health 5½ minutes out of a 30-minute debate. Do you know what else says a lot about the Liberal Party? Once again, a bogus campaign of deception on this very matter, because on this side we made it abundantly clear—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —what we would be doing if we were elected—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Flinders!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —at the last election, at press conference after press conference after press conference. And we had a lot of them on health because we had a lot of policies on health. We had a fully costed strategy to substantially increase capacity in every facet of our health system. We promised—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Flinders is warned for a final time.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —more than 300 new beds and now we have increased it to more than 550. We increased it by more than 300 nurses—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —by more than 100 doctors, and 350 ambos, because we knew the state that those opposite had left the health system in.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: What was their first act?

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hartley will be departing shortly.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Their first act—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Treasurer, please be seated. The member for Hartley appears to be appealing to me—137A, remainder of the debate. Member for Hartley, please depart.

The honourable member for Hartley having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Because we knew the state that they had left the health system in under the last four years. What was the first act of the previous Liberal government in health? It was to impose a further—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —\$400 million of savings on the health system and then, as the Premier said, call the corporate liquidators into our Central Adelaide Local Health Network.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Frome!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Less resources and corporate liquidators.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Newland!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: And what did they promise to do? What did they budget to do at the outset of a global pandemic?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: To cut doctors and to cut nurses. This is how the Liberals left our health system.

Ms Savvas interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: And when ambulance officers were realising that they could not get to emergency callouts on time, what did they do? They contacted the government and they begged for more resources. They begged for more resources, but did they get them? Of course they did not. Of course they did not, and they tried and they tried and response times got longer and longer and longer.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: People were dying because they could not get an ambulance.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Flinders!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Out of desperation, what did our hardworking paramedics and ambulance officers do? They started telling South Australians directly. They started putting messages on the sides of the ambulances so that South Australians knew the dark truth about how those opposite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —were running our health system into the ground. What did the Liberal government do in response to ambulance officers speaking out? They took them to court.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: When we got into government, our hardworking paramedics and ambulance officers—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

The SPEAKER: —had not had a pay rise in five years—five years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Flinders! Member for Waite!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: They took them to court and they refused to give them a pay rise. That is the legacy of those opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, indeed, member for Flinders—137A, to be joined by the member for Mawson for the remainder of the debate. He is a lively contributor.

The honourable members for Flinders and Mawson having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: When our constituents were coming to us to tell us how concerned they were that when they called an ambulance—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —one would not turn up, do you know what our policy was going to be? To make sure that ambulances could turn up, and we made it abundantly clear what our target would be for this term of government. We wanted response times to get back to where they were in 2017-18—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is warned.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —85 per cent of all callouts on time—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —85 per cent response times.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That was our target and we said it at press conference after press conference. We said it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Frome!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —on talkback radio interview after talkback radio interview. It was abundantly clear.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Frome!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Every time a journalist asked the Premier, the Minister for Health or me as shadow treasurer—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —what our target was, we told them. So now what do we get? We get the member for Schubert once again bogusly putting it around that that was not our commitment at all.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That was not our commitment at all. Our commitment, apparently, was something entirely different—something entirely different—and now bogusly the member for Schubert—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert well knows 137A, and will depart for five minutes.

The honourable member for Schubert having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Bogusly putting it around that this confected target—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —that they have come up with is what we should be held to account for. We know what our target is. We are investing the resources so that we can meet it. As we said to the people of South Australia, we are committed to delivering it over the course of this term.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: But I am not surprised that this is the tactic. I am not surprised that this is the tactic of those opposite, because it is those opposite who spent the last four years carrying on like this, deceiving South Australians about what they were doing to their health system, pulling resources out. Just remember—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —the debacle of their health policy at the last election. We had a drop to *The Advertiser*, 'We are going to spend half a billion dollars, five hundred million dollars, in new resources to health.' By the next morning, by the time the papers were hitting the pavement, those opposite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Perhaps members should, member for Waite, but in any event, of course, you will know that standing order 141 does not permit quarrels between house including in relation to *The Advertiser* or any other subject matter. Of course, also the standing orders make plain that no

noise or interruption is allowed in debate. It might be said that in the course of debate such as this that standing order is observed only in the breach. The Treasurer.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: They bogusly dropped a story to *The Tiser* claiming that they were going to put five hundred million dollars into health. By the time the paper hit the pavement the next morning they back-tracked to one hundred and twenty three million dollars. Then that day, at a press conference, their health minister, Stephen Wade, was asked, 'Is this new money?'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: He said, 'To be honest, I don't know. You would have to ask the Treasurer. I don't even know what the health policy is—'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —or how much it costs. I don't know whether the money is new. I just work here.' That was the approach of those opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: But do you know who was central to this approach? You know who was central to this? The member for Schubert. Front row seat to the strategy and to the policy of those opposite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Frome!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —for the entire four years. It's extraordinary. Instead of providing the resources—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —that our health system needs, they sent in the corporate liquidators. Instead of listening to our ambos, they took them to court. Instead of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Frome!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —hiring more health workers, they sacked them. It's just extraordinary. Instead of sending in extra doctors—

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —we got ourselves a spin doctor.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond! Member for Morialta!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Just extraordinary. And the member for Schubert in particular has a history for this. Remember the bogus promise that she rolled out—

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

The SPEAKER: Order! There's a point of order from the member from Morialta, which I am bound to hear under 134.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: And no, I don't need guidance before the member has put his point.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Standing order 127, personal reflections.

The SPEAKER: That may be.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Florey!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: And that, member for Chaffey, is rather the point. She isn't here to raise the point of order and therefore I give it due consideration. However, given the nature of a very willing debate, I will listen carefully. The Treasurer.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Because it was the member for Schubert who made the bogus commitment to the community in the Barossa that the Liberals were funding a new hospital and it was complete rubbish—complete rubbish. Once we had sifted through the spin—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is warned.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —and the dross and the rubbish that the Liberals had put out, what turned out was that they committed to buy a block of land. That's the sort of spin we get from the member for Schubert. Yesterday, we had the episode of—

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —selective quotes from the member for Schubert—the selective quotes. Don't worry about the rest of the sentence.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: What about my little clause that I'm building my question in question time around? That's how those people opposite operate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: They're not interested in facts, they're not interested in change, they're not interested in resourcing our health system, they're interested in petty political arguments—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —because they have got nothing else.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: They are not fit to govern and that's why the decision was made at the last election. We have tried the alternative—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —we have tried the cuts, the corporate liquidators, the sacked doctors, the sacked nurses—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —the increased savings, we've tried that, we've tried demonising our ambos, running them through the court system—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —refusing to give them a pay rise for five years, we've tried all of that—and South Australians are suffering. That's why we are here, that's why we have a plan, that's why it's funded and that's why we're delivering it.

The SPEAKER: Members may well ask: what are the terms of standing order 142?

No noise or interruption allowed in debate. While a Member is speaking, no other Member may make a noise or disturbance or converse aloud or speak so as to interrupt the Member speaking except on a point of order.

And it's for that reason that 137A has been widely used today. Is there a member seeking the call or are we going to put the question? Time has expired.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes	12
Noes	26
Majority	14

AYES

Batty, J.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.	Gardner, J.A.W. (teller)
Hurn, A.M.	McBride, P.N.	Patterson, S.J.R.
Pederick, A.S.	Pratt, P.K.	Speirs, D.J.
Teague, J.B.	Telfer, S.J.	Whetstone, T.J.

NOES

Bell, T.S.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brock, G.G.	Brown, M.E.
Champion, N.D.	Clancy, N.P.	Cook, N.F.
Ellis, F.J.	Hood, L.P.	Hughes, E.J.
Hutchesson, C.L.	Koutsantonis, A.	Malinauskas, P.B. (teller)
Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K.
Pearce, R.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Savvas, O.M.	Stinson, J.M.	Szakacs, J.K.
Thompson, E.L.	Wortley, D.J.	

PAIRS

Marshall, S.S.	Fulbrook, J.P.	Pisoni, D.G.
Close, S.E.	Tarzia, V.A.	Andrews, S.E.
Basham, D.K.B.	Hildyard, K.A.	

Motion thus negatived.

Grievance Debate

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:09): Twelve months ago, the Labor Party was elected to government. They had a series of election promises, but none were more important than their promise to fix the ramping crisis. None were more important than their first priority: to fix ramping in South Australia.

They have argued earlier today. They have received a vote of support from their members, but the people of South Australia know what they voted for. Swinging voters in South Australia who trusted the Labor Party to deliver for their interests know what they voted for. People in Morialta who chose not to support me but instead to support the Labor Party know that they were promised that Labor would fix ramping. Despite all of Labor's attempts and endeavours to convince everybody this week that they never ever said it, they have not fooled anyone outside of their own supporters in this chamber.

I need look no further than our worthy journal of daily record in South Australia, *The Advertiser*, which this week has summarised it in its editorial extremely well:

Labor has not fixed the ramping crisis. There is no magic wand for this complicated and difficult task.

But that does not excuse any attempt to weasel out of this simple election commitment by twisting history.

Labor won the election because of a dishonest campaign, aided and abetted by the compliant ambulance union. Having secured huge funding promises, the ambo union has gone to ground. They will not attack their Labor mates over ramping.

Then, again, as the leader said in part earlier:

...the problem for the government is that, in light of its preposterous denials this week that it ever set a ramping target when the issue was the centrepiece of its election campaign, this too looks like trickery.

Frankly, it's going to be hard to believe anything Labor says about ramping from now on.

Why only now, a year after the election, is it taking issue with what it happily led the public and the media to believe was its policy—bringing ramping back to 2018 levels? There must be many swinging voters around the state feeling like they have been hoodwinked.

Labor will be banking on the fact that it has three years until the next poll to repeat its position enough times that at least some voters will start believing it.

But who will buy whatever big promise it makes in the 2026 campaign?

That is really the key thing, isn't it? Who will buy any promise, let alone a significant promise, made by Peter Malinauskas or any of his ministers ahead of the 2026 election campaign?

The leader of the house told us only a few years ago that once credibility is lost in politics, it never comes back. I will repeat again what he said: the only thing that matters in politics is credibility. This government has ceded any credibility.

The members for Elder, Newland, King, Adelaide, Mawson and Stuart, and all of the Labor backbenchers and marginal seat holders, have ceded their credibility by voting today to support the Minister for Health in this confidence motion by effectively reinforcing the line that their Premier and their minister have been running all week that has been described by *The Advertiser* and by just about every other journalist in South Australia as preposterous: this idea that the government did not promise to fix ramping.

We see it right across the board in their election commitments. They promised that there would be a hydrogen power plant built for half a billion dollars in Whyalla. I do not think anyone believes the costings. I do not think anyone believes that any of that part of the commitment will be delivered. They promised that families with three-year-old children would get preschool, universal access to preschool in 2026. Free preschool is the expectation, 15 hours of a preschool service, and nobody in education thinks that is remotely likely to be delivered in the way it was promised.

They promised university commissions that have been put on hold while they try to convince the universities to agree to it amongst themselves. They promised that there would be apprenticeships delivered by training colleges. Even the paid advertising that South Australian taxpayers paid for said that there would be apprentices coming out of these new training colleges, but we know from the Minister for Education, Training and Skills that their big spend on training colleges, on technical colleges, will deliver pre-apprenticeship courses and no apprentices. They promised that they would give principals the right to hire and fire in our schools, and there is nothing to be seen of their promise.

Forty-eight per cent is the mark that the Deputy Premier gave her own government on Monday when asked how many of their election promises they were delivering. Forty-eight per cent

was the report card that the Deputy Premier gave this government. My goodness, that was generous. This is a government that has failed the people of South Australia. They are not delivering on their central commitment, and they are not delivering on many of their other commitments either. They have lost all credibility, and nobody in South Australia can trust this Labor government ever again.

UKRAINE INVASION

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (15:14): Before I get into what I had planned on speaking about today, I want to thank the Minister for Health and Wellbeing for his tireless work for the people of South Australia. He has already done so much, and if those opposite had won all we would have are the plans drawn up for a \$662 million basketball stadium, if that—not extra beds, not extra ambos, not extra nurses, not extra doctors, just plans for a stadium. I am proud to have the member for Kaurua as our Minister for Health and Wellbeing who is actually delivering more beds, more ambos, more nurses and more doctors.

I found the display today from those opposite absolutely appalling, particularly given the former member for Elder and her volunteers repeatedly said at pre-poll that our health system was fine, so given they did not think it was a problem, they certainly did not have a plan, just like they do not have a plan now. At one stage, a Liberal Party volunteer at pre-poll said to an ambulance officer, who was choosing to hand out on his day off, that the problem could not be that bad if he was there—on his day off. I would have thought that had demonstrated the complete opposite.

I now take the opportunity to reflect on the ongoing trauma, death and disposition caused by armed conflicts across the globe. With the recent recognition of the one-year anniversary of the Russian invasion of Ukraine, my mind is drawn to the struggle of the Ukrainian people, particularly the 400 Ukrainians who now call South Australia home as a direct result of the invasion.

Russia's invasion has resulted in widespread destruction, displacement and loss of life. Putin's unjustifiable actions have drawn the condemnation of the global community. The people of Ukraine are not alone in their struggle for sovereignty and peace. Like all armed conflicts across the globe, this invasion is a reality that affects not only those directly involved in the conflict but also their families and communities.

The horrors of war leave deep scars that can last a lifetime. War is about power and greed. It is about the interests of capital needlessly sacrificing, displacing and dispossessing ordinary working people. War is a gross misuse of the power possessed by those with a monopoly on violence, creating long-lasting trauma that will affect generations to come. War is about the failure of diplomacy, compassion and understanding, showing us the darkest side of humanity.

We all know the trauma of war is not limited to physical injuries. The mental health impact on defence personnel, nurses and everyone else involved in conflict simply cannot be overstated. Post-traumatic stress disorder affects those who have witnessed and experienced the brutality of war. The flashbacks, nightmares and anxiety that come with PTSD can be debilitating and lead to other mental health challenges.

Trauma impacts not only those who are directly involved in the conflict but their families and communities too. Families of those who have lost loved ones or seen them return injured must deal with the emotional trauma of loss and suffering. Communities that have experienced war have to deal with the aftermath, including rebuilding homes and infrastructure, and dealing with the psychological scars left behind, and that pain of those directly affected can be felt by the generations that follow.

I have been told of unimaginable war crimes by Russian soldiers, crimes so disturbing they will echo through generations of human rights violations. The invasion has forced thousands of families to flee their homes, often with nothing but the clothes on their backs. For children, the experience of war and displacement can be particularly traumatic. Many have witnessed violence and destruction firsthand, lost loved ones and been separated from friends and family. The situation for many children remains uncertain and challenging. The trauma of their experiences can have long-lasting effects on their mental health and wellbeing.

These grave concerns are why we must stand with Ukraine. Some may ask why South Australia would pick sides for a conflict raging on the other side of the world. The answer is simply

that neutrality, to sit on the fence, only serves to aid the oppressor. In the same way bystanders can stand up to stop the schoolyard bully, internationally we all play a role to stand up to oppressive regimes. It would be remiss of this place to be a bystander to the injustice we see—and we will not be. Our government has offered support to our new Ukrainians and continue to do so:

- support through waiving school fees and connecting adults with job providers;
- support through funding to the Association of Ukrainians in South Australia Inc. to employ a coordinator to support the community;
- \$1.8 million worth of medical supplies;
- access to public housing;
- financial counselling; and
- emergency financial assistance.

I was so proud to stand with my parliamentary colleagues in the South Australian Ukrainian community on the anniversary of this invasion. I was proud to stand in solidarity with the Ukrainian people. Slava Ukraini.

ADELAIDE PARKLANDS

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (15:19): I rise today to speak about what I see as one of the greatest assets of our city, which is our Adelaide Parklands. The Adelaide Parklands is something that has set our city apart, supporting biodiversity, supporting heritage and supporting recreation right in the heart of our city. They have been described by some as the lungs of our city and by others, indeed by those opposite, as 'green gold'. That green gold is very unique.

In 1837, the Adelaide Parklands became the world's first public planned park and today, nearly a couple of hundred years later, Adelaide remains the only city in the world that is built inside a park. It is a very big park indeed. Our 700 hectares of Parklands is about twice as big as Central Park in New York and about four times larger than Centennial Park in Sydney.

But over my lifetime, in particular, we have seen the size of our Parklands shrink. Too often, I think, our Parklands seem to be under threat from developers or, perhaps more concerningly, governments that are keen to use our Adelaide Parklands as a source of free land. That is one of the reasons the Liberals have strongly supported both the state heritage listing and the world heritage bid for our Adelaide Parklands, and I commend the work of the Leader of the Opposition as the former environment minister in this space.

Right now, one year into the Malinauskas Labor government, our Adelaide Parklands are under threat as they never have been before, which is very surprising when you look at what Labor said about the Parklands prior to the election, and indeed what they said then versus what they are doing now very much seems to be the theme of the week. What they said then on the Parklands—and I will read from their policy document—was that Labor will 'protect Adelaide's unique Parklands'.

Labor has broken their Parklands promise with alarming speed and with alarming severity, including by not supporting the state heritage listing of the Parklands and now seemingly setting their sights on Park 21 West for the development of office blocks and stables in that park. This latest Parklands grab is impacting what Bush For Life calls the most significant native remnant vegetation remaining in the Adelaide Parklands.

Ms Hood interjecting:

Mr BATTY: The member for Adelaide interjects, and I would encourage her to go out and visit her constituents at Park 21 West, just as I did the other day, because they are very, very concerned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BATTY: They are very concerned with what is coming—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale!

Mr BATTY: —because far from being an empty, dry, barren patch of dirt, as some have implied, Park 21 West is actually one of the very few areas of the Parklands where we have actively sought to revegetate. It is home to 85 species of native plants and animals, including threatened species.

I do not know whether the member for Adelaide knows this, and I do not know whether the Malinauskas Labor government knows this, but what I do know is they have not tried to find out, because there has been no consultation on this latest Parklands grab at all. There has been no consultation with Bush For Life, whose volunteers have cared for this site lovingly for over 15 years now. There has been no consultation with the traditional owners of the land, and I note that this was one of the originally identified sites for the first Kaurna burn in an Australian capital city. This is what Bush For Life tells me.

Of course, there has been no consultation that we can see with Adelaide City Council either. I note that Adelaide City Council has their own detailed concept plan for that park, which was widely consulted on. What we do see is just another land grab in our Adelaide Parklands, just another broken promise from the Malinauskas Labor government, a government that simply does not care about our Parklands.

HOMELESSNESS

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (15:24): I rise to speak about homelessness, an issue significantly impacting my local community of Adelaide, and one that my government, our tirelessly working Minister for Human Services and I are incredibly passionate about addressing. Today, we received some really sobering statistics. ABS data show that on Census night in 2021, the number of South Australians experiencing homelessness was 7,428—a 19 per cent increase on the 6,224 people identified by the 2016 Census.

The national data, covering a period when the federal Liberal National government was in power, showed how the Coalition utterly failed to support social and affordable housing or homelessness services from 2013 to 2022 as the crisis worsened. In South Australia, the former Marshall Liberal government was no better, slashing funding, slashing staff, and I am talking 20 per cent over four years, which equates to around 200 people—200 skilled and experienced staff in the department dealing with incredibly complex cases.

As well as homes from public housing, they also made cuts to some of our most important homelessness services: Vinnies, Catherine House and Hutt St Centre, and in the lead-up to winter as well. While the data released today is now almost two years old, the then Labor opposition knew there was a problem and we got to work developing election policies during 2021, including an extra \$177.5 million for public housing and an extra \$6 million for Hutt St Centre, Vinnies and Catherine House, which had had their funding cruelly cut under the former Liberal government.

Our boost to public housing will mean we will have 1,144 more public housing properties in 2026, compared with the Liberals' plans, and we are also stopping the sale of 580 public housing properties. We will also see an upgrade of 350 vacant properties so they can be homes again for people in need. We have introduced rent reforms, which include changes to private rental bond arrangements and banning rent bidding so it is easier and more affordable to rent a home.

It is important to remember that behind this Census data are real people: grandparents, mothers, fathers, daughters and sons, which is why I wanted to tell the story of Michael today. Michael went from homelessness to homefulness because of the incredible work of the Hutt St Centre and its Aspire program, which provides intensive case management to help clients stabilise and connect with their community.

With a low client-caseworker ratio, Aspire provides support in finding and maintaining accommodation and with many other life issues over a period of time for those experiencing chronic homelessness. Please note that Michael's name has been changed for privacy. This is Michael's story. Ten years ago, Michael had a successful career as a manager in the mining sector. He shared

a home with his partner and had nearly paid off their mortgage. The future seemed bright until his company downsized and Michael was made redundant.

He sought similar work in the sector, firstly interstate and then overseas. The stress of being away from home began to erode his relationship and, soon after, Michael's partner asked him to leave. Following a long and costly legal battle, Michael lost the home and most of his assets. He stated:

Losing everything really destroyed my self-worth. I had always been a very driven person but, when you keep getting knocked down, even the little things seem impossible.

He returned to his home state of SA to be closer to his family, but his father was battling health issues after a series of strokes and Michael's brother had a young family to look after, so he did not want to impose on them. He stayed in friends' spare rooms, garages, on their couches, until he ran out of friends to call on.

When Michael first connected with his Aspire case manager, Jake, three years ago, he had been sleeping rough for five years and had all but given up on himself. Through persistence and over many months, Jake convinced Michael that support was available and a better future was possible. This is a quote from Michael:

I was staying under a jetty and didn't even have a phone, let alone a place to charge it, so I'd often be hard to reach—but Jake never gave up. Having someone who believes in you is so important. It's hard not to give up when you are rough sleeping, and lots of people do give up without that support.

I've got a roof over my head again. I can lock my front door—be safe and secure. I can get away from the cold and rain. I can relax again. I finally have the space to get back on my own two feet.

Jake and the team have helped me through the toughest years of my life. Even when I was ready to give up on myself, they never did. Their support helped me believe in myself again. It makes me very emotional, but now I really feel like things will be okay.

AMY GILLETT BIKEWAY

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:29): Today I rise to talk about a really important local issue in my electorate of Schubert, and it is one that you would be familiar with as well, Mr Speaker. As many of you would be aware, Amy Gillett was a member of the Australian women's cycling team before dying in a tragic car accident whilst training with the team in Germany in 2005. She was a rower and an academic who was also completing her PhD at the University of South Australia.

After her death, there was a bike path that was built in her honour as part of a nationwide program initiated by family and by her loved ones to really encourage people from right across the nation to enjoy cycling, to get out into the great outdoors and enjoy cycling.

For those of you who are not aware, it runs 17 kilometres through the beautiful Adelaide Hills. It runs north to south from Oakbank to Mount Torrens. It is a sealed bitumen track. Just over the weekend in my electorate of Schubert, in Mount Torrens, there was a community celebration to really celebrate all of the businesses that have benefited from the Amy Gillett Bikeway. It was a fantastic opportunity to get so many local community groups out and raising money for their tennis clubs and for a whole range of other things that they are so focused on.

But there is one glitch, and that is that the bike path is actually not complete. It stops at a dead end in Mount Torrens at Oval Road, and there are at least two other stages that we need to push on and deliver for the people of the northern Adelaide Hills, and indeed right into the Barossa. There are two more stages. One of them is to get from Mount Torrens down Onkaparinga Valley Road and into Birdwood, and the next stage is to Mount Pleasant.

There is \$2.6 million worth of funding on the table from the commonwealth to be able to deliver the next stage from Mount Torrens to Birdwood, but unfortunately that \$2.6 million is not quite enough to get it complete. As we are leading into the budget period here in South Australia, I really am urging the state Labor government to step up and to work with the Adelaide Hills Council and the commonwealth to see the next stage of this completed because I know how important this is for my local area.

It is not just good for locals though. I speak to so many people, so many of my mates from across South Australia, who love getting to the northern Adelaide Hills and the Adelaide Hills and ride through from Oakbank on the idyllic pathway. It is not just for bikes either. There are families who go for strolls along there. You can take your dog for a walk, all of those fantastic things. Unfortunately, there is a risk that the next stage will not be completed if the government does not step up and provide some level of funding, so I have written to the minister to be able to join that conversation with the Adelaide Hills Council and with the commonwealth.

People in my electorate were so delighted that the next stage of the Amy Gillett bike path was actually part of the former Liberal government's cycling strategy in South Australia, and we just need to give it that final push to get it over the line because I know how important this is. I doorknocked people throughout the election campaign and since. I have held street-corner meetings, speaking with people about their priorities, and I will be heading along to a Birdwood community forum on Friday, where I am really looking forward to speaking with people about this important project. With the budget coming up, I am urging the government to get on board and provide some funding.

Whilst I have a couple of moments left, I would also like to pay tribute to the Barossa Vintage Festival, which is coming up in April. It runs every two years, and this year it is actually its 75th anniversary. It is a remarkable celebration of food, culture and businesses and really looking back on our traditions, and there are so many in the Barossa, particularly, might I add, our rote grutze, which is a fantastic old German recipe.

I am encouraging everyone to get to the Barossa to support our local businesses who put in so much work to be able to ensure that this vintage festival can go ahead. I would like to thank the volunteers, who I know are working overtime as we are heading into the vintage festival, making sure that they are getting the parades ready, the floats and the scarecrows, so thank you to all of the volunteers. I am looking forward to getting out there and enjoying what is on offer.

PHISHING

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (15:34): It is a beautiful day outside today, a perfect day to go fishing actually, but that is fishing with an 'f' and not a 'ph'. I am angry, I am disappointed and outright disgusted that we have human beings who get up on a beautiful morning, as it was today, get ready to go to work and know their job is to exploit the vulnerabilities of members of our community and steal their hard-earned money, often limited.

What am I referring to? Scammers. A few weeks back my father received an email from what he thought was Norton security. The gist of the email was that he was about to be charged \$499.99 to renew his Norton security service. My father, as some here know, is not a well man, and even though he would ordinarily see straight through an email like this, he was caught off guard.

Worried that this company was going to take \$500 out of his account, he did not see the warning signs. The email said, 'If you don't want this deduction to occur in the next few days then call this number.' My mum was not there at the time, and he called the number. The operator on the other end told him to enter a particular website into his browser that would bring up a cancellation form.

During the conversation, my mum got home. She was suspicious but the operator was very convincing: 'Fill in this form and it will cancel the debit.' Meanwhile, he had gained access to their computer. Sadly, through the conversation he gained access to their internet banking and was away. Surprisingly, he kept calling them back. 'Don't worry, everything is okay, just don't check your internet banking,' he said. My mum smelled a rat and called the bank almost immediately but the damage was done—not to their account, as the bank managed to freeze the transfers, but to their confidence.

Having always managed the finances, my mum was now scared to even go near internet banking. Our family gathered around and assisted to sort out what had happened, and I thank the ANZ for its assistance with this, but it goes to a much broader issue. Almost every day I receive a phishing email. In fact, to me every email is a scam unless proven otherwise. In the last few days, I have received the following emails. One was from 'Auto notice' from myGov advising me that I had a secure email message from myGov and that I should 'click here' to read it. It was from the ATO

account team. I know I should log into my myGov app to check that I indeed have a message, but not everyone is as suspicious as me.

The second one was from MetaMask. I do not even know who MetaMask is, but the subject was 'Know Your Customer regulation'. It said that their system had flagged my MetaMask account. Who knows what that is? It was non-verified and said that due to the recent KYC regulations they would be unable to continue providing services from 1 May and I should start my KYC verification by 'clicking this link'.

If you do not know what KYC (Know Your Customer) is, it basically gives 100 points of ID to the person who is asking for it. This is one of their tactics to create a sense of urgency. In the case of my dad, they said a deduction could happen in the next few days, so he panicked. I reached out to my community to hear their horror stories. One had received a text saying, 'Morning, hope you're having a good start to your day, mum. I got a new number after getting a new phone. WhatsApp message me on 04-blah-blah so that I can save your contact.' This plays on the hearts and concerns of parents.

There was one that said, 'Having trouble with your shipping address, click here.' There was one from PayPal stating that there was some activity on the account and to 'click here to log into PayPal', of course capturing your log-in details when you did. Another parent got a text saying that their child had been involved in an accident and was stranded and to send money with Visa details as their phone was broken in the accident.

Again, to some of us these all set off the warning bells but to others it catches them. I ask everyone to always assume that it is a scam, to always Google the address of the company asking you to update your details rather than clicking on any links. Check that the email is from the company in question, or call to confirm. Google phone numbers; often they have already been reported. Know your kids and the way they usually communicate with you, and have a password for things like changing numbers.

Further, check on your parents and grandparents. Conduct a cyber safety check with them. As they get older, they are not as savvy and they can be caught off guard. Do not, like me, think that they are okay. If they are, then that is great, but if they are not, then you may just save them thousands of dollars. Also, talk to your kids who are just starting out with internet banking and emails. If we all check on each other then we can cut these vile humans off at the pass. To those who seek to do this kind of work, or crime, I hope that you can live with yourselves at the end of the day.

Just quickly, on a brighter note—I have a few seconds—I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Banana Boogie Bakery on making the best and second-best hot cross buns in the country and the best vanilla slice in the state. If you have the time, I encourage you to head up to Belair and see for yourselves. Not only are they the best baked goods, but they have the best staff. Vanilla slice, best one in the state according to *The Advertiser*, and we know that they know everything.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2023

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (15:40): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act for the appropriation of money from the Consolidated Account for the financial year ending 30 June 2024. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (15:40): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

A Supply Bill is necessary until the budget has passed through the parliamentary stages and the Appropriation Bill 2023 receives assent.

In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the Supply Acts, there would be no parliamentary authority for expenditure between the commencement of the new financial year and the date on which assent is given to the Appropriation Bill.

The amount being sought under this bill is \$6,553 million.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Interpretation

This clause provides a definition of agency. An agency is a minister, an administrative unit, or part of an administrative unit, of the Public Service of the state or any other instrumentality or agency of the Crown.

3—Appropriation

This clause provides for the appropriation of up to \$6,553 million from the Consolidated Account for the Public Service of the state for the financial year ending on 30 June 2024.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Hurn.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CIVIL ENFORCEMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:42): In continuing my remarks, I would like to inform the house that in relation to the Statutes Amendment (Civil Enforcement) Bill there are two changes that have been made since a similar bill came before this house before the last election.

First, in removing the requirement to obtain the judgement debtor's consent to a garnishee order over wages, which is consistent with the approach in other jurisdictions, the bill now legislates a minimum amount of weekly wages that must be preserved for the judgement debtor and that is 90 per cent of the national minimum weekly wage, as fixed from time to time.

Secondly, the other change that is significant in this bill is making it clear that garnishee orders may be made against funds held in a term deposit account. The bill also provides that payment cannot be required before the term deposit has matured. That is so that the judgement creditors, and debtors for that matter, avoid incurring fees or charges.

There are other amendments contained in this bill that remain the same as the previous bill that those opposite brought before us before the last election. They include an amendment to the Enforcement of Judgments Act to enable a judgement creditor to serve an investigation notice on a judgement debtor, ideally avoiding the need for court summonsed investigation proceedings. There is also an amendment to the Enforcement of Judgments Act to empower the Sheriff, by written notice, to require a judgement debtor or third party to provide information or documents disclosing the interests of third parties in real or personal property, which could be subject to a warrant for seizure or sale.

The next two amendments I will cover are very important. One is an amendment to that same act to clarify and broaden the Sheriff's powers to eject and proactively direct people not to enter land where the Sheriff is exercising a warrant for the sale of the land in order to enforce a judgement. Also, there is an amendment to the Sheriff's Act to allow for the Sheriff to enter into agreements with the Commissioner of Police, to enable and empower police officers to assist the Sheriff in the performance and exercise of the Sheriff's duties under the act.

Those two measures that I just mentioned are very important. It is sad that we even need those measures, but unfortunately I have learned of some matters as the local member dealing with constituents who found themselves in difficult circumstances. It is very sad when it comes to the stage where these orders have to be enforced, and sometimes that is a very traumatic and

challenging time for a person who is a debtor to have such orders enforced against them, but we need to make sure that we empower and protect our public officers in the pursuit of their duties. They are carrying out these difficult tasks dealing with debtors who may be, for example, ejected from property on behalf of the state and on behalf of all of us.

It is really important that we have enough powers for the Sheriff's Officers themselves, but also for the police to become involved if the Sheriff's Officers see a need in order to protect themselves or others. I did speak on the last occasion in parliament about the important work that our Sheriff's Officers do, and I acknowledge that we have recently passed some legislation to protect them in our courts. With those remarks, I conclude my contribution in relation to this bill. Of course, it goes without saying that I support the bill.

Mrs PEARCE (King) (15:46): I rise to speak in support of the Statutes Amendment (Civil Enforcement) Bill 2022. This bill was introduced by the Attorney-General in the other place, which passed earlier this year. I understand it is largely the same bill as was introduced by the former Liberal government. It makes a number of changes to civil enforcement processes in the South Australian judicial system following a review undertaken by the Courts Administration Authority back in 2017.

In short, the bill addresses situations where a court has made an order for monetary payment by one party (the judgement debtor) to another party (the judgement creditor). Often, this sort of situation arises in the case of a breach of contract and other similar civil proceedings. Part 2 of the bill allows judgement creditors to serve investigation notices on judgement debtors. This notice would allow the court to investigate the debtor's means to repay the debt in question.

It is important to note that this new investigation notice provision does not replace the existing provisions of the Enforcement of Judgments Act, which allows for an investigation summons, but rather creates a supplementary, optional, less formal process that will reduce the legal costs and fees that might otherwise be incurred.

In the review undertaken by the Courts Administration Authority, it was noted that the current system is unnecessarily adversarial and an inefficient use of the courts' time. This amendment therefore helps to promote a more efficient justice system and reduces the overall cost of litigation. This bill also increases the range of circumstances in which the court can make garnishee orders, which are orders for a debtor's wages to be withheld for the purpose of repaying a court-ordered debt.

Currently, these garnishee orders can only be made with the debtor's consent, which the Courts Administration Authority review found to be out of step with modern practice in other jurisdictions. The bill therefore expands the power of the courts to make garnishee orders. This brings me to the particular point I want to make in relation to this bill, that is, the difference between the 2022 bill and the previous iteration introduced by the former Liberal government.

This bill reflects the Labor way of doing things. We are making our justice system more modern and more efficient, whilst also protecting the rights of low-income earners and those facing financial difficulties. Unlike the Liberals' proposal, this bill includes an additional safeguard: that debtors, who are the subject of garnishee orders, must be left with an amount that is at least 90 per cent of the national minimum weekly wage as determined under the commonwealth Fair Work Act.

In addition, the bill includes a new further protection where a garnishee order is being made against funds held in the term deposit. In that case, the order does not need to be paid until after the term deposit has matured. This small change will help ensure judgement debtors are not being faced with significant fees or charges for breaking a term deposit on top of the amount they already owe to pay the judgement debt.

The position being put forward in this bill is quite simple: people who have breached a contract, or otherwise are found by a court to owe a debt, should repay that debt. But the laws we pass in this place should not send people, especially low-income earners and working people, into further hardship and poverty.

It is simple amendments to bills such as this which show the contrast between Liberal and Labor governments. Wherever we can, Labor governments look for ways to improve fairness in the law, to protect working people and to try to ensure we are not forcing people into financial hardship unnecessarily.

I also note the work done by the Hon. Robert Simms in the other place, who put forward some further amendments to protect workers who might experience uneven earnings throughout the year—for example, seasonal workers, who experience high incomes at one point in the year but a lower income at other times, and who therefore may be disadvantaged if their income is simply averaged across the year. I am glad that the bill now incorporates amendments on this issue, which were put forward by the Attorney-General in consultation with the Hon. Robert Simms.

Bit by bit, we can improve our laws to make them fairer for working people. I support this bill, inclusive of the new changes made, which were not made in the 2021 iteration of this legislation. I look forward to continuing to work with the government to pass laws which not only promote a modern and efficient justice system but also treat people fairly.

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (15:51): I rise in support of the Statutes Amendment (Civil Enforcement) Bill. In 2017, the Courts Administration Authority conducted a review of the civil enforcement processes in South Australia, and the recommendations of the review will be implemented through these amendments to the Enforcement of Judgments Act 1991 and the Sheriff's Act 1978.

It is the case that the previous government introduced the Statutes Amendment (Civil Enforcement) Bill 2021 (lapsed bill) into parliament in May 2021. At the time, it passed the Legislative Council in an amended form; however, it did not progress beyond the second reading stage in this house prior to the 2022 election. As such, this bill is being introduced here today with two changes to the previously introduced version, and I am in support of it.

The bill contains two changes to the previous bill to ensure that the measures do not disproportionately disadvantage judgement debtors. Whilst these people have had a judgement made against them and will need to pay the judgement creditor, it should be the case that they are able to continue to live on a wage that will allow them to pay their bills and put food on the table. As such, this bill will legislate a minimum amount of weekly wages that must be preserved for the judgement debtor, being 90 per cent of the national minimum weekly wage.

We are facing real pressure on the cost of living currently, and in order to ensure that penalties do not affect low-income earners more than those who are in a better financial situation, this bill will protect a minimum wage to ensure costs can be met. It would not be right to push someone into poverty, possibly causing desperation, loss of accommodation and impact to families in order to be able to pay their fine.

It will also be the case that garnishee orders may be made against funds held in a term deposit account. However, payment will not be required until the term deposit comes to maturity. Financial institutions apply penalties and loss of interest when a term deposit is broken, and enforcing payment immediately, leading to the term being broken, would only benefit the banks.

These two changes, together with the following other amendments, which are unchanged from the previously introduced bill, seek to balance the interests of judgement creditors who have had their day in court and won, and judgement debtors who may find themselves in positions of financial hardship.

The previously introduced bills sought to progress the following amendments, which this bill also seeks to achieve and are as follows:

- amend the Enforcement of Judgments Act to enable a judgement creditor to serve an investigation notice on a judgement debtor, ideally avoiding the need for court summonsed investigation proceedings;
- amend the Enforcement of Judgments Act to empower the Sheriff, by written notice, to require a judgement debtor or third party to provide information or documents disclosing

the interests of third parties in real or personal property subject to a warrant for seizure or sale;

- amend the Enforcement of Judgments Act to clarify and broaden the Sheriff's powers to eject and proactively direct persons not to enter land where the Sheriff is exercising a warrant for the sale of the land to enforce a judgement; and
- amend the Sheriff's Act to allow for the Sheriff to enter into arrangements with the Commissioner of Police to enable and empower police officers to assist the Sheriff in the performance or exercise of the Sheriff's duties under the Enforcement of Judgements Act.

This amendment bill passed through the other place with the government introduced and supported amendments to the previous bill. With the support of the Greens, an amendment was made to ensure that the courts take into account circumstances where a judgement debtor's income may vary, such as casual or seasonal workers. This is reasonable as casual work is just that—casual. There is no security of wages or employment, and this needs to be considered when determining ability to pay.

Secondly, the Greens put forward the following amendment that was supported by the government, where a person who uses the information obtained through an investigation notice for an improper purpose will be deemed to have committed an offence. This will provide greater protections for litigants' personal and financial information.

This bill implements recommendations arising out of the review of the civil enforcement process in South Australia undertaken in 2017 by the Courts Administration Authority. It seeks to ensure that judgement debtors are not disproportionately disadvantaged and, with the above changes, I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (15:58): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES (PROTECTION OF PROSPECTIVE TENANTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 March 2023.)

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:59): I rise to indicate that the opposition supports the bill and indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition in so doing. In terms of where we are at in the debate, I just indicate that I have been handed a bundle of amendments—a rather small bundle—that I understand are to be moved by the minister in due course.

On the face of this document filed today, I just indicate that I have not more than seen those and read them. I understand that they may not be introducing any particular controversy to the debate and we will necessarily deal with them in the course of the committee when we get there. I do not flag that that creates any particular difficulty, but I do not propose to address those matters, of course, in what I expect will be my brief contribution just now in relation to the bill.

What we see here is that the subject of this residential tenancies bill is what I am anticipating is the starting point in terms of legislating in response to a variety of work that was undertaken through the second half of last calendar year, as I understand it, and in the context of a series of announcements by the government over the course of those recent months.

As has been explained by the minister and is apparent on the face of the bill, this bill is relatively minimal in its scope, including in the view of stakeholders, as I understand it. It takes an opportunity to deal with those matters that might be regarded as perhaps at the more straightforward end of reforms that might be undertaken to improve the circumstances of tenants and landlords in navigating what we all know are challenging circumstances at present in the rental market.

The first, and perhaps most substantive, of the proposed changes, to bring to an end a practice of rent bidding and the advertising of a range of rental amounts in the advertising, is one such relatively small, I hope, ameliorative step in terms of making it that bit more straightforward for someone who is considering applying for a rental to not have the situation in which they are having to contemplate uncertainty in terms of price.

South Australia, in going down this path, would be adopting what has most recently been adopted by the New South Wales Perrottet government and would follow on. I think we would become the fifth state to have a legislated ban on rent bidding. It is not, as I understand it, a widespread practice in South Australia, including for the reason that the Real Estate Institute of South Australia, at least that body and perhaps others, would recognise such a practice as a breach of its code of conduct. It is already conscious of that kind of practice, being a practice not accepted by it in this state. So here we would be bringing a statute into line with practice as is applied by the Real Estate Institute of South Australia and is already applied by the majority of jurisdictions in the rest of the country.

The corollary to that is transparency through advertising at a fixed price. Of course, when renters are expressing interest in a tenancy, they are, generally speaking, filling in a form of application for which they will get one shot. So it is not a circumstance that is generally amenable or suitable to an analogy of a live auction but rather one in which certainty is a benefit to all participating, and it is an unduly unfair one on a prospective tenant who would be needing to and having to present a whole range of information in terms of their suitability and capacity to be successful in obtaining a rental property.

To also ask that person to deal with uncertainty as to price is regarded, and reasonably, as something that can be avoided. The bill goes somewhat further in that regard insofar as it seeks also to prevent tenants from being characterised as having a top-level profile in connection with their willingness to bid higher or to offer a greater amount for a rental property in terms of those that provide profiles for tenants.

To that extent, it means that it will hopefully do away with a culture in which a response to a tight rental market means, on the one hand, offering in terms of a range and expecting that bidding would occur on a range, and that the characterisation or the relative recommendation level of a particular tenant by those who offer services in this regard will not be influenced by matters involving a tenant's willingness to pay a higher rent and to achieve a higher rating as a result. It will be a false pretext upon which to rate a tenant for those rating services and, rightly, there is a relatively substantial penalty associated with doing so.

Clause 5 of the bill goes on to deal with measures to improve the integrity of data management and use of tenant information. It introduces penalties for misuse and interference and loss and requires that tenancy data not be retained and, indeed, be destroyed three years after the end of the tenancy and that unsuccessful tenants' data be destroyed promptly within 30 days of a tenancy agreement on a property being executed, unless the prospective tenant consents to the data being held to support further applications.

It is another small step rightly acknowledged as being at the more straightforward end of the spectrum, in terms of what we understand has been feedback from the government's inquiry in the course of last year and into late last year, but it is steps, nonetheless, that we might hope will be supportive of an improvement generally, in terms of the certainty that can be offered to tenants who would go into the market for rentals, a more principled basis of assessment of the bona fides and categorisation of a tenant's capacities for rating purposes, and some fairly clear indications in relation to the use and misuse of data and obligations in terms of its retention and its destruction, which I hope will have the desired effect of increasing a tenant's confidence, in terms of the process of sharing their data, as necessarily is the case in participating in the rental market.

Those are the elements that I would highlight, in terms of the steps that the bill will provide for, and I highlight that the real work, the crunchy work in this area, is likely to be what is to come. I again flag my awareness, but not familiarity, with that small bundle of amendments that appears to have been filed today. We will look forward to hearing more about that at the committee stage. Otherwise, I again indicate the opposition's support for the bill as it is presented at this stage.

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (16:12): I rise in support of this bill. In May last year, I was contacted by a local constituent of mine called Ariba, who wanted to share her experience of rent bidding. Ariba and her partner, Toby, had moved to South Australia from interstate, but when they went to try to rent a home they found that the advertised rent was not often the real rent at all.

It led to Ariba and Toby missing out on about 20 properties, wasting their time and energy having to apply for rentals that required them to offer higher than advertised rent in order to even have a chance at securing the property. Ariba was sick and tired of rocking up to a rental inspection, only to find herself at a rental auction instead. To use Ariba's own words:

I've experienced firsthand the frustrations of trying to find a rental in South Australia after moving here with my husband from Victoria in 2021.

I was disappointed to learn that SA had yet to modernise their Residential Tenancies Act, unlike other states, such as Victoria. At the time we were looking for a place to rent, we were living at a hotel, and we were in the middle of another COVID-19 wave in Victoria and SA were contemplating closing the borders on us.

This added additional pressure to try to secure a rental, so that we would be able to relocate to SA before the borders were closed, as living in a hotel was becoming financially unsustainable.

I often missed out on securing a property because other tenants were offering more when they submitted their application. It creates an unfair advantage, and also wastes tenant's time, especially when they have to take time out of work hours to visit a place for an inspection.

After listening to Ariba's story, as her local MP I advocated on her behalf to the office of the Minister for Consumer Affairs, and I am extremely grateful that the minister and the Malinauskas government took action.

Last year the Malinauskas government began a process to begin reforming the Residential Tenancies Act 1995, to better meet the needs of today's rental housing market, improve protections for renters, and to ensure that landlords can continue to manage their properties effectively. The Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs first announced a review of the act with the release of a discussion paper, marking the start of the most comprehensive review of the Residential Tenancies Act since 2014.

In addition to the review, the Malinauskas government identified immediate priorities like those raised by my local constituent, Ariba, to assist renters with affordability, protect renters' rights and privacy, and improve the housing outcomes for people in SA. This brings me to some of the key areas of this amendment bill. This bill will ban rent bidding, prohibiting rental properties being advertised at a price range while also preventing landlords or agents from inviting higher rent offers. In addition, third parties, which often include websites facilitating tenant application forms, will also be prevented from engaging in rent bidding.

The bill's provisions relating to third parties are intended to address conduct involving prospective tenants being charged fees for background checks, and an assessment or rating of their suitability being provided to the landlord or agent. This actually comes from really concerning reports that in some instances prospective tenants are paying for their background check and offering higher rent in order to be afforded a high rating, which is just disgraceful.

The amendment bill prohibits rent bidding by the landlord or agent, prevents a person in trade or commerce from providing an assessment or rating of a prospective tenant that is based on a higher offer of rent, and disallows a person from receiving or requiring a prospective tenant to pay for an assessment or rating of their suitability for a tenancy. A maximum penalty of \$20,000 is proposed to apply with an expiation fee of \$1,200.

The amendment bill also prevents landlords from requesting prescribed information from potential tenants on rental application forms. For successful tenant applications, information provided for the purposes of applying to enter into a tenancy agreement will also need to be destroyed within

three years of the tenancy ending. The amendment bill proposes an expiation fee of \$1,200 and a maximum penalty of \$20,000 applies for these offences.

The amendment bill also provides for protecting tenant information. This is in light of recent cybersecurity incidents where individuals' personal information was accessed. The amendment bill contains measures to protect tenant information by prohibiting tenant information from being disclosed without their consent or as required by law, the tenancy agreement, a court or tribunal. Tenant information for a successful tenant is required to be destroyed after three years and within 30 days of a tenancy agreement being executed for unsuccessful tenants. Again, a maximum penalty of \$20,000 is proposed to apply, with an expiation fee of \$1,200.

The fourth immediate priority within these reforms relates to more affordable residential tenancy bonds which is being progressed through amendments to the Residential Tenancies Regulation 2010. Because of rent price increases, renters of even moderately priced housing are currently required to provide a six-week rental bond rather than four weeks, which is a significant challenge for those looking for affordable housing, particularly with the increase in the cost of living.

Currently, landlords can claim residential bonds equivalent to a maximum of six weeks' rent when the weekly rent is \$250 or greater, with only a four-week bond entitled to be claimed for properties falling below that threshold. I think we can all attest to the fact that it is very rare that you can find a rental for under \$250 a week. Increasingly, fewer properties are falling below this threshold, and the bond threshold will now be raised to \$800 to ensure that for the majority of rental properties in SA, only a four-week bond will be required.

This change will reduce the amount of up-front costs for tenants between \$500 and \$1,600, depending on the amount of rent that they are paying. For example, based on the median rental price for a house in the metro area, the current bond would be \$2,790 and with the changes we have made to the bond amount, from 1 April the bond amount will be \$1,860, a saving for tenants of \$930, which is really significant. The new bond amount will apply to any bond paid or payable under an agreement entered on or after 1 April this year. Any bond paid before this date will remain lodged with CBS until the conclusion of the tenancy agreement.

The consultation on the Residential Tenancies Act has concluded and Consumer and Business Services is currently preparing a report based on the 5,000 responses and 150 submissions the government received from the YourSAy consultation. I think this enormous response really does reflect how important these issues are for tenants and for landlords. As a renter myself, who has been trying to get my rusting bath replaced for more than a year, I commiserate with the challenges that renters in my community face.

The reforms in this bill are the government's immediate priorities, with further consideration and consultation on the broader review of the Residential Tenancies Act, which includes other issues raised in their review, which I know many in my community are passionate about, in particular issues such as renting with pets, longer tenancies and retaliatory evictions.

The Malinauskas government is serious about delivering on better outcomes for tenants and landlords, which is why we will be introducing further amendments to the Residential Tenancies Act later this year. As the Premier said, every South Australian deserves to have a roof over their head and to be safe and secure in a place they can call home.

The government recognises the extraordinary pressure the current housing market is placing on vulnerable South Australians particularly, and we are doing something about it. This bill is just one part of the Malinauskas government's plan for a better housing future, which provides responses to the challenges being experienced by so many South Australians.

Other policy announcements under our A Better Housing Future include increasing affordable housing, residential land supply, the tenancies reform I have just spoken about, private rental assistance programs, support for home buyers—in particular for regional housing, an area I am very passionate about—and tax concessions to promote new housing opportunities.

I commend the Malinauskas government for the biggest ever land release in South Australia, paving the way for at least 23,700 homes in major growth areas such as Concordia, Dry Creek, Sellicks Beach and Hackham.

As the Premier said last month, urban sprawl is not a dirty word and he rejected clogging up our suburban neighbourhoods with evermore infill. I cannot agree more with the Premier when he said he does not believe in urban infill at all costs. My community is so passionate about protecting the character of our local streets and neighbourhood that I know many will agree with the Premier in condemning that quote and that urban infill at all costs is just not good enough.

These land releases will be supported by effective roads, schools and other infrastructure and will take the pressure off inner metropolitan suburbs, while also providing young South Australians with a shot at the great Australian dream of home ownership. The accelerated land release to create more diverse and affordable housing will be underpinned by the formation of an infrastructure, planning and development unit, charged with coordinating electricity, water, sewerage, roads, schools and other infrastructure.

In addition to the residential tenancies reforms, in addition to these land releases, the Malinauskas government also announced more public housing, including building an extra 564 public homes and stopping the sale of another 580, which will provide 1,144 more public homes than under the plans of the former Liberal government.

I want to congratulate the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs on this significant body of work. I think the level of consultation and the number of submissions that we received as part of this review really does highlight the challenge, the mountain that has to be climbed by many people who rent in my community, including myself, and I congratulate her on that significant body of work.

I would also like to congratulate my local constituents Ariba and Toby. Many people do not think that contacting their local MP will result in change but in this case thank you to Ariba and Toby for speaking up, for sharing your story, and allowing me to advocate on your behalf and see this change now on the floor of the parliament. I really do hope that this bill leads to significant change for you and other renters in my community. I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (16:24): The member for Heysen has gone through the bill and expressed that the opposition is supporting the bill. I will just speak to some points on the bill. An important point for those who are following this is the removal of rent bidding. It should be noted of course that rent bidding is actually a breach of the existing code of conduct for REISA members. I think it is important that we understand that, as consumers, organisations such as the Real Estate Institute of South Australia (REISA), for example, do put standards on their members. They will not accept members who do not meet their standards. We see this with Master Builders and we see it with Master Plumbers.

As a matter of fact, I had a situation just this week involving a woman in her 70s whose hot-water service was not working. We still do not know whether it was not working because the flame was out or because it was old and it had had it. She fortuitously received a flyer in her letterbox from a company called Service Today, so she conveniently rang that company and they were there in a very short period of time.

They told her she needed the immediate replacement of her hot-water service, and the quote was for \$3,400. She said, 'That sounds a bit much. I think I might just see if I can get a better price somewhere else,' and immediately the guy said \$2,600. She felt very intimidated at that time but agreed to the \$2,600 and paid a deposit. The new hot-water service was put in place, but we do not know whether the old one needed to be replaced or not. She paid a deposit, which did not cover the quote, and then found out that she could have had that same system for around \$1,300 from numerous other members. I rang Master Plumbers who advised me that they were not members of Master Plumbers for various reasons because of their ethics, and so that is a matter that is now being dealt with.

That gives people an understanding that organisations such as REISA do require standards of service and standards of ethics from their members. If their members do not honour those ethics and those service expectations they will no longer be members. So it is terrific that REISA had this code of practice in place of not allowing rent bidding amongst their membership, and now it is becoming law.

Of course, there is transparency through properties being advertised at a fixed price rather than at a range. I know how frustrating it can be not knowing what the price is. I know that often, when a property is up for rent, particularly in the inner suburbs, up to 60 people can turn up for the open inspection. If you were going there hoping you could get it at the lower price range and once you got there you saw that there were 60 people, I think you would realise that it would be higher. This of course would stop any rent bidding. It does not actually stop somebody who wants to rent that property offering something higher, but it does not allow a decision as to whether that person is the successful applicant based on a higher bid to be the major factor.

I do know in practice, from what I have heard from the industry, that often people who do offer higher than the asking price need more due diligence on their ability to pay and their record as tenants. Real estate agents are already very wary. It is not always good news for a landlord when somebody offers more money, because it does raise red flags about the prospective tenant. Work is done to ensure that they have a record of being respectful as tenants and are able to continue paying the rent.

We do need to remember that about 120,000-odd properties in the rental market are in the private sector. The rental sector or the non-owner-occupier sector is predominantly a private sector business. The previous Labor government in their 16 years sold 20,000 public homes. That obviously put a lot more pressure on the availability of homes, and that has had an effect of course on our rent. I think we have about a 0.3 per cent vacancy rate in South Australia at the moment.

It is disappointing that, when the Labor government announced new land releases, there was no infrastructure announced with that, no funding announced for infrastructure to be put in place, so there are lots of questions about what that will do for housing affordability. There are no details about whether developers will be forced to pay for the infrastructure and then that will be passed on to the consumers or, if investors buy those properties to rent them out, whether they will be paying more for those properties and hence have to charge higher rents because there is additional infrastructure that the government is not prepared to pay for. None of those details were released.

The time line is years and years away. There is actually an urgent need for more housing. Of course, it is the supply that is the problem. The market is driven by supply and demand. If supply shrinks and demand grows, then the price goes up. What this bill does do is make things more transparent, and I think it does remove some of the stress for those who are looking for properties, because I know it is a very stressful time for people.

It is a lot different to what the Greens were offering. The Greens' Residential Tenancies (Rent Control) Amendment Bill really does show the red belly of the Greens here in South Australia, really across Australia. It does show the lack of understanding of the market. It also shows a complete lack of understanding of what the fix is for providing more affordable housing and more housing, and that is more supply.

There are some extraordinary restrictions placed on landlords under this proposed bill by the Greens: 'Landlord must not advertise, offer or accept rent greater than the indexed rent amount.' Can you imagine if that was in place now what that would have done to the rental market here in South Australia, where we saw about a 30 per cent increase in the last two years of the price of real estate in South Australia, if people could only reflect on the CPI in order to adjust that rent.

Imagine if you purchased a rental property from somebody who may have bought that property in the 1970s and had a tenant in that property for a very, very long time and the tenant was paying a rate that was much below market, because there was a relationship that had developed over that time and the landlord was in a position to do that. The landlord then decides to sell that building as maybe a fairly senior person and decides to do something with that money for their family or other purposes. Then the prospective property owner who wants to rent that out must then go to the tribunal to even charge a market rate under the Greens' proposed bill.

I was talking to Mario Lucci on Radio Italia about this proposed bill by the Greens and the phones lit up with people outraged that there would be people in this place who would even consider putting such constraints on those who invest in real estate and property, residential property in particular, here in South Australia, those who provide much of the rental housing here in South Australia.

There were some interesting statistics in the paper this morning that showed that the average ownership period of rental property is about five years, so it is not an easy place to be for landlords. However, a lot of that sounds to me like it is future planning. Younger people might be buying something to get into the marketplace but they are not ready to move into it yet, so they rent it out for a short time. People who have been living in the same property for 30 years and have brought their families up there might decide to buy something as they are preparing to downsize so as they can make that transition easier.

So we see the demographic, if you like, of those who buy residential property and rent it out, those who are technically called landlords, is a wide range of South Australians, and people have a wide range of purposes for being in that position. The last thing that we want is for any legislation to come out of this place that makes that harder and puts barriers in place. One of the things that I am proud of about Australia, and South Australia in particular, is that if you have a go you can get ahead. Obviously, the easier we can make it for people to have a go the better, but at the same time it is a real balancing act.

We know that there are people who are not in a position to buy a property and they will be renting, so the purpose of this bill is to make that task slightly easier. I am very pleased that there has been the consultation with the Landlords' Association of South Australia and REISA about the bill. I am confident that it will have a positive impact for tenants without imposing any burden on landlords.

There is always going to be rogue elements of any legislation or people who want to get around legislation. Will we be seeing rents advertised higher than market on the expectation that they can come down—in other words, a reverse option? It will be interesting to see if the minister is able to explain if the bill covers that, whether it does not allow reverse options. If you have a property you rent out, 12 months ago it was \$500, and this time it has gone up to \$650 in the hope you could get about \$580, as people put their offers in that are lower than the advertised price. This will be a test of the bill. Under this bill, the way I read it, I do not know there was any intention to stop that from happening, and you could argue that is probably not transparent.

Something else that might happen is that if somebody offers to put in a higher bid, they might put in a much higher bid than is actually needed to secure the property because they are not aware of any other competition that might be in place. In other words, they may very well think, 'There are 60 people who have come to see this place, the asking price is \$500, maybe I should put in a bid of \$600 just to make sure I am ahead,' when there might not be any other bid.

This is, I think, one of the unexpected outcomes that we may see from this bill. I think the facts are that you are in the marketplace and it is very difficult to try to manipulate the market. I know that the intent of the bill is to support tenants, and I hope it does do that, but I guess my experience as a consumer for all the years that I have been on this earth, being in business for 22 years prior to being in this place, means I do know that many people see changes like this as a challenge of how they can get around those changes, or those rules, legally and not break the law. We are a very enterprising community. They are a couple of things that popped out immediately to me on reading the details of the bill.

Just in finishing, there will be a very large residential land sale in Fullarton coming up. It is on the market now—Highgate House—and is being managed by the disability minister. The amenity of that area, the heritage gardens for example, is important. The minister was kind enough to give me a briefing about Highgate House yesterday and I asked her, 'Is there any way that we can preserve the heritage garden that is in there at Highgate?'

The trees that are there are not protected, because they are not native trees, but that does not mean they are not valuable. They are oaks and other European trees that have been in the ground for 150-plus years and beautiful manicured hedges. It is an area that has not always been a public area, but in recent years has been a public area. It is certainly perceived as being a public area and used.

Unley has amongst the smallest open space of all the electorates in South Australia. We have higher density living, we have less parkland and we have tree canopy loss every year with new

development, whether that be an extension of a heritage home or whether it be something being knocked over and up to six going up on the same block, and trees are knocked over in that process.

We are losing the equivalent of two Unley Ovals of tree canopy every year in South Australia. The Unley council has come up with a plan through the rating system that would actually monitor and reward people who have 15 per cent tree canopy or more after a development application. It is not for existing ratepayers, people who have not put in an application for development. Anyone who has put in an application for development will be required to have 15 per cent tree canopy at the end of that development in order not to get a 10 per cent penalty on their rates.

Some are arguing that it should be a one-off payment, but all you are doing with a one-off payment is you are in fact buying the right to knock every tree down in your development and not have to replace it, whereas Unley's plan of an annual review every year of the tree canopy that you have on your property carries more lateral thinking. It is not as draconian as what happens in some suburbs of Sydney and Melbourne, where you cannot even put a pool or an extension in if it is going to knock down a particular tree or reduce canopy size. It is a very good compromise that will see more tree canopy on private land, which is desperately needed in Unley.

Mrs PEARCE (King) (16:44): I know that many in my community want to see more affordable and secure housing and our government has listened to that request, not just from the feedback that arose from my community but also from feedback from people all across our state, both in our metropolitan communities and across our regions. We have listened to the difficulties that they have been encountering whilst trying to secure housing so that we can do our part to alleviate some of the stress where possible.

Whether it be the rising levels of inflation, which have increased the price of everything all the way down to the price of basic goods on our supermarket shelves, rising interest rates, which are pushing back the date for many who aspire to own their own home, or the challenge many renters are facing with the rising prices across the market that is only become increasingly harder to enter, we know that many are struggling when it comes to housing.

We acknowledge what a difficult situation this is for so many in our community, especially those who are worried about what they will have to do if they can no longer sustain their current rental. This is why, when we came to government, we set about reforming the Residential Tenancies Act so that it better meets the needs of today's rental housing market, so that it improves protections that are there to protect renters, whilst ensuring that landlords can continue to manage their properties effectively.

Our rental review has been performed in the context of all other Australian jurisdictions having already performed similar reviews. We want to ensure that renters here in South Australia are not left behind without similar regulatory safeguards in place to protect them. With the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs announcing the review of the act last year, this would be the first time in nearly 10 years that the act had undergone such a comprehensive review. I thank the minister for all of her hard work that she has put into this space.

We know that the rental market today does not resemble the rental market back in 2014, and this is why it was so important that we prioritised this review. To assist renters now, we have identified immediate priorities to be introduced to assist renters with affordability, protecting tenants' rights and privacy, and improving housing outcomes for people here and now in South Australia.

This is all part of our recently announced housing package under our A Better Housing Future plan, a \$965 million plan that will better protect renters, increase availability of affordable rentals, boost the number of social and affordable housing options, provide greater support for people trying to buy a home, provide new housing in our regions, and support our regional communities to build housing projects suited to their needs.

This is an immediate response to the challenges which are being experienced right here and now by renters in South Australia, because every South Australian deserves to have a roof over their head and to be safe and secure in a place that they can call home. With our economy performing so well, we have noted a growth in our state's population and we are seeing more people moving here

to South Australia. From this growth, we have seen a strong demand for housing across all sectors, both within metropolitan Adelaide and now in our regional towns.

As our vacancy rates are at historically low levels, a supply shortage of rental properties on the market has caused a spike in rents. For many in our community, that has meant substantial increases in costs, leaving many prospective tenants and current renters struggling to find a rental property that is appropriate for them in our very competitive market.

Some people have sought to take advantage of this, such as in the case of rent bidding and requesting information from a tenant which may otherwise exceed what a tenant should reasonably be expected to give. This bill will address the issues of rent bidding and will take the first step towards standardising rental application forms by considering the type of information on that form to protect a tenant's information.

I understand that new section 47B of this amendment bill provides for information to be prescribed in the regulations that must not be requested of a prospective tenant. Further consultation will take place on this and may include information such as bond history, credit or bank account statements containing daily transactions and any attribute about the applicant that relates to a protected attribute under equal opportunity legislation.

Following consultation on the draft bill, a technical amendment was added to ensure the intent of exemption under s47B(2) is intended to apply only to a landlord or agent who is also a housing assistance provider. This is done to avoid a situation where the prohibition may have interfered with the housing assistance provider's ability to request information that is required to determine if an applicant is eligible.

In recent times, it has become even more apparent why it is so important to be protecting our personal information. We have all seen how vulnerable our information can be to those with a malicious intent, even when it is securely stored away online, which has been a reality for many South Australians who have in recent times been impacted by data breaches, including Optus, Medibank and, recently, Latitude Financial.

This amendment bill contains measures that acknowledge the need for privacy, and will seek to protect South Australian tenant information by prohibiting disclosing that information without their consent or as required by law, tenancy agreement, a court or a tribunal. A tenant's information for a successful application will be required to be destroyed after three years and for those who are not successful their information must be destroyed within 30 days, unless the prospective tenant gives consent to their information being stored for up to six months to support their search for another property.

Another immediate priority, which I am sure was a relief to the many who have contributed thus far to the review of the act, was our commitment to ban rent bidding through this amendment. This will prohibit rental properties from being advertised at a price range and prevent landlords or agents from inviting a higher rent offer. This includes third parties, which may often include websites facilitating tenant application forms, preventing them from engaging in rent bidding.

These provisions, as they relate to third parties, are intended to address conduct involving prospective tenants being charged fees for their own background checks. This includes for an assessment or rating of the suitability being provided to the landlord or agent because, strangely, some prospective tenants who have forked out for their own background check or who have offered a higher rent have been offered a higher rating. When you are cash-strapped, juggling a busy workload, looking after children and trying to get food on the table, there are only so many times you can fork out for your own background check, and for that to impact on your rating is even more unfair when the chips are already stacked against you.

Sections 52A and 54A will prohibit rent bidding by the landlord or agent, prevent a person in trade or commerce from providing an assessment or rating of a prospective tenant that is based on an offer of higher rent, and disallow a person from receiving or requiring a prospective tenant to pay for an assessment or rating of their suitability for a tenancy. This move to ban rent bidding brings us into line with other states around Australia, and while it was something we were being asked by

renters who felt it was unfair, it is a move also supported by members of the real estate industry, such as Cain Cooke, the Real Estate Institute of South Australia's Chief Executive.

It will also give tenants who are lodging applications some level of certainty that they will be able to afford the cost of the property they are applying for without having to further plunge themselves into rental stress in the hopes of maintaining a roof over their heads and a place to call home. When we have a rental market as tight as it currently is here in South Australia, we need to be doing what we can to enable that certainty for prospective tenants, to not make it feel like they need to put themselves into financial stress to be at the top of the list.

Outside of these changes being progressed through amendments to the Residential Tenancies Regulations, the fourth immediate priority as part of our plan for a better housing future is for more affordable residential tenancy bonds. With increasing rents across the board, those trying to secure even moderately priced housing are required to provide a six-week rental bond, rather than four weeks. Landlords are able to claim residential bonds equivalent to a maximum six weeks' rent when the weekly rent is \$250 or greater, and only a four-week bond entitled to be claimed for properties that fell below the threshold.

As is a common theme, much has changed since the previous substantial review of the act, and nowadays fewer and fewer properties fall below that threshold. With the threshold being raised to \$800, this will ensure that most rental properties in South Australia will only require a four-week bond. For renters, this will mean a reduction in the up-front costs they have to secure between amounts of \$500 and \$1,600, depending on the amount of rent they are paying. This will apply to any bond paid or payable under an agreement entered on or after 1 April 2023, with any bond paid before this date remaining lodged with the CBS until the conclusion of the tenancy agreement.

I understand that CBS has a big task ahead of it as they prepare a report based on the enormous response of over 5,000 people completing the YourSAy survey and over 150 submissions received from the consultation. This is testament to the significance of this issue and the demand out there in the community to see some supportive change. I note that many important issues have been identified, and I am pleased to share that whilst these reforms here today are based on what are the immediate priorities for many renters across our state, we are not finished yet. More improvements are on the way.

Having been a renter before, I know how tough it can be having to look for a new place to live, filling out form after form and being turned down for so many places. You try to not get your hopes up for the place that you like the look of or is close to work because you know that the reality is that, just like so many applications you have made before this one, it could also fail.

You must take time out of what is usually an already busy schedule to go and view the houses. For me, this involved taking my two kids in tow and the whole time you are doing this you note the many others that are also viewing the same house, which brings back the reality of just how competitive this process can be. With some properties sometimes receiving more than 20 to 30 applications, it is easy to appreciate that applicants can really get worn down by this. At the best of times, it can be a really hard process to navigate.

But I think of others in my community and right across our state who are having to navigate this path right now under these incredibly stressful conditions. It is what drives us to get back up and speak on bills like this here today. There are many families out there right now, for example, trying to find a new place to live because, for whatever reason, they could not maintain their home. They are having to find a place to live that is located close to their kids' school, so that they do not let it affect their education, close to family or relatives that they may be caring for or require supports from, close to their place of work or still close to the vital services that they rely on.

We have heard stories like this, but they are more than just stories for so many South Australians. It is the lived experience for so many waking up and wondering how they will afford a rental property suitable for themselves or their family, all while juggling the pressures of life. It is for people who are in situations like that that we on this side of the house are taking this issue seriously, because everybody deserves safe, secure and appropriate housing.

That is why, during the 2022 campaign, we committed to investing in our public housing and building an extra 400 homes, with 150 of these being in regional South Australia, upgrading 350 empty properties and updating 3,000 homes in a maintenance blitz. We reversed the former government's plan to sell off further public housing, halting the sale of 580 public housing properties.

Our commitment to increasing affordable housing includes the likes of collaborative projects, working alongside the commonwealth government to increase supply for projects such as the \$70 million Build to Rent project at Park Court on Greenhill Road, Eastwood, delivering 130-plus apartments, with 30 to 50 of these being social housing homes.

These are just a few parts of our A Better Housing Future plan—but it does not stop there. We have plans for residential land supply, greater support for homebuyers, regional housing and tax concessions to promote new housing opportunities. We know that the availability of housing plays an instrumental role in ensuring that our regions and our industries continue to grow and, indeed, thrive, and that is why I commend this bill to the house.

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (16:58): I rise to speak on the Residential Tenancies (Protection of Prospective Tenants) Amendment Bill. It is important to note that as we debate this bill we know that thousands of South Australians struggle to find a place to call home. The urgency of these reforms and possibly more to come following the ongoing review of the act—for which I commend Minister Michaels—cannot be underestimated.

I note the last time the Residential Tenancies Act was substantially reformed was in 2014 and this occurred after consultations began in 2012. Both that earlier legislation and the bill before the house today were brought forward under Labor governments. We have a long history of good work in this area.

Through the 1980s and early 1990s we massively increased public housing stock. In 1989, a Labor government founded HomeStart Finance that has helped more than 80,000 South Australians buy a home. In the early 2000s we established the Home Equity Loan that helped 1,500 social housing tenants buy a house of their own to call home. We established the Affordable Housing Innovation Fund that partnered with community organisations to deliver around 400 new homes.

When former Premier Jay Weatherill was housing minister, we started the first inclusionary zoning policy in Australia in 2006-07. This requires 15 per cent affordable housing in significant new developments and was paired with a policy that ensures these homes are offered exclusively to low and moderate income households before they go on the open market.

In 2008-09, when the Global Financial Crisis hit we worked with the federal Labor government on the National Building Economic Stimulus Plan. This program delivered \$434 million for South Australians to build and upgrade social housing. I believe around 1,200 new homes were built. This included the largest residential building ever built by the Housing Trust, the Uno Apartments on Waymouth Street. That combines a youth homelessness service, public housing, community housing, affordable housing and market housing.

We secured \$292 million under the National Partnership Agreement on Remote Indigenous Housing. This delivered hundreds of new homes and upgraded homes in remote communities, from the Far West Coast to the APY lands. Under Labor, this program was independently assessed as delivering the best value for money in Australia. We set up the Nunga loan. That ran until 2012 and helped Aboriginal families to buy a home.

Labor cares about housing in a way that Liberal governments, possibly with the exception of the late, great Thomas Playford, simply do not understand, although Thomas Playford may not actually even recognise the Liberal Party of today. He was a Liberal leader who invested massively in public housing, rather than doing what we saw from 1994 to 2002 and again from 2018 to 2022. In the 1990s and early 2000s, 13,000 public housing rental properties disappeared under the Liberals.

The report with these figures mysteriously disappeared off the government website under the previous Liberal government. It is okay, we still have it. Luckily, we kept a copy. The Liberals may

not have heard of a thing called the Wayback Machine. You can run from the truth but in this modern world you cannot hide.

From 2018 to 2022, as soon as the Liberals got their hands back on public housing, it all started again. During this terrible period, public housing went down every year, more than \$20 million per year was stripped from the Housing Trust budget and almost 200 staff disappeared. Playford would never have stood for that. Playford was a leader who nationalised electricity in South Australia, the reverse of what the Liberals did in the 1990s when it privatised. In a book published this week, former Liberal leader Martin Hamilton-Smith expressed his regret about what happened to ETSA in 1999.

Since the days of Playford that ended long ago now, it has been Labor that has flown the flag for better housing for South Australians. In fact, the history books show that the last time public housing increased at all under the Liberals was in 1982. David Tonkin was the Premier, police cars were baby blue, CDs went on sale for the first time and median house prices in Adelaide were around \$40,000. That is how long ago that was.

The Liberal Party's housing policy at the last election was 85 words, talking about what they had done and not what they were going to do. There was no promise of extra housing. There was no promise of tenancy reforms. There was no promise of extra money—absolutely nothing. As the Premier said in this place recently, public housing went down in 29 of the last 30 years—both Labor and Liberal could have done better.

This is why our election commitment to deliver an extra \$177.5 million for public housing was so critical. Our first budget fully funded this and expanded our commitment from 400 extra homes to 437. We added another \$55.2 million at the Mid-Year Budget Review—thank you, Treasurer. Extra public housing funding now totals \$232.7 million from 2022-26 and will deliver 564 new homes. We stopped the sale of 580 public housing properties and, together with new builds, we will have 1,144 more public housing properties in 2026 compared to the Liberal plans.

We partnered with the commonwealth on the \$10 billion Housing Australia Future Fund and the Housing Accord that aims to support 50,000 social and affordable homes over five years from mid-2024. We landed our first commonwealth partnership in January for a \$70 million Greenhill Road development and look forward to many more. We adjusted price points and income thresholds for affordable housing and doubled the exclusive listing period.

This means low and moderate income buyers get 60 days to arrange finance and make offers before affordable homes hit the open market. We formed the Housing Security for Older Women Taskforce that recently met with Her Excellency the Governor. We expanded the Private Rental Assistance Program by lifting the weekly rent cap from \$450 to \$600 and applicants can now have assets up to \$62,150 rather than \$5,000. This stops people from having to eat into their assets to rent a home.

We extended funding for domestic violence crisis accommodation that had been left no money by the Liberals and we provided \$6 million extra for St Vinnies, Catherine House and Hutt St Centre, all losing homelessness funding under the previous government. We have done all of this in the Housing Trust and in our first year of new government.

These achievements are not just abstract sets of facts and figures. When we came to government last year, my office was inundated with cries for help from people who were facing homelessness after renting privately for many, many years. We heard about cases where rent was being increased by \$100 or \$200 per week. We heard about cases where substandard homes were being rented for exorbitant prices.

Every reform we make has a profound impact on households who just need a safe place to lay their heads, raise their kids and fully participate in our community and economy. It is not just the Housing Trust and my office that have been working to make life better in the housing market. My cabinet colleagues have been hard at work in other parts of the housing system.

The Minister for Housing and Urban Development is releasing land, working on the construction code and establishing the Office for Regional Housing. The Treasurer is working with HomeStart to help first-home buyers and low income earners to own a home of their own. The

Premier keeps us all in line, having grown up in a house where his dad went to work for the Housing Trust every day.

The Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs is undertaking a review of the Residential Tenancies Act to make life better for renters and owners. The response to the review showed just how critical this work was. I was so amazed to see that we had more than 1,000 responses to the Autism Strategy consultation, but we have had 5,000 people complete the YourSAy survey for residential tenancies consultation along with 150 detailed submissions. This is an issue where people are crying out for action, and I just reaffirm that the Liberals did not do anything for four years. They avoided talking about this—they walked away from it—even as around them the housing crisis grew.

Coming from the review we have the bill before us today. As a first step to fixing this problem, the bill proposes a new section 47B to prohibit a landlord or agent from requesting prescribed information from a prospective tenant. This will reduce the amount of information that can be requested, reduce unnecessary burdens on applicants and better protect privacy. Importantly, the proposed section 47B(2) provides an exemption to allow prescribed information to be requested for the purposes of determining eligibility for a housing assistance program. This is positive discrimination, and I note that organisations like community housing providers may request this to help with disability and other housing challenges.

I look forward to working with the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs on regulations for the prescribed information. Much has been said in the media and correspondence to MPs about rent bidding. It is tough enough having a low income and no stable housing, but it is another thing entirely when, in a tight housing market, suddenly it becomes the *Hunger Games*. We cannot fix every problem in the community, but a critical function of government is to set the rules so that the playing field is as even as possible. This bill proposes to insert new section 52A, requiring rental properties to be advertised as a fixed amount and bans a landlord or agent from soliciting or otherwise inviting an offer of higher rent.

A new proposed section 52B will also crack down on unregulated third-party operators who may charge tenants a fee for the privilege of applying for a rental home, or to get a rating score. The third main proposal in the bill is to protect the information of tenants and applicants. The commonwealth Privacy Act 1988 does not apply consistently to landlords or agents and third-party operators that deal with rental applications. In response, this bill proposes a new section 76B, which specifies obligations to protect tenant information from misuse, interference or loss, and also from unauthorised access, modification or disclosure.

It will achieve this by requiring information provided while applying for a rental home to be destroyed after three years from the tenancy ending. This applies to successful tenants who have entered into a tenancy agreement, and aligns with the period of time information may be kept on a residential tenancy database.

Parties who facilitate tenancy applications will only be able to keep information on unsuccessful applicants for up to 30 days after the relevant tenancy agreement is entered into. We have seen the disastrous results of recent data hacks where staff or customers, who have not dealt with the company for many years, have had the information released. We must do better, and we will do better with the bill before us. Crucially, tenant and prospective tenant information will also not be able to be disclosed without the consent of the person, or as required by law or the tenancy agreement.

I offer my support to the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs as she continues her important work of reviewing the act, and I look forward to further reforms being implemented after careful consultation and planning. I do note the minister is getting on with other work linked to the act that is not part of this bill. I think that is very important. While some may choose to question the thoroughness or the fulsomeness of the response, I think they are missing that there is more work to be done, and that has been acknowledged, and that work is underway. I give my full support to the minister to get this work done, as does our caucus.

From 1 April, the threshold for a six-week bond changes from \$250 to \$800. That is a big change. The last time it moved was in 1994. I hate to think what was the number one song and the colour of police cars—I think police cars were Commodores at that point.

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The Hon. N.F. COOK: Were you driving one then, member for Elizabeth?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. N.F. COOK: I can just imagine—and playing a guitar in the front seat. I digress. That was 12 years after public housing went up for the last time under a Liberal government, but it is still a generation ago. When the \$250 threshold was set, you could get a three-bedroom home in Norwood for that price. Today, you are lucky to get a room in a share house for \$250 a week.

The change to \$800 will save renters big dollars right at the time they need it most. For those of us lucky enough to have stable housing, we can forget the stress and cost involved in constantly looking for a new home. It costs thousands to move. We can forget the extra costs of moving house, taking time off work, disrupting the schooling of our kids, having to make connections with new services like GPs. SACOSS would call this the poverty premium. That is low income households having to pay money for the same outcomes achieved by households with money.

Some people rent because they choose to, but for too many they rent because they just do not have another choice. For this reason we need to make renting better. The changes in this bill and the changes to the bond amount come at the same time the SA Housing Authority is boosting its Private Rental Assistance Program, as mentioned before. It is a great example of agencies working across government and moving in the same direction at the same time to support people who need it the most.

While it may sound like a small thing, the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs has been making improvements all the way down to the forms on her department's website. For many years the standard fixed-term private rental lease form had an unfortunate inclusion. The section called 'Term of agreement' was blank and could be filled in with anything, but in small type just above the box were the words '6 or 12 months'.

With so many mum-and-dad investors out there with just one rental property, they thought the fine print on this government form was a direction and not a suggestion. As such just about every tenancy under the sun was for six or 12 months. I was thrilled, a few months ago, when this fine print was changed to '6, 12, 18 or 24 months'—so sensible. Securing longer term leases and more housing stability does not always require legislation; it can be helped just by improving the tools that people use every day.

In closing my remarks, I note that private rental has become a place where disadvantaged people are spending far too long in very challenging circumstances. While there are wonderful landlords, there are also some who seek to exploit people who are doing it tough. We also have many people who would otherwise have been in public housing but cannot get in, because it has gone down in 29 of the last 30 years, even while our population has grown. This group is effectively identical to tens of thousands of households in public and community housing in terms of income, health, disability and histories of trauma. The difference is they do not have an affordable rent and stable housing, and this often compounds their disadvantage.

This is why we need to keep making improvements across the housing market, from homelessness services to social housing to private rental and home ownership. Within our social housing system, we have many people who may have been in institutions in decades gone by or who have lived a life on the margins and have not had the support they need to develop the skills to manage relationships in their community or participate in our economy.

This changing face of social housing, compared to the Playford era or even to 20 years ago, is placing renewed pressure on the homes and the staff in our social housing system. In the coming years one of my great aspirations is to build better supports for the tenants both in social housing and in the private rental market. This kind of support is like the mortar between the bricks on a house: things fall down if it is not there.

The bill before us today is one of many steps we are taking as a government to improve our housing system, and I commend this bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

RAIL SAFETY NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (FEES) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 March 2023.)

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (17:19): I rise today to speak in support of the Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) (Fees) Amendment Bill of 2023. I can indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition. The Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) (Fees) Amendment Bill seeks to amend a number of sections of the Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) Act 2012. This is in order to complement the Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2023.

There are several amendments that are featured in this bill—amendments, for example, to private sidings. These sidings define what is a low-speed section of track, which is distinct from a running line. It includes exemptions for persons—these persons who are accredited—from the annual fees prescribed by the national regulations, and there is the insertion of a section to also increase prescribed fee amounts.

What the bill seeks to do is remove the requirement for tourist and heritage rail operators to pay what is an annual accreditation or registration fee to the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator (ONRSR). It will amend the definition of the term 'private siding'. That will allow rail managers of various freight terminals to be registered instead of accredited, which will of course result in lower annual registration fees as well.

The ONRSR prescribes fees relevant to rail infrastructure managers and operators to be paid annually to that body. A new cost-recovery model is being introduced. What that will do is amend the way in which these accredited operators will pay their relevant prescribed fees. This is following broader amendments to the national law that were made in late 2022.

As it stands at present, an accredited operator is required to pay a fixed annual fee of \$15,000 as well as a variable fee annually based on track kilometres managed, travelled or possibly both. The new model will actually see an accredited operator pay a fee—this is an annual fee—that is based on a risk profile, as well the regulatory effort required from the ONRSR to oversee the operator.

The risk profile will actually be structured into various tiers, and there are six of these tiers. Tier 1 will be considered the highest risk, and it will keep going—tiers 2, 3, 4, 5, 6—and tier 6 will be the lowest risk respectively. Operators allocated tier 1 will be subject to the highest annual fee based on the risk profile, while those in tier 6 will be subject to the lowest.

There are, however, types of rail operations not included in the six-tier cost-recovery model. In terms of further discussion, railway operators not included in this six-tier cost-recovery model may be subject to other costing arrangements. This includes tourist and heritage sector railway operations, for example. Accredited tourist and heritage operators are instead subject to a reduced annual fixed fee of \$2,000, including the variable annual fee. However, this bill seeks to remove the requirement for tourist and heritage operators to pay annual accreditation or registration fees.

Railway operations, defined as what you would call less complex railway operations, will also be exempt from the six-tiered risk model, as they are considered to require less oversight, as it is put. These operators will instead be subject to an annual fee of \$20,000. Additionally, railway operators that manage private sidings will only be required to be registered rather than accredited, on the grounds that they also require less oversight. They will be subject to a fee of \$5,500.

This bill will amend the definition of 'private siding' to allow various managers of freight terminals to fall under this definition and therefore be subject to the lower fee of \$5,500 rather than the considerably higher fees incurred under the six-tiered models. The final component of this bill also inserts three new sections in the national law to enable annual increases in fees, and of course these will be indexed via movements in the consumer price index.

We know that the regulator was tasked by various infrastructure and transport ministers right around the country with developing a national cost-recovery model based on risk but also on regulatory effort as well. In doing this, the regulator has reviewed the current cost-recovery arrangements but also looked to other costing models not only nationally but also internationally, with a view to discover learnings in shaping development of the proposed new model.

I understand various stakeholder input was also sought and obtained in progressing the resultant cost-recovery model for consideration by various infrastructure and transport ministers as well. Obviously during COVID, I imagine a number of these ministerial meetings had to be had via Zoom or similar technology. Now the ministers have the luxury, responsibility and privilege of being able to meet face to face, and sometimes you can achieve much more face to face than you can over a Zoom call. I trust that the meetings of the minds of the various ministers of the various states and territories, coming together from right around Australia, will result in productive and constructive outcomes.

I know that way back from 2016 ministers have been meeting in respect to this particular topic and have agreed to various recommendations from the first stage of the cost-recovery review, and they also tasked the regulator with further developing a national model. Various sets of principles have guided the development of a cost-recovery model: for example, a model needs to be transparent—transparency is very important—fees should be based on a national model, they should be reflective and proportionate to the risk clarification, they should be aligned with the regulators regulatory effect and also cross subsidisation should be avoided.

However, if it is used, it needs be transparent but also the model—I am a big believer in this—needs to be simple to administer; it is all in the simplicity. Obviously cost recovery for tourist and heritage operations will be considered separately by governments, but this has been some time coming now and it has been thoroughly fleshed out.

I thank the ministerial staff for their efficient and thorough briefing on this topic. We on this side of the chamber will not get in the way of good regulation where it is warranted, so we will be supporting this bill. We will reserve our right to potentially ask questions at the committee stage. There may be various speakers on this side of the chamber. I know we have a number of regional MPs—and even the member for Unley, who has rail in his own electorate; I know he is a fanatic user of the rail network—and various colleagues who represent regional areas. I know that they take a particular interest in this subject matter, and so there might be an opportunity in the committee stage to actually flesh out some of those key questions.

Knowing what the minister is like, I dare say he might actually proactively answer our questions in his contribution. We look forward to hearing what the minister has to say about this, but all in all we say that this is a very solid amendment bill that continues to amend key sections of the Rail Safety National Law. Much of this has been debated and agreed for some time, and we look forward to seeing its speedy passage. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

COURTS ADMINISTRATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

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

GENE TECHNOLOGY (ADOPTION OF COMMONWEALTH AMENDMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 17:32 the house adjourned until Sunday 26 March 2023 at 11:05.