

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 1 June 2023

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

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

The SPEAKER read prayers.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: LEIGH CREEK HEALTH CLINIC

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:01): I move:

That the 29th report of the committee, titled Leigh Creek Health Clinic, be noted.

The Department for Health and Wellbeing or SA Health proposes to establish a new health clinic in Leigh Creek, replacing the existing clinic, which has exceeded its functional design life. The project is aligned with the strategic intent of the Leigh Creek Transformation Project. The Leigh Creek Health Clinic forms part of the Flinders and Upper North Local Health Network and plays an important and leading role in the delivery of health and aged-care services from Whyalla and Port Augusta hospitals, in addition to healthcare facilities at Roxby Downs, Quorn and Hawker.

The Leigh Creek district includes several townships that are home to approximately 200 Aboriginal people and provides important health services to the Indigenous community. The health clinic currently provides weekly visiting general practitioner services, pharmacy services, 24/7 medical support and visiting community-based services, and provides important care to the community on country. The establishment of the new clinic will provide essential health care and services to support a sustainable remote community, and associated tourist activity within the region, and will minimise travel to neighbouring health facilities.

The expected outcomes of the project are to provide a new fit-for-purpose health service in Leigh Creek and enable the disposal of an end-of-life asset, to ensure continuity of clinical services in Leigh Creek and the surrounding regional catchment areas, maintain an accessible clinic for the community to receive care on country and design a clinic with the ability to expand and contract in response to potential longer term changes to clinical models of care in the context of local requirements.

The continuity of health service delivery in Leigh Creek supports the local community and surrounding catchment areas and aims to expand its reach of health services in the community in a flexible and high-quality environment. This is evident through its adaptable design to accommodate future needs of the community and associated healthcare delivery. The new clinic will be located on an amalgamation of three lots on Black Oak Drive, Leigh Creek, where existing properties at this location have been demolished as part of the broader township demolition program undertaken by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport (Department for Infrastructure and Transport).

The health clinic has been designed to have a minimum 50-year design life, providing long-term asset security and performance within the community. The design is to a size that reflects the clinical services demanded of the area and ensures effective utilisation of the building. Once construction of the new clinic has been completed, the existing clinical services will cease operation and transfer its operations to the new clinic, ensuring the continuity of the health service.

Plans submitted by SA Health call for the construction of a new health clinic, which will comprise:

- two emergency treatment areas for stabilisation and triage services;

- three multidisciplinary consult spaces with videoconferencing and telehealth capabilities, to be used by visiting clinicians;
- SA Ambulance Service crew respite space and garage;
- clinical support spaces, including utility and storage spaces;
- consumer and visitor waiting space;
- reception area with visiting GP-operated pharmacy;
- administrative and amenities spaces;
- mortuary facilities; and
- staff and visitor car parking.

The addition of a new SA Ambulance Service crew respite space and garage will provide paramedic crews with appropriate rest and respite areas and secure storage and charging facilities so that paramedic services can continue to operate in remote communities safely and effectively. Due to the age of existing health equipment, the new clinic will also include an upgrade of relevant medical equipment.

The total investing budget for the project is \$5.89 million, of which \$1.8 million was committed in the 2020-21 state budget, with a further \$4.09 million supplemented by the broader Leigh Creek Transformation program. Construction is scheduled to commence in June, with practical completion and commissioning in December of this year. Sarah Constructions have been appointed as the building contractors and will incorporate ecologically sustainable development strategies into the clinic's design. The clinic construction will utilise a prefabricated modular methodology where the clinic will be constructed off site and transported to site for assembly.

Onsite works will be undertaken concurrently to prepare the foundations and structural piers that the modular facility will be placed upon. The benefit of utilising prefabricated modular construction techniques in this context is to appropriately address the remoteness of Leigh Creek and the anticipated premiums associated with construction in a remote area. Demonstrated experience with this type of construction was noted in the tender field of construction contractors and was a requirement for the engagement of the services of the successful contractor. Selection of the contracted tender field was approved by DIT's Transport Tender Allocations Committee.

SA Health states that consultation has been a key theme throughout the concept planning and will continue with various stakeholders during the design and construction process. Stakeholders include clinical and non-clinical staff, consumer reference groups and industrial bodies.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Leigh Creek Health Clinic project. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Melissa Nozza, Director, Capital Projects and Infrastructure, SA Health; Craig Packard, Chief Executive Officer, Flinders and Upper North Local Health Network; John Harrison, Director, Building Projects, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; and Jon Anderson, Business Manager, Sarah Build. I thank the witnesses for their time. I would also like to thank the member for Stuart for the written statement supporting this project, which is in his electorate.

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

Motion carried.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: BELAIR NATIONAL PARK FACT-FINDING VISIT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. C.J. Picton:

That the third report of the committee, entitled Belair National Park Fact-Finding Visit, 2 March 2023, be noted.

(Continued from 18 May 2023.)

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (11:08): I would like to thank the Minister for Health for moving this report last sitting day and the member for Elizabeth for adjourning the debate to allow me to speak to it today.

On 2 March, the Natural Resources Committee conducted a fact-finding visit to the Belair National Park. This is the committee's report of that visit. The purpose of this trip was to hear about how introduced plant species, such as pest olive trees, are managed in the national park and to hear about innovative projects taking place to support biodiversity, such as the Bandicoot Superhighway.

Belair is the oldest national park in South Australia and the second oldest in the country. My colleagues the member for Mawson and the member for Finniss and I were joined by representatives of National Parks and Wildlife, Friends of Belair National Park, the Sturt Upper Reaches Landcare Group, and the City of Mitcham.

Our day opened with a presentation by Mr Craig Baulderstone, Vice President and Bushcare Coordinator from Friends of Belair National Park. Mr Baulderstone was joined by the President of the Friends of Belair National Park, Mr David French, and the immediate past Bushcare coordinator, Ms Barb Raine. The Friends are a volunteer group of around 200 members, and the work that they do to support maintenance and conservation efforts in this park is immense.

Mr Baulderstone estimated that the group contributes around 5,400 hours of volunteer work per year, whether that be through regular working bees, weeding and revegetation work, hosting school groups or conducting guided walks for the public and passing on specialised knowledge on topics like fungi and native orchids.

The work of these volunteers is invaluable and this, along with their passion and dedication towards the park, is to be commended. The Friends work in conjunction with national park staff to keep introduced flora under control. Mr Baulderstone explained that weeding and revegetation is a long process and that proper follow-up is crucial. He pointed out that the recruitment of native species occurs when you hold back the weed canopy, which introduces or maintains robustness in the system, enabling habitat for fungi and insects.

We were able to see the fruits of their labour as we were taken around the park by national park staff. Our first stop was a patch of federally listed grey box grassy woodlands, where the national park's district ranger, Jen Pitman, explained that the lack of weeds in the area is testament to the thorough weeding processes carried out by the Friends. We then visited a section of the park that is a leafy greenhood orchid stronghold. Ecologist Anthony Abley explained that the park hosts the largest population of these native orchids in the state.

The biodiversity work in the park also stretches to native fauna. Dr John Halsey of the Sturt Upper Reaches Landcare Group joined us to discuss the Bandicoot Superhighway, which was established in 2016. This is a five-kilometre stretch of public and private bushland carefully tended and monitored to allow bandicoots safe travel between Belair National Park and Mark Oliphant Conservation Park. This project fosters interbreeding between the southern brown bandicoot populations in the two parks and has been a great success.

Dealing with introduced plant species in this instance is complex. Dr Halsey pointed out that Melville Gully is such an important stretch of the superhighway due to the density and protection of vegetation. The proliferation of blackberries in this area—usually considered a weed—provides both sustenance and shelter for the bandicoots. In parts of this landscape, these weeds need to be retained, or at least slowly managed out, to allow for alternative food, shelter and protection to be established.

On the weekend, I heard more about the Bandicoot Superhighway Project when the President of the Sturt Upper Reaches Landcare Group, Danny Rohrlach, was so generous with his time as to present to members of the SACWA Heysen Group. It was most informative to learn about the full scope of the work being undertaken to create a corridor and also interesting to learn a little bit more about our very special furry friends. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Danny for all the work he and his team do to restore the biodiversity of the area, supporting landholders and educating us as well. Danny was not able to join us for the committee visit due to illness, so I was glad to be able to catch up with him over the weekend.

The committee found the trip to Belair informative and comprehensive and was impressed by how the volunteers, National Parks and Wildlife staff and the council worked together. Their hard work does not go unappreciated. Without dedicated volunteers such as the Friends of Parks groups, Landcare groups and others, we would not be able to manage the fauna and flora of our beautiful parks and reserves.

The Friends of Belair National Park members work so hard in their efforts to control the weeds but also re-establish native vegetation. I have seen them in action several times, and I am always impressed by their passion and enthusiasm for the work that they do. This year, the group launched a new initiative by awarding the Emerging Environmental Steward Award. It is specifically designed to acknowledge someone who has completed study in conservation and ecosystem management at Urrbrae TAFE, has demonstrated a commitment to the conservation industry and holds a conservation ethic, passion and enthusiasm for environmental issues.

This year, the inaugural winner of the award was Maisie Brown. Unsurprisingly, Maisie is an Upper Sturt local who has completed her diploma and done volunteer work with the Native Orchid Society of South Australia and the SA Seed Conservation Centre. Maisie was presented with her award by the President of the Friends group, David French, at the TAFE graduation ceremony on 4 May.

Such is Maisie's dedication to the environment, she is going to use the award prize money for the purchase of equipment for a vegetation survey of Mound Springs in the northern regions of South Australia. I would like to say congratulations to Maisie, and I am sure that we will be seeing more of you as your work in the environment continues. I thank these volunteers for their work and dedication to our natural environment.

Our trip to Belair was insightful, and I especially want to thank those who guided us on our visit and were so generous with their time and in sharing their knowledge and expertise. I also thank members of the committee and the committee staff for their time on this site visit. I particularly thank them for heading my way and spending time in one of Waite's most idyllic spots: the oldest national park in South Australia.

Before I finish, I want to take this opportunity to thank Dr Amy Mead for her work with the Natural Resources Committee over the past 10 months. Her work and support have not gone unnoticed, and we wish her well as she moves to support another parliamentary committee. I commend the report to the house.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:15): I rise briefly to commend the Natural Resources Committee for its recent work, as reported in the third report of the Natural Resources Committee for this session and arising from a fact-finding visit to Belair National Park that I am pleased to observe took in a presentation about progress on the Bandicoot Superhighway. There is a very good photograph of Dr John Halsey on page 13 of the report.

I take on the observations of the member for Waite about the excellent work that Danny Rohrlach has been doing for a sustained period of time in leading the Sturt Upper Reaches Landcare Group. The Bandicoot Superhighway, linking country all the way through Upper Sturt and through that part of the Hills, is really increasingly famous and a demonstration of what can be done when community gets together.

Whenever these things are mentioned, what comes to mind for me most particularly is a gathering that took place at the Upper Sturt Soldiers Memorial Hall a couple of years ago, led by the then minister for the environment, the Hon. David Speirs. He did a wonderful thing in this regard in bringing together a range of different stakeholders to contribute towards ensuring that the conservation of natural heritage in the area can really draw upon the strengths of everybody involved. It is what Danny Rohrlach has been so good at, and Dr John Halsey as well.

What we have seen is that, through private land conservation measures, we have a situation where there are neighbours throughout the stretch of the Bandicoot Superhighway and the surrounding area who proudly want to put it up on their front gate that they are participating in private land conservation and that they are connected to projects, including the Sturt Upper Reaches Landcare Group and the Bandicoot Superhighway, and they are seeing a community of interest that

is developing off the back of participation in that kind of endeavour. It is even feeding into improved land value and attraction for those who want to come to live in our part of the Hills for precisely that reason.

While I am sure the visit to Belair National Park was productive in all sorts of ways—and I have no doubt that Craig Baulderstone has presented, in a range of different ways, about the tremendous value of Belair National Park—I want to shine a particular light on the complexity of community response in the Sturt Upper Reaches Landcare Group, on the Bandicoot Superhighway and on the great value of the private land conservation work that really has brought community together over the last several years. So I commend the report and that aspect in particular.

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (11:18): I would like to thank the member for Heysen for his words and acknowledge that meeting that happened in Upper Sturt a couple of years back. I was there myself with a slightly different hat on—my Upper Sturt CWA hat—and we served morning tea, actually, to the leader. So I know that the group have done some great things with that grant money. I stand to close debate.

Motion carried.

Motions

AUKUS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.J. Speirs:

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 South Australian industry;
 - (d) opportunities from emerging technologies;
 - (e) the progress of taskforces 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.

(Continued from 4 May 2023.)

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (11:19): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes24
 Noes.....12
 Majority12

AYES

Andrews, S.E.
 Boyer, B.I.
 Clancy, N.P.
 Hildyard, K.A.
 Koutsantonis, A.

Bettison, Z.L.
 Brown, M.E.
 Cook, N.F.
 Hughes, E.J.
 Malinauskas, P.B.

Bignell, L.W.K.
 Champion, N.D.
 Fulbrook, J.P.
 Hutchesson, C.L.
 Michaels, A.

Mullighan, S.C.
Piccolo, A.
Stinson, J.M.

Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)
Picton, C.J.
Szakacs, J.K.

Pearce, R.K.
Savvas, O.M.
Thompson, E.L.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
Ellis, F.J.
McBride, P.N.
Speirs, D.J. (teller)

Batty, J.A.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Teague, J.B.

Cowdrey, M.J.
Hurn, A.M.
Pederick, A.S.
Telfer, S.J.

PAIRS

Close, S.E.
Marshall, S.S.

Tarzia, V.A.
Hood, L.P.

Wortley, D.J.
Pisoni, D.G.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

Bills

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (11:24): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am so pleased and deeply honoured to lead debate in this house on the Criminal Law Consolidation (Child Sexual Abuse) Amendment Bill 2023. Although in terms of the number of pages this is a short and relatively straightforward bill, it is a profoundly significant one in its effect. It rightly seeks to change the heading of section 50 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 from 'Unlawful sexual relationship with a child' to 'Sexual abuse of a child' and consequently, in doing so, to remove the utterly unacceptable connotations of consent and suggestion that there could ever, ever be a sexual relationship with a child, which is inherent in the current heading of the offence.

The government's decision to make this heading change is absolutely predominantly a result and recognition of the tireless, courageous, fierce advocacy of Ms Grace Tame and her Harmony Campaign, particularly around the fact that using the term 'relationship' to utterly inappropriately describe the offence implies, wrongly, mutual responsibility and consent and has the deeply troubling ability to give perpetrators licence to characterise their abusive behaviour as consensual.

I am so grateful to Ms Tame for being here with us today, and I wholeheartedly commend her for her extraordinary advocacy for change to the wording of this offence and for her clear and courageous communication about why this change is so necessary and so significant for courageous survivors of child sexual abuse, for preventing such abuse from occurring in the future and for progress on the broader campaign to shift our community's understanding, legislation and expectations on consent to sexual activity.

As members will be aware, Grace Tame was awarded Australian of the Year in 2021 in recognition of her remarkable work particularly focused on the prevention and awareness of child sexual abuse in Tasmania and beyond. Using her powerful voice, Grace, alongside a group of remarkable women, also inspired so many of us to take to the streets with our rallying cry that enough is indeed enough. Grace spoke at the rally in Hobart, welcoming the shift of community conversations and understanding about sexual abuse. Quoting her, 'Evil thrives in silence. Behaviour unspoken, behaviour ignored is behaviour endorsed.' Indeed.

In inspiring us, Grace and others united those who have campaigned for change for a long time and those who have joined this fight in our shared refusal to any longer accept sexual abuse, sexual harassment and assault and the ingrained power imbalances that underpin it. The unwavering

voice of Grace Tame continues to inspire others who have been sexually abused to raise their voices, and her work continues to shine a light in every dark corner where such abuse exists. Ms Tame powerfully called for governments to take the issue of abuse in all its forms seriously. We will, and, through this bill, we are.

It is incumbent on every member of this parliament and indeed of all parliaments to listen and to ensure voices such as Grace Tame's and those whose voices we have not heard but who have also suffered are amplified and acted upon. It is incumbent upon every one of us in government and in community to also shine a light where horrific sexual abuse of children exists. As the Minister for Child Protection, I hear horrific accounts of child sexual abuse. My heart is broken every single day; however, every day my resolve, my determination, is utterly strengthened.

As are survivors, I am angry and determined to see meaningful change and I am utterly enraged that horrific predators are opportunistic and often target vulnerable young people. Across this state and the nation, survivors have spoken and will not be silenced until every child, every person, is safe wherever we work, whomever we are alongside, whatever our position is when we are at home, when we are out at night, during the day, at school, in a park, at a shopping centre, wherever.

I am inspired by the courage that survivors such as the remarkable Grace have shown in coming forward. Their voices will drive us all to continue to speak for as long as it takes to ensure every single child can live their life free from abuse and violence. In Tasmania, Grace became the first woman in that state to legally be granted the right to speak under her own name with regard to her personal experience of sexual abuse as a child. She rightly harnessed her platform as Australian of the Year in the most powerful of ways to continue her fearless campaigning, including through her involvement in the national #LetHerSpeak campaign, which was led by Nina Funnell, a sexual assault campaigner and Walkley Award-winning journalist.

Ms Tame was bravely the lead case in this campaign, which received significant media attention having partnered with News Corp, Marque lawyers and End Rape on Campus Australia, raising further much-needed awareness around child sexual abuse. She has also used her national recognition as an opportunity to establish the Grace Tame Foundation, with the foundation's aim being to ensure that the Australian government and governments of states and territories take appropriate action by enacting laws, delivering educational programs and encouraging social behaviours. I am proud that with Ms Tame's advocacy around the fact that language is critically important this bill is here in this house today.

It is critically important not just because of how it is interpreted by the legal profession and judiciary, which of course is crucial, but also so importantly about how the general public are delivered information and how awareness of child sexual abuse is generated through the media and beyond. Ms Tame explained to the Attorney-General a very poignant anecdote to emphasise this point. As the Attorney spoke to in the other place, and as Ms Tame has spoken about publicly, during a public discussion on a Facebook post, Ms Tame's childhood sexual abuse perpetrator, a federally funded University of Tasmania PhD student, was called a paedophile, referring to his 2011 convictions, which included possession of child sexual abuse material.

In a blatant act of cowardice, the perpetrator publicly defended himself by hiding behind the words of the offence saying, 'No, I was convicted of maintaining a relationship,' before abhorrently bragging that his crimes were awesome, while describing the crimes in graphic terms. The language of the charge, in effect, in Ms Tame's words was 'soft enough to give him the shield to enable his disgusting fantasy'. Clearly, it would have been a much more uncomfortable and pointed accusation had the perpetrator been forced to respond by saying that, yes, they had been charged with the offence of sexual abuse of a child.

In 2016, the perpetrator was then convicted of producing child exploitation material in descriptive form for those descriptions and served another prison term. This changing of the language of this offence here in South Australia is such a crucial step in ensuring that the offence name is accurate in reflecting the insidious nature of the conduct, and it also achieves a change in how reports on such offences are made, including in the media, without impacting on the operation of the offence and existing precedents.

Currently in South Australia, section 50 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act provides that an adult who maintains an unlawful sexual relationship with a child is guilty of an offence. The maximum penalty for this offence is imprisonment for life. This bill rightly does not change the elements of the offence and, necessarily, maintaining an unlawful sexual relationship will still be an element of the offence, as recommended by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. This change is consistent with similar offences in Queensland, the Australian Capital Territory, New South Wales and Tasmania.

The Northern Territory, I understand, has also very recently introduced a bill that would change the heading of their relevant offence. The new heading, 'Sexual abuse of a child', appropriately reflects the gravity of the offence, which is entirely exploitative and predatory in nature, and also seeks to change how such offences might be reported on in the media, adding to the much-needed awareness of child sexual abuse and bringing accountability and transparency to this vile act.

Importantly, the bill also inserts a new subsection into section 50 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to make it explicitly clear that the heading does not form part of the section, despite section 19 of the Legislation Interpretation Act 2021, and that there is no intention for the wording of the offence heading to affect the operation of the offence.

This bill makes a simple change in terms of language that sends a powerful—powerful—message about our opposition to child sexual abuse, our understanding of the experiences of survivors and our deep desire to see change in the way this offence is handled and spoken about. Language matters and we can never give perpetrators of child sexual abuse a licence to characterise abuse as in any way consensual.

I take this opportunity to thank Grace Tame and everybody from the Grace Tame Foundation for their tireless and fearless advocacy that today, quite literally, changes the law and the way that child sexual abuse is portrayed and discussed in the courts, in the media and in our communities right across Australia.

I thank also all the many other advocates who have been relentless champions for change and awareness of child sexual abuse over decades and thank you particularly to every brave survivor of child sexual abuse—those who are able to tell their painful story to raise awareness and ensure other children are not subject to this abhorrent abuse of power and those for whom talking is just too hard. Today and every day our parliament stands with every single one of you.

In closing, I quote Grace Tame on the power and critical importance that these changes have. Grace has said:

Our legislation must reflect the unequivocal seriousness of this crime, which is never a child's desire, but instead a perverted fantasy projected onto and into them through a process of grooming which involves a stratagem of calculated—often invisible—offences designed to gradually increase a pre-existing stark power imbalance.

Indeed. I commend Grace for these words, for her strength and for her voice. I commend this bill to the house and I seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*

3—Amendment of section 50—Unlawful sexual relationship with child

The heading of section 50 is amended by this clause. Section 50 is also amended to provide that, despite section 19 of the *Legislation Interpretation Act 2021*, the heading of the section is not part of the section and is not intended to affect the interpretation or operation of the section.

Schedule 1—Related amendments

Part 1—Amendment of *Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006*

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

The reference to an offence against section 50 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* is amended by this clause such that the reference reflects the heading to that offence as amended by the measure.

Part 2—Amendment of *Sentencing Act 2017*

2—Amendment of section 81—Intensive correction orders

The reference in the definition of *serious sexual offence* to an offence against section 50 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* is amended by this clause such that the reference reflects the heading to that offence as amended by the measure.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Heysen, I recognise the presence in the chamber of Grace Tame, former Australian of the Year.

*Bills***CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Debate resumed.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:39): I rise to indicate the opposition's support for the bill and, as lead speaker for the opposition, will make some brief remarks. Other than to emphasise the words of the minister just now, I, too, recognise the presence of Grace Tame here today in the chamber. It is well that we recognise the particular relevance of Grace Tame's presence here today because it is not every day that legislation comes to parliaments around the country, the result of such singular work by one individual.

We know that the advocacy of Grace Tame as Australian of the Year in 2021 was of particular importance in a whole range of ways. Here we are now some distance from that time and legislating to continue to ensure that language is appropriately adopted further to make clear that the sexual abuse of a child is properly described and that there is not the occasion, either in the public imagination or in terms of Grace Tame's own experience, or the possibility for there to be some endeavour to mischaracterise child sexual abuse is something other than that. The minister has reflected on the particular remarks of that perpetrator of offences against Grace Tame in 2011.

I otherwise remind the house that section 50 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act remains, as it was and as it will continue to be, among the most serious offences in the criminal law. We know that sexual abuse of a child carries a maximum penalty of imprisonment for life. It is offending of the most serious kind and it is appropriate that, in describing that offending, it is described as what it is. I, too, would quote Grace Tame, in relation to both the offence and the importance of language in the context of the offence, and it has been observed just now. Grace Tame said:

Our legislation must reflect the unequivocal seriousness of this crime, which is never a child's desire, but instead a perverted fantasy projected onto and into them through a process of grooming which involves a stratagem of calculated—often invisible—offences designed to gradually increase a pre-existing stark power imbalance.

Let there be more strength to your advocacy work, Grace Tame, and let us in our work as legislators ensure that we do all that we can to continue to steer those rules that apply both in terms of offences and penalties and in terms of the culture, the public discourse and the use of language that surround them. So I once again commend the bill, recognising in particular the work of the former Australian of the Year towards that end and I look forward to its speedy passage.

Mrs PEARCE (King) (11:44): I, too, rise to speak in support of the Criminal Law Consolidation (Child Sexual Abuse) Amendment Bill. I am passionate about doing what we can to make our state better, fairer and more equitable for all. Often, to be able to create meaningful change we have to face hard truths. In today's case, we must acknowledge that there are predators out there who will exploit the most vulnerable and that we have seen some cases where there have not been adequate provisions to take power away from them. To be able to address this, we need to raise

public awareness and implement effective laws and policies that will help to prevent abuse, and, as always, language matters.

I would like to thank Grace Tame for all of the work she has put into the prevention and awareness of child sexual abuse, having used her story to push for much-needed reforms to raise awareness about the impacts of sexual violence. All of us in this place face public scrutiny every day—it is part of public life. But, unlike Grace, we do not have to live through our trauma daily to be able to create change.

It is an incredibly powerful way to make a difference, as it is empowering to help others to feel seen, heard and recognised. But I would also like to acknowledge that it would be a heavy burden. From the bottom of my heart: thank you. I recognise your heavy load and you inspire me to be more open about the experiences I have had in my life to advocate for progressive change. The impact you have already had on the nation is significant.

When I first heard your story, it made me reflect on my early years in high school, in a small country town, and how I wish I knew more then. It is not my place to put another story on public record and I will not, but what I will say is I wish I knew where I could have gone to seek advice on what at the time was thought to be a salacious rumour and I wish some of the attitudes towards that rumour were starkly different. Essentially, I wish there was more public awareness on predatory behaviours and abuse and how to tackle it.

But the actions taken by people like Grace have helped ensure change for the next generation. I am a mother of two and I take great comfort in knowing that both my daughter and son are learning about consent. My daughter is as fierce as she is fearless and I would not want anybody to diminish her flame. In fact, I want both my children to feel empowered and safe to be who they are, as I would wish that on any child. I am pleased that, through a growing awareness across our nation, we are better protecting our children.

I will add that I was also pleased that their school chose to celebrate International Women's Day some years ago by watching a presentation from Grace. I will have it noted that it was the high school and not the primary side of the school, but to be there and see not just students learning about grooming, consent and sexual abuse but to have the parents as well was monumental in helping to raise awareness and be a catalyst for change. It is a hard truth, but one that we must all face, and I thank people like Grace who have championed this and led the way.

I am pleased that the Attorney-General met with Grace earlier this year to discuss the foundation's Harmony Campaign, which is calling on jurisdictions to harmonise laws that apply to sexual assault. At the moment, around Australia, there are multiple definitions for all things ranging from sexual intercourse, the age of consent, consent and grooming, as well as different sets of punishments for those different offences. The foundation acknowledges how big an ask it is to see all Australian states and territories update and harmonise their legislation and therefore, for the moment, the foundation requests three changes as a starting point.

Request number one brings us all here today to this very bill. Currently in South Australia, section 50 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 provides that an adult who maintains an unlawful sexual relationship with a child is guilty of an offence, which provides for a maximum penalty of imprisonment for life. Let us be clear: the behaviour of an adult preying on a child is not a relationship. It is abuse and it is a crime.

With Queensland and the ACT recently changing the headings of their offences and the Northern Territory having introduced a bill that will change the headings of their offences, it is also time that we here in South Australia do the same so that the words we use in our legislation reflect the true nature of the offence and that we use words that will not diminish the gravity of them.

As I have mentioned, words matter, and the use of a word like 'relationship' in this context implies a sense of mutual responsibility, consent, and it diminishes the gravity of the offence. This bill will amend section 50 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 to 'sexual abuse of a child'. This bill will also insert subsection (14) into section 50 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to disapply the Legislation Interpretation Act 2021 to provide that the heading does not form part of the

section and that, with this amendment, there is no intention for the new heading to affect the interpretation or operation of the offence.

Prior to 2017, section 50 of the act was 'persistent sexual exploitation of a child' and was designed so that an offender could be found guilty as long as the jury was satisfied the offence was committed against the child over a period of not less than three days. In 2017, however, the High Court delivered a significant judgement in two appeals, being *Hamra v The Queen* and *Chiro v The Queen*. In *Chiro*, the majority said that upon a finding of guilt the jury would be asked by the judge which of all the sexual acts alleged they had proven beyond reasonable doubt, and then the judge had to sentence taking these into account.

If the jury is not asked that question, the judge must sentence on the version of the facts most favourable to the offender; that is, taking into account the two least serious acts. In light of this, section 50 was amended at the time to introduce the relationship offence titled 'persistent sexual abuse of a child', which was based on a model provision recommended by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse where the relationship offence removes the requirement to provide particular offences to establish the persistent offences.

Later in 2021, the DPP raised concerns that the heading was no longer appropriate as the 'persistent' sexual abuse of a child is no longer an element of the offence, with concerns raised that the language of 'persistent' in the section heading could give rise to an argument that the word must have some work to do in interpreting the provision.

This brings us to today's amendment, which we have made clear does not change the elements of the offence, and maintaining an unlawful sexual relationship will remain an element of the offence in line with those recommendations made by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in 2017, and remains consistent with similar offences in other jurisdictions around Australia, such as in Queensland, the ACT, New South Wales and in Tasmania.

To harmonise law regarding offences such as these between all states, territories and the federal government is a monumental task, and it is a task that deserves our utmost attention to ensure that it is reviewed and acted on appropriately. This is why South Australia is engaging with the commonwealth government as part of a broader review into sexual consent and abuse laws. The changing language in our legislation is not about a mere swapping of words in and out; it is bigger than that, because words have the power to either empower or disempower those who need the full support of the system.

When we soften the words we use, we do not capture that gravity. We must correct the record to take power away from abusers who for too long have 'sought solace in our systems and institutions that shield them from the full extent of what they've done'. We are working to ensure that with this bill here before us today we are starting to correct the record and ensure that our words and actions in this place provide protection to survivors while taking away power that for too long has been abused by offenders.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (11:53): I rise to indicate my support for a straightforward but such important change to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. I would like to acknowledge Grace Tame in the gallery today and thank you for your strength and to acknowledge that, in your presence here today and in listening to our words, I hope you feel a sense of pride for all that you are achieving, but I also acknowledge how difficult it must be to sit here.

Sex with a child is not only unlawful, it is abuse, child sexual abuse, and we must give it that name. Language matters. It is never a relationship; it is an abuse of power. It reminds me of domestic violence headlines that still exist today: 'Fun-loving dad kills his wife', 'Good-hearted man murders his children'. They are not good-hearted men, they are not fun-loving men: they are murderers. The impact of child sexual abuse is immeasurable and most often something that the victim will keep secret for many years due to the violation and shame that come as a result of the abuse.

I note that in March, our Attorney-General Kyam Maher MLC met with former Australian of the Year and sexual abuse survivor, Grace Tame, to discuss her foundation's Harmony Campaign, which calls on jurisdictions to harmonise laws that pertain to sexual assault. Grace Tame has made it clear to us all that the word 'relationship' implies mutual responsibility, consent and entirely

diminishes the gravity of the offence. A child who is sexually assaulted is never able to provide consent.

One of the areas in which harmonisation is sought by the campaign is in the language used to describe child sexual offences. In South Australia, section 50 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 provides: 'An adult who maintains an unlawful sexual relationship with a child is guilty of an offence.' The maximum penalty for this offence is imprisonment for life.

In Western Australia, New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania, the relevant child sexual offences have headings that use the term 'Persistent sexual abuse of a child'. In South Australia, Queensland, the ACT and Northern Territory, the headings for the relevant offences refer or referred to a 'relationship with a child'. Queensland and the ACT have recently changed these headings of their offences, and the Northern Territory has recently introduced a bill that would change the heading of the relevant offence.

The bill does not change the elements of the offence, and maintaining an unlawful sexual relationship will still be an element of the offence as recommended by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. However, the offence will be renamed to more appropriately and properly reflect the lack of consent, and reinforce the absolute gravity of the offence.

A broader review of sexual consent and abuse laws, that includes other issues raised by the Grace Tame Foundation's Harmony Campaign, is currently being undertaken by South Australian and federal governments. This includes a singular age of consent, its relevant provisions and punishments being agreed upon and adopted by all states and territories, a singular definition of the physical act of sexual intercourse being agreed upon by all states and territories, and the development and implementation of uniform grooming legislation.

I would like to thank the member for King for her words, acknowledging high school experiences. I wish I, too, had the words. I give my strength and respect to all those who speak out, and my heart to all those who cannot.

I would like to acknowledge Grace Tame for her work and advocacy, and thank every child sexual abuse survivor who has had the courage to speak out. For those who find themselves unable to speak, your voice is valued. You are heard. In fact, I am reading your book right now and I have learnt so much, and I thank you. In fact, when I read it I devour it, and then I put it down for a few days. It takes some reflection and some time to take in. I would like you to know that with your tireless advocacy you are making a world of difference to so many. Please know that every time someone criticises you, I make a donation to the Grace Tame Foundation. I commend this bill to the house.

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (11:58): One in five children experiences sexual abuse. For a long time, I have admired the courage of Ms Grace Tame and her efforts to passionately advocate for survivors of child sexual abuse and systemic change to prevent child sexual abuse and so, particularly given she is joining us here in the chamber today, I am so proud to be able to stand and speak briefly on this extremely important bill.

As we have heard from some of the other speakers today, and I certainly echo many of their comments, in March this year our Attorney-General, Kyam Maher, met with Ms Tame to discuss her foundation, Harmony Campaign, which calls on the jurisdictions right across our country to harmonise laws that pertain to sexual assault.

One of the areas in which harmonisation is sought by the campaign is in the language used to describe the child sexual offences. Currently, in South Australia section 50 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 provides that an adult who maintains 'an unlawful sexual relationship with a child' is guilty of an offence. The maximum penalty for this offence is imprisonment for life. I know there are many people in my community who believe that that is just not enough.

At the crux of Ms Tame's concerns is that the word 'relationship' implies mutual responsibility and consent and diminishes the gravity of the offence. In response to Ms Tame's advocacy, the government has introduced the Criminal Law Consolidation (Child Sex Abuse) Amendment Bill to change the heading of section 50 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, from 'Unlawful sexual relationship with a child' to 'Sexual abuse of a child'.

There is no place for the word 'relationship' on matters of sexual abuse. No child can consent to a sexual relationship with an adult. The existing language does not reflect the gravity of the crime and, as Ms Tame tells us, it feeds into victim blaming attitudes and gives licence to characterise abuse as romance. Ugh. It has no place in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act in South Australia or in any state in this country.

The changing of the language in this offence in South Australia is an important step in ensuring that the offence name accurately reflects the nature of the conduct and also achieves a change in how these offences will be reported without impacting on the existing operation. The new heading that we are proposing in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 'Sexual abuse of a child', appropriately reflects the gravity of the offence—which is entirely exploitative and predatory in nature—and also seeks to change how such offences might be reported on in the media, adding to the awareness of child sexual abuse and bringing accountability and transparency to these vile acts.

A broader review of sexual consent and abuse laws that includes other issues raised by Ms Tame and her foundation, Harmony Campaign, is pleasingly currently being undertaken by the South Australian and federal governments. I am looking forward to being able to discuss more of those matters here in this parliament. The Harmony Campaign is also advocating for changes to see a singular age of consent, its relevant provisions and punishments be agreed upon and adopted by all states and territories. The campaign believes that the glaring discrepancies between these trivialise and confuse the issue and are often exploited by perpetrators.

The campaign also advocates for a singular definition of the physical act of sexual intercourse to be agreed upon by all states and territories. Quite rightly, it is the belief of the foundation and the Harmony Campaign that if the nation achieves consistent sexual assault legislation we will be better equipped to prevent and respond to the issue and more able to better protect survivors and deter perpetrators.

I would like to thank Ms Tame and the many advocates who have relentlessly and courageously advocated for change in awareness of child sexual abuse over many decades. I particularly thank the brave victim survivors who are able to use their painful stories to raise awareness and to ensure that other children are not subjected to this type of repulsive abuse and abuse of power.

While a technically simple change in this bill, it is an extremely important one in its recognition of the advocacy of Ms Grace Tame and the Harmony Campaign that language matters. We cannot give perpetrators of child sexual abuse a licence to characterise this abuse in any way as consensual. Ms Tame tells us that the legislation must reflect the seriousness of the crime, and so sexual abuse of a child will no longer be referred to as an 'unlawful relationship' in South Australia's Criminal Code. It will be labelled for what it is: sexual abuse of a child. The changing of the language of this offence in South Australia makes sure that the offence accurately reflects the nature of the offence and gives victim survivors the dignity and respect that they deserve. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr ODENWALDER: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (12:05): I rise today in support of the Criminal Law Consolidation (Child Sexual Abuse) Amendment Bill 2023 to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. This amendment, although short and relatively straightforward, is significant and it is truly powerful.

Section 50 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act currently reads, 'Unlawful sexual relationship with child'. Successful passage of this bill before us today would amend this section to read, 'Sexual abuse of a child', removing the connotations of consent in the current heading of the offence. A child cannot be in a sexual relationship. It must be called what it is: sexual abuse.

I acknowledge all survivors and the trauma you deal with every day. I will do whatever I can in my position in parliament and as a member of the broader community to support you. Like the member for King, it is hard not to think about my daughter when speaking on this bill. We all want our children to be safe—to feel safe and be safe—and the thought that one day they might not be is horrifying.

I am very grateful that the topic of child sexual abuse is not hidden away as much as it was when I was younger. I do not know that any of us had the words to talk about it growing up, but now there are so many advocates working in this space to ensure we talk about it, to give us the language, to help us know how we can keep our children safe, acknowledging that we cannot be with them 24/7. At the very least, we should have an open communication with the young people in our life so they know how to speak with us, know we are safe for them to speak with and know we will never question them and never blame them. I thank those advocates from the bottom of my heart, including the formidable Grace Tame.

As I am sure we are all very aware—I know there are many fans of her in this building, as you have likely heard for yourself in these speeches, especially from the member for Gibson—Grace Tame was Australian of the Year in 2021 in recognition of her extraordinary work raising awareness and supporting the prevention of child sexual abuse. In Tasmania, Ms Tame became the first woman in that state to legally be granted the right to speak under her own name with regard to her personal experience of sexual abuse as a child. She then went on to use her platform as Australian of the Year to fearlessly campaign, particularly through the #LetHerSpeak and #LetUsSpeak campaigns, led by the also formidable sexual assault campaigner and Walkley Award-winning journalist Nina Funnell.

I am really glad my friend and colleague the Attorney-General met with Ms Tame earlier this year to discuss her foundation's Harmony Campaign. The Harmony Campaign is aimed at achieving consistent laws in jurisdictions across the country that pertain to sexual assault. One of the areas in which harmonisation is sought by the campaign is in the language used to describe child sexual offences.

The decision to make the heading change included in this amendment bill is in no small part as a direct result of the tireless work of Ms Tame and the Harmony Campaign. Using the term 'relationship' to describe the offence of child sexual abuse implies some sort of mutual responsibility and consent. This is grossly inappropriate and it gives perpetrators the licence to characterise their abuse behaviours as consensual.

In Western Australia, New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania, the relevant child sexual offences now have headings that use the term 'persistent sexual abuse of a child'. Queensland and the ACT have recently changed the headings of their offences, and the Northern Territory is consulting on an exposure draft bill that would change the heading of their relevant offence. The language we use in this place and in our legislation is crucially important, not just because it will be interpreted by the judiciary and the broader legal profession but because it sets how South Australians are delivered information and how awareness is generated in the media.

I have no doubt South Australians would be shocked to learn that existing laws could allow a paedophile to describe their abuse as a relationship. That is why, thanks to the work of Ms Tame and other advocates, the Attorney-General and his team, we have a bill before us today to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. This amendment bill will change the heading of section 50 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act from 'Unlawful sexual relationship with a child' to 'Sexual abuse of a child'.

Importantly, this bill also inserts a new subsection into section 50 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to disapply the Legislation Interpretation Act 2021 to provide that the heading does not form part of the section and that there is no intention for the new heading to affect the interpretation or operation of the offence. The maximum penalty for this offence is still, as it should be, imprisonment for life. I am proud to be part of the Malinauskas Labor government that is currently undertaking, alongside the Albanese Labor government, a broader review of the sexual consent and abuse laws that includes other issues raised by Ms Tame and her foundation's Harmony Campaign.

While technically a simple change, this bill sends a powerful message about our opposition to child sexual abuse, our understanding of the experience of survivor victims and our desire to change the way this offence is described and handled. Language is vital, it matters, and we simply cannot allow perpetrators of child sexual abuse the licence to characterise their abuse as consensual in any way, shape or form. It is not.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (12:12): I speak to close this debate and, in doing so, I thank the shadow attorney-general for his contribution. I also thank the members for King, Gibson, Davenport and Elder for their heartfelt contributions and for their generosity in sharing their passion about this issue. I am very grateful to them and, as always, strengthened by their willingness to speak together so strongly about these and other most important issues—some of the most important issues that we as a parliament confront. I wholeheartedly thank all of you for your words.

As has been said, this bill is a short bill—the number of words is small—but its impact is profound. Its impact absolutely sends a message that in no circumstances—never, ever—is there a sexual relationship with the child but, rather, only abhorrent sexual abuse of a child.

As others have said and as I have spoken about, we are so grateful to you, Grace, for your advocacy. I think the member for Gibson spoke about how you have strengthened the voice of other survivors and how, through your strength and courage, you have taken this forward. I just want to say to you, in thanking you again, that you also strengthen all of us in here as we go about making these changes. I am incredibly grateful to you for that and for taking the time to be with us today. It buoys us in what we do here, so thank you so much. Again, I commend this bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

Mr TEAGUE: I note, as members have addressed just now in the course of the second reading, that the work the bill does is limited to the substitution of the heading as it presently stands, 'Unlawful sexual relationship with a child', and substituting, 'Sexual abuse of a child'. In those circumstances, I note that the body of section 50, the bulk of the 13 subsections of section 50 retain the impugned term 'unlawful sexual relationship with a child'.

Indeed, subclause (1) that sets out the offence continues to provide, 'an adult who maintains an unlawful sexual relationship with a child is guilty of an offence', with, as has been observed, a maximum penalty of imprisonment for life. The term 'unlawful sexual relationship' is defined in subsection (2), and then so on. My question is why those references, including the characterisation of the offence itself, are retained, particularly in circumstances where the focus here is on language?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: You raise a really important point, shadow attorney-general. It is certainly an issue that we as a government will explore, as other jurisdictions are similarly exploring, jurisdictions that have similarly changed the heading of their offence but that have, however, left that term in the body of the particular clause.

Similar to other jurisdictions, we are committed to moving forward on that particular issue around that word being maintained in the subject matter. The issue is that the royal commission into institutional child sex abuse actually—I do not know if the right word is to say it 'maintains' that particular word but it certainly does not address that particular issue.

There are currently two national reviews underway on this very issue, amongst other issues. One is an Australian Institute of Criminology review and the other review is through the Legal and Constitutional Affairs References Committee of the Australian parliament, which is also taking in a broader inquiry into laws pertaining to consent across Australia.

The terms of reference for that review propose that the committee inquire into current and proposed sexual consent laws right across Australia, with particular reference to inconsistencies in laws across different jurisdictions, the operation of consent laws in different jurisdictions, any benefits of national harmonisations, how consent laws impact survivor experience of the justice system, the efficacy of jury directions about consent, the impact of consent laws on education, the findings of any

relevant state or territory Law Reform Commission review or other inquiry and any other relevant matter.

As I said, the reason that I say we will continue to look at that issue is that we want to understand the outcomes of those two national reviews that are happening, as are other states that are also wanting to see what we can do across jurisdictions in a harmonised way to address that very issue. As I said, it is a really important question and it is one that we will certainly come back to. We do want to await the outcomes of those two reviews that I understand will contemplate the very issue that you raise. As well as changing it, having a desire to change that here, we want to make sure that there is national uniformity around any change going forward.

Mr TEAGUE: I note and appreciate the minister's response in that regard and I indicate my commitment and my wholehearted desire to work with the government in regard to any work that is going on in that regard. I guess I put it in the context of the observations of the member for King just now. We have seen how the interaction of the statute with the common law has led to change in terms of the substantive definition. Here we are focused on the important use of language and in all the circumstances that have been described.

If I might just take the chance, and it is really not for, as it were, opposition, but I think it is an important role of government to work through that necessary harmonisation work and report and all the rest of it, but I just make the observation that where the substance of the offence remains unchanged, and we see somewhat jarringly in this context that subsection (1) setting out the offence describes it in those terms still, I might suggest a change and a series of changes in the subsequent subsections to provide in subsection (1) that an adult who engages in sexual abuse of a child is guilty of an offence.

I would commend the government's reflection on that change and if there is more work to be done, including in the short term, to bring back a further amendment bill that addresses the substance of those matters throughout the body of section 50, then I can just indicate that I would welcome consideration of that.

As the member for King has described, we have dealt with expressions of persistent exploitation. We have a reference in section 1 to 'maintains'. If there are issues around how that is characterised, I suggest that that ought to present no difficulty in that the term for these purposes, the sexual abuse of a child, is defined as capable of being amended in terms of the definition in subsection (2). I just put all that on the record, and if it is indeed the case that the substantive description of the offence and the rest of those references can be expunged from the statute book, then that would be a welcome further step as far as I am concerned.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: Again, I absolutely take the point. It is a really important point. I just wanted to provide a little bit of further information that may be helpful in terms of the steps going forward to, as you say, expunge from our laws that word and the horrendous connotations. One of the things I wanted to draw your attention to is that the Australian Institute of Criminology review that is being undertaken specifically had a process open to seek the input of survivors into the changes going forward. The closure for accepting submissions and survey responses was actually yesterday, so I think it is important that there is an opportunity to reflect on what survivors contribute through that process. As I said, the process closed yesterday, so I am sure we will hear more about that.

The other thing that I wanted to mention also is that, just for interest for the member—I am certainly happy to provide this information—it is South Australia, Queensland, ACT, New South Wales and Tasmania which have maintained the reference to that word 'relationship' in their legislation; however, they have changed, or taken steps to change, their heading. Victoria and Western Australia do not use that word 'relationship' in that offence. I say that because my understanding is that all of those jurisdictions are rightly focused on making sure that that change is made. We are committed to making that change.

The third piece of information that might be helpful to the member is that in our women's safety equality policy that we took to the election we made a very firm commitment to review all laws pertaining to consent to sexual activity in the broadest term, and prior to the election, when we were in opposition, I also moved a motion to establish a committee to do so. Unfortunately, that opportunity was not taken up at that time, but that review of legislation programs, education, etc. is underway. I

am certainly happy to keep the member abreast of progress in that regard, but I hope the member takes that as an indication of, again as I have said a couple of times, our steadfast determination to resolve this particular issue and also to look at a range of other issues into the future.

Clause passed.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (12:28): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

I would like to take the opportunity to say a couple of things that I meant to say very briefly before, and that is to wholeheartedly thank Kelly from the Attorney-General's Department and Elliot from the Attorney-General's office, Hilary Wigg from my office and parliamentary counsel, obviously, for their work on drafting the bill.

On behalf of everybody here in our parliament, I again very much thank Grace Tame for being with us today and strengthening us in this debate—strengthening us and bringing so many of us together to make change and to make sure a light continues to be shone wherever horrific child sexual abuse exists. So again I thank her.

Thank you to all the members who have contributed to this debate. Also, thank you to the Hon. Kyam Maher, who has just walked in: thank you very much to the Attorney-General for his work towards what is a really important moment for our state in terms of the passage of this legislation. Thank you very much, Attorney.

Bill read a third time and passed.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY (DOMESTIC ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 May 2023.)

Mrs PEARCE (King) (12:30): Violence against women and their children is a serious issue in Australia. When we talk about it, we often share these statistics:

- one in three women has been a victim of physical or sexual violence since the age of 15 by someone known to them;
- almost one in four women has been emotionally abused by partners since the age of 15; and
- one woman dies almost every week at the hands of a current or former partner.

In fact, many of us in this place recognise these statistics each year as we stand on the steps just outside to acknowledge every woman in this country who has been killed and reflect on how far we have to go to eliminate violence towards women and attitudes of disrespect and gender inequality.

Even though most people recognise these stats and that violence against women is a serious issue, there is a tendency to minimise disrespectful behaviours, blame victims for violence and empathise with males. This was found through the research report, 'Reducing violence against women and their children', commissioned by the Australian government Department of Social Services some years ago. But that is not the only concerning reality it found.

The report also highlighted that from an early age young people begin to believe there are reasons and situations that can make disrespectful behaviour acceptable. Girls blame themselves, questioning whether the trigger for the behaviour is potentially their fault, rather than questioning the

behaviour of the male. Boys blame others, particularly the female, and deflect personal responsibility, telling each other that it was a bit of a joke and did not mean anything. Adults accept the behaviour when they say, 'It takes two to tango,' or, 'Boys will be boys.'

These stats really concern me. If we are really and truly to eliminate violence towards women, and attitudes of disrespect and gender inequality, we need to change that, whether it be:

- implementing measures that can work to change the underlying social drivers of violence to stop it before it starts, by addressing the attitudes and systems that drive violence against women and children;
- finding ways to identify and support individuals who are at high risk of experiencing or perpetrating violence and to prevent it from occurring;
- finding ways to provide services and supports to address existing violence and to support survivors experiencing violence; and
- helping to reduce the risk of retraumatisation, supporting victim survivors to be safe and healthy to be able to recover from trauma and the physical, mental, emotional and economic impacts of violence.

We must do what we can to change these perceptions if we are truly serious about eliminating domestic violence. I am so pleased that today we have a bill before us that will help us to take progressive steps in this space, a bill that will better protect survivors and make clear that our society has zero tolerance for this behaviour.

The Equal Opportunity (Domestic Abuse) Amendment Bill 2022 seeks to amend the Equal Opportunity Act 1984 to add domestic abuse as a new, protected attribute against discrimination, placing domestic abuse alongside sex, sexual orientation, gender, race, disability and age as an attribute protected from discrimination. It will make it unlawful to treat someone unfavourably because they or their relative or associate have been or are being subject to domestic abuse. I think this is important and something that I am incredibly pleased to see—that this amendment goes further than protecting a survivor: it encapsulates the support system around survivors as well as supporting it.

Under this bill, domestic abuse will be defined in the same way as under the intervention orders legislation, meaning it covers abuse in a broad range of relationships, including spouses, intimate partners, family members and also carers, because domestic violence comes in many different forms and we must work to eradicate it in every way possible.

Additionally, the bill also provides protections to prevent perpetrators of violence from disingenuously claiming to be the victim under this proposed legislation. It is designed to recognise both direct and indirect discrimination. There may be some wondering how this bill will help and how does it apply in everyday life. Imagine a workplace where an employee may be criticised or made to feel guilty for taking time off via domestic violence leave. This bill will help to prevent that.

There is a growing body of evidence that shows that victims and survivors of domestic and family violence often experience discrimination related to their experiences of domestic and family violence, particularly in the workplace, and when experienced discrimination can compound the harm of the original acts of violence.

Employment plays a critical role in assisting survivors of domestic and family violence to leave their violent relationship. Eliminating the discrimination that survivors may face will help to improve their ability to access and remain in employment, but it is not just the area of employment where this bill assists survivors. Imagine someone looking to rent a property, but they get knocked back because they are judged unfairly for being protected under an intervention order. Maybe they are unable to provide evidence of a rental history because they have been residing in domestic violence crisis accommodation, or maybe they have an unstable rental history with many short-term tenancies. This bill will help to prevent discrimination in these scenarios.

We know that when a person is living with family and domestic violence they often experience heightened financial stress, homelessness, isolation and vulnerability. We need to tackle these vulnerabilities as we introduce laws to better support and protect survivors. We have debated domestic violence leave in this place; now we need to do what we can to ensure there are no barriers

or negative connotations for accessing this support. We know that housing is a necessity, and we must do what we can to prevent survivors from being penalised. This bill helps to achieve both of these things.

The rights of domestic violence survivors would be better protected under this reform. I firmly believe that better protecting those who experience discrimination related to domestic and family violence will be a positive contributor to achieving workplace equality and wellbeing which, in turn, helps to enhance workplace productivity. I also believe it will help raise community and business awareness about the impacts of domestic and family violence and increase the understanding of the systemic implications of this issue in areas such as education, housing and employment.

I thank the Attorney-General, the Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence and the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity, for their hard work and efforts in developing this bill. I commend this bill to the house.

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (12:38): I rise today also to speak on the Equal Opportunity (Domestic Abuse) Amendment Bill, which will better protect the rights of domestic violence victim survivors. It is bad enough that someone would be subjected to domestic violence, but then to be discriminated against because of it is just horrendous. This bill will prohibit discrimination against people and their families who have experienced or are experiencing domestic abuse. The bill amends the Equal Opportunity Act 1984 to add domestic abuse as a new protected attribute against discrimination.

Our government is committed to working alongside service providers, women's organisations, women experiencing domestic violence and other stakeholders to pull every possible lever to prevent and end domestic violence. We will do everything in our power to better support, protect and empower those affected.

This bill will see that it is unlawful to treat someone unfavourably because they or their relative or associate have been or are being subject to domestic abuse. With this bill, new discriminatory behaviours that will be prohibited include criticising or otherwise treating an employee poorly because they took time off on domestic violence leave or refusing to rent a property to someone because they are protected under an intervention order or have been residing in domestic violence crisis accommodation.

It is sad that we need these laws, but these are genuinely the types of scenarios that victims of violence have raised with me directly and raised during consultation ahead of this bill. Those who have experienced domestic violence and who have provided input into this bill should be commended. To share personal and traumatic experiences, and to offer insight and suggestions on how to improve the rights of people who are experiencing abusive situations, is extremely brave and admirable. Domestic abuse is not just acts of violence. Abuse can be financial control and emotional manipulation.

I have been contacted by several women in my community who are experiencing domestic violence and who are seeking help, and it is heartbreaking to sit with them and to hear their stories. We all know these stories too well: instances of violence in what should be a safe family home, the difficulties that follow periods of financial control and abuse, the toll on the mental health of the victim and the impact that this can have on their family and friends. We know this is happening and we know that real action is needed. That is why it is so frustrating and so disappointing to hear the discrimination that some survivors continue to be subject to—sometimes at their place of work, sometimes when they are looking for a new property.

Imagine the concern that comes with learning that your former partner is trying to leave the country with your children. Imagine the pain of being unable to talk about what happens behind closed doors because of fear for your safety. Imagine how distressing it becomes when the discrimination you face prevents you from leaving that situation—when you cannot leave an unsafe house, for example, because you do not meet a rental agency's requirements or when leaving that house means no roof over your head and no prospect of a roof over your head or over your child's.

This bill will prohibit discrimination in all areas of public life covered by the Equal Opportunity Act. In addition, indirect discrimination will also be prohibited. For example, someone applying for a

rental property will not be able to be denied on the basis that they are unable to fulfil a requirement to provide a rental history due to previously being in emergency crisis accommodation or having a history of short-term rental instability for reasons of domestic violence. That would be indirect discrimination and it would be unlawful.

We are a government that is working to ensure people requiring a leg-up receive the support they deserve where they need it. Where abuse may be impacting an employee's performance in the workplace, we want to see that employees are able to lean on the support that their workplaces can provide. That is why this legislation stipulates action taken in relation to workplace performance must be fair and reasonable and not be discriminatory. It is abhorrent to think that at a time when employment is crucial to their circumstances a vulnerable person could experience such awful treatment in their workplace. So let's prevent that.

Let's move forward with legislation to do anything we can to support people through their circumstances. Nobody deserves to be left out in the cold while they are seeking to recover from a period of abuse and control. This bill also includes protections to prevent perpetrators from claiming to be the victim. I am hearing more and more about that kind of narcissistic gaslighting behaviour. Claims of this nature do nothing but increase the stress and trauma inflicted on the actual victim and, by extension, those close to the victim.

The repercussions of domestic violence and control are far-reaching, and we know emotional, physical and financial abuse are a cause of distress to more than just the direct victims. Friends and family carry the weight of knowing their loved ones are hurting, and it hurts all the more if the laws that we pass do not appropriately protect them.

False claims aggravate the justice process and consume resources already stretched that should be solely devoted to the actual victims. Added protections for domestic abuse victims, for the survivors, do not require the perpetrator to have been convicted. There is a very broad scope to determine the abuse that does not necessarily require a conviction. As we know, the legal process can be traumatic and lengthy and sometimes detrimental to the healing process, so alternative evidence and medical records can be considered in these circumstances.

Our government has a strong vision for ending the scourge of domestic, family and sexual violence and other forms of disrespect and discrimination. A recent review of strangulation laws found a lack of clarity in proof requirements was resulting in the early discontinuing of cases. Our Attorney-General, the Hon. Kyam Maher, alongside the Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, the Hon. Katrine Hildyard, last month proposed changes to the South Australian Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. These changes see that application of pressure on the neck be considered in future strangulation cases, where currently proof that a person's breathing was restricted through strangulation is required for a case to proceed.

Earlier this year, the state government launched its coercive control awareness campaign, which rolled out across several social media platforms to encourage awareness among young South Australians about controlling behaviours. That campaign definitely started some important conversations in my community, and I am sure in lounge rooms right across our state.

The launch of this campaign was another important step, with the government consulting widely to assist in the formation of draft coercive control legislation. This consultation has engaged those with lived experience, young people, Aboriginal women, regional women, the LGBTQIA+ community and more as our government works to see that feedback drives appropriate change.

People experiencing domestic or family violence need every support they can get and establishing the experience of domestic abuse as a ground protected under our antidiscrimination laws is an important step forward to helping them break free from abusive relationships. Under these reforms, victim survivors of domestic violence could take action if they are discriminated against by employers, prospective landlords and others.

The Commissioner for Equal Opportunity would have the power to investigate complaints of discrimination and claims could be determined by the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal if not settled between the parties. It is a way of helping and supporting victim survivors of domestic violence at a time when they need it the most. We need to ensure that those facing

discrimination for experiencing domestic violence can access support and an avenue for recourse through the Equal Opportunity Commission.

Governments should do everything they can to help prevent and end domestic violence and support and empower those who are experiencing it. Through this legislation and a range of other measures, we are doing just that. Already in our term of government and under the dedicated leadership of our Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, we have achieved a lot.

Last year, we restored funding to the Women's Domestic Violence Court Assistance Service after it was cut by the former government. This important service helps hundreds of women affected by domestic violence to access free legal advice and provides invaluable support by helping survivors of domestic and family violence to secure necessary legal protections against an abusive partner. By restoring this funding, our government is ensuring this service can continue and cope with growing demand, with around 800 women accessing these services every year.

The investment also means the service can expand its focus to better support those in regional areas, as well as women from culturally diverse backgrounds, who may face additional barriers in reporting abuse and seeking support. Our government has also reinstated the \$1.2 million of funding to Catherine House that was, again, cruelly cut by the former government. Catherine House is an incredible service offering a safe and secure place for women experiencing homelessness, often as a result of domestic violence.

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

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

We also introduced a new minimum employment condition for public sector and local government employees of 15 paid days of family and domestic violence leave each year. Paid family and domestic violence leave is a workplace entitlement that literally saves lives. The measure will allow victims of family violence to take time off of work without losing income or without losing their jobs, a key support that will help people to leave dangerous situations.

In addition, we are harnessing the opportunity that comes with hosting major events, including the FIFA Women's World Cup, to deliver programs in local sporting clubs and communities aimed at preventing violence against women and children. There is far more to this event than just the game of football and we are committed to bringing that good to the fore. The Malinauskas government has committed \$1 million to realise the potential of this global sporting event, with funding to assist the state government and Football South Australia in delivering football participation programs and, importantly, public awareness campaigns and complementary club education.

There is still so much that we can do in this space and we intend to progress a range of legislative changes and reforms. We will also be introducing legislation to require those who have been charged with serious domestic violence offences and granted bail to be electronically monitored as a condition of bail, and we are looking to review legislation pertaining to consent to sexual activity.

We will continue to relentlessly speak up and act and prevent and end domestic violence. This bill will better protect the rights of domestic violence victims and survivors and strengthen our state's antidiscrimination laws because domestic, family and sexual violence, as well as discrimination of any type, has no place in our community. I commend this bill to the house.

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (12:52): I am very proud to contribute towards this excellent piece of legislation, which will strengthen the Equal Opportunity Act. We have a very proud history of equality here in South Australia and we demonstrate this every day as we walk into parliament. Early pieces of legislation contributed towards the Equal Opportunity Act and this will make it even stronger.

I think the key part of our government election commitments in regard to this bill really speaks to who we are and what we are as a government. The bill will prohibit discrimination on the basis that someone is or has been subjected to domestic abuse and protect victim survivors and their families in public life, including in employment, education or when trying to access services or accommodation.

Partner violence has been experienced by one in six women and one in 16 men since they turned 15. The fact that one in six women has encountered partner violence is alarming and deserves special attention. As the Minister for Human Services, I take this role very, very seriously. It is absolutely disheartening that disability support workers, early childhood educators, aged-care workers and all other female-dominated careers include women who are often confronted with low wages and job insecurity. When domestic violence is added to this mix, it is dangerous.

We are acutely aware that having secure employment and the assurance that your employer will provide support during times of crisis are essential factors for women to sustain themselves, support their families and ensure their safety. By addressing these issues, women can confidently take necessary steps to secure their wellbeing. Sadly, individuals with disability face much higher likelihoods of experiencing physical and/or sexual violence. With the responsibility of disability within my portfolio, I am acutely aware of how this disproportionately affects those within this community. Additional layers of discrimination on top of domestic violence compound the problem, and it is unacceptable in 2023.

Public housing is also part of my portfolio and has been yours, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I am intensely aware of the impact many victim survivors fleeing violence have when attempting to rent with intervention orders and the threat of violence. This compounds our currently difficult housing market, creating a situation where women are left out of the housing market and enter public housing. Recently we prioritised the statewide Domestic and Family Violence Homelessness Alliance, extending its funding of \$16 million by a further two years, giving job security and security for people who do tough work every day.

The South Australian Housing Authority provides important support to those affected by domestic and family violence. Approximately a third of all new allocations into public housing are victim survivors. This is an incredibly important statistic: we are a safety net. SAHA further oversees transfers between properties to ensure safety, as well as writing off debt for customers where it can be attributed to domestic violence situations.

We undertake significant safety-related maintenance upgrades also. People might be interested to know that some of these include:

- sensor lights in place of existing external light fittings;
- aluminium security screen doors and windows;
- peep holes or door viewers for external doors;
- meter box locks;
- changes of locks and keys on front doors/external doors to a common key;
- locks for sliding doors with a common key;
- locks for sliding windows with a common key;
- door chains;
- security door tamper-proof guards around handles;
- patio bolts on double or sliding doors; and
- where appropriate, pet suitable yards with a secure gate.

The South Australian Housing Trust is the biggest residential landlord in South Australia and, apart from many rental agreements, we are also pet friendly, within reason, as you would be aware, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Research has found significant overlaps between domestic and animal abuse. This means abuse victims fear speaking out because that could be dangerous, not just for themselves and their family but for their pets. Further, we know that victims are often reticent to leave their pets when fleeing domestic violence. Public housing can offer a safe place for people who are victim survivors and their animals when making an extraordinarily brave decision to leave.

The proposed bill aims to eliminate discrimination in every aspect of public life, as governed by the Equal Opportunity Act. This includes preventing discrimination in employment or any form of work, whether unpaid or paid. Additionally, it encompasses the provision of education, decisions made by associations and qualifying bodies, as well as the provision of land, goods, services and accommodation.

The objective is to create a comprehensive framework that ensures equal treatment and opportunities for all individuals across these domains. Furthermore, the bill will address a concept known as indirect discrimination. This occurs when a general requirement is imposed that individuals with a protected attribute, such as being subjected to domestic violence, find difficult or impossible to comply with. For instance, if a prospective landlord demands evidence of a recent rental history from applicants, it may unfairly disadvantage a domestic violence survivor who has been residing in crisis accommodation or had numerous short-term rentals. Indirect discrimination will be deemed unlawful, unless the requirement is reasonable given the circumstances.

Another significant aspect of this bill is the provision granting the equal opportunity commissioner the authority to decline action on a complaint of domestic abuse discrimination if there is insufficient evidence to substantiate the complainant's experience of domestic abuse. The provision is necessary to address the risk of domestic abuse perpetrators exploiting the new ground of discrimination. Unfortunately, it is not uncommon for perpetrators to falsely claim victimhood and attempt to manipulate individuals or services connected to the actual victims. This clause will offer a clear framework for the commissioner to dismiss such complaints alongside their existing powers.

Like many in this chamber, and in the other place, I regularly attend the Pay our Respects to Australian Murdered Women Vigil here on the steps of parliament every year. We are all aware of the horrifying scale of domestic and family violence in this country. We attend every year to pay tribute to those who have lost their lives to preventable violence. Violence and its prevention is the very reason I am here in parliament. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

Question Time

CONSTRUCTION, FORESTRY, MINING AND ENERGY UNION

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:00): My question is to the Premier. What action is the Premier taking to protect South Australian construction businesses from John Setka's CFMEU? With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: On 27 May 2023, *The Advertiser* reported, and I quote:

...Premier Malinauskas solemnly promised to watch the influence of the CFMEU on the local building industry. So far you could characterise his efforts as a whole lot of watching and not much doing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer has the call.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (14:01): Mad dogs off the leash again. I am happy to respond to the question from the leader because he is right to raise the fact that there is some consternation in some parts of particularly the building industry about this. I know that there has been some media reporting on certain behaviours in the construction industry. What I can say is that the government has commenced ensuring that, insofar as the state government is empowered to do so, it is taking action to make sure that participants in the construction industry are better

protected against anyone who behaves or engages in either inappropriate or, even worse, illegal conduct in the industry.

We have been and are in the process of providing additional resources to SafeWork SA not only to give them a greater capacity to participate in inspections and other activities on worksites but to make sure that they have additional tools at their disposal. My colleague in the other place the Attorney-General, the Hon Kyam Maher MLC, has been continuing to work on a package of measures in that regard.

In recent years, with the gradual transition of the parliament's ability to legislate in this area, moving from the state jurisdiction to the federal jurisdiction, there isn't always an easy or a simple answer for a state government to take action in this regard. But whether it's that particular participant that the leader raises, or whether it's anybody else who behaves inappropriately in the construction industry, of course that's a concern for the government. We will continue to take what actions we are able to make sure that everybody's interests are protected who participate in this industry, whether it's businesses, whether it's employees, or whether it's employee representatives.

CONSTRUCTION, FORESTRY, MINING AND ENERGY UNION

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:03): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier have a plan to stop the rollout of John Setka's Incolink scheme in South Australia and, if not, why not? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr COWDREY: It has been reported that the CFMEU plans to rollout Incolink, the Victorian workers' entitlement and redundancy scheme across South Australia, potentially leading to increased costs for the South Australian building and construction industry, which is currently served by a local scheme. The Incolink board includes Mr Setka and other union bosses from Victoria.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:04): I thank the member for Colton for his question. Last week—I can't remember the exact day, but late last week—I had the opportunity to speak to the CEO of the South Australian Master Builders Association, who was in touch with me regarding the reports emerging around Incolink's interests in taking over the South Australian equivalent, known as BIRST. BIRST is of course a scheme that has been in operation in South Australia in partnership between the CFMEU and MBA for some time.

The Victorian equivalent in Incolink has the same arrangement between the Victorian branch of the CFMEU and the Victorian branch of the MBA. As has been described to me by the South Australian MBA, the distinction between Incolink and BIRST principally is the sums of money that are involved. The mandate and the objectives of those two organisations I understand to be largely the same, but the costs associated with the Victorian model are substantially higher than is the case for the South Australian model.

From the South Australian state government's perspective, we have a couple of interests here. The first is making sure that workers who are effectively insured under that scheme have their entitlements preserved, which is a principle that I would hope everyone would want to see upheld. We seek to satisfy ourselves that the BIRST scheme in operation in South Australia does that effectively. We haven't received any representations—well, I certainly haven't received any representations—to say otherwise, which begs the question: why change?

The other interest we've got here beyond workers' conditions themselves, which is the paramount consideration of the Labor government, is cost of the scheme's operations relative to the delivering of outcomes to the workers. To the extent that there is a gap there or a differential between Incolink and BIRST, the government would have an interest in that as a matter of public policy.

Following the representations I received from the MBA, I undertook to go away and ascertain what legitimate levers the state government has at its disposal because, as the Treasurer rightly pointed out, our levers here are relatively limited. Ever since WorkChoices of course state governments relinquished powers—

Mr Cowdrey: What about the Labor Party levers?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —to the commonwealth regarding industrial relations. Nonetheless, there are still various acts and powers and functions that exist with the state that we are willing to deploy should that opportunity present itself and should the need arise.

The other element that I neglected to mention, of course, is the issue of South Australian workers' money going across the border. That would strike us as being a less than desirable outcome, particularly in the absence of any obvious benefit to either South Australian businesses or South Australian workers themselves. To that end, the state government has an interest. We will examine our options carefully and respond appropriately.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: You've got all those union fees going over there.

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Unley!

CONSTRUCTION, FORESTRY, MINING AND ENERGY UNION

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:08): My question is again to the Premier. Has the Premier met or spoken with any representatives of the CFMEU since the March 2022 election?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:08): I have never met or spoken to John Setka. Last year, when the government was dealing with workers compensation legislation, I had a number of union round tables, a number of union meetings, and I think there was a CFMEU official there.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: They're called thugs, not officials.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Florey! Member for Hurtle Vale! Member for Cheltenham!

NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley) (14:09): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Is the Torrens to Darlington section of the north-south corridor identified in the federal budget papers and, if not, why not?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:09): For the federal budget—that is true, as much as I wish I was in charge of the federal budget. I report to the member that the commonwealth government are co-contributors to the north-south corridor and have been for the entirety of the project, from when it was first begun under the Labor Party. The father of the north-south corridor, the current Prime Minister, Mr Anthony Albanese, is a big supporter of it.

The most recent public notices given by the commonwealth government were that the extra amount that we required as part of our review was funded in the forward estimates of the commonwealth government. A public press release was put out, I understand, by Catherine King, in response to questions from *The Advertiser*. I know members opposite don't believe what they read in *The Advertiser* for some reason. I don't know why.

The Hon. C.J. Picton: That's if they read it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If they read it at all. The commonwealth budget operates on a cash accounting basis; ours operates on an accrual accounting basis, as the Treasurer will inform you in a couple of days' time. So the way that they account for their expenditure is different from the way that we account for our expenditure. This is a decision they made long ago. I know that the extra money that we required over the forward estimates is there. I have received my correspondence from the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure—

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —and the South Australian government is entirely satisfied, and no level of interjection or little wisecracks from my young friend will change any of that. I know that my young friend is desperate to make a name for himself, and the advice I give him is that wisdom comes with time, not the other way around. I would say to my young friend that patience is a virtue, that the north-south corridor is being built. It has been repaired from what was left—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Badcoe!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is in the federal budget. If the member can show me the evidence he has that no federal budget papers—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I also say this to my young friend: the north-south corridor is not a new initiative, it is not a new measure; it's an existing measure. I am not quite sure what has confused my young friend, but my young friend would do well to read what he finds in *The Advertiser*. In *The Advertiser*, the federal Minister for Infrastructure has set out quite clearly that the funding that we requested over the forward estimates as part of our review is there.

FREIGHT COSTS

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley) (14:12): Again, my question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Does the minister have a policy to reduce freight costs for South Australian trucking companies and, if so, what is it? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: The recent federal budget increased the heavy road user tax on truckies by 6 per cent, representing a 5.2¢ a litre increase over the next three years.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:12): Again, my young friend is misinformed about the nature of the ITMM conference, which is the governing body of transport ministers nationally. On that body, Liberal ministers agreed to the recommendation of an increase. This is an annual event. But I do say this to my young friend: one of the most important aspects of trying to—

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hartley!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —reduce freight costs is to actually have a freight strategy. It was startling to me that under the previous government there was no freight strategy. Indeed, we were the only state—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Badcoe! Member for Wright! Member for Hartley!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I understand that we were the only state in the federation not to have a freight strategy. The then shadow treasurer and I thought that it would be nice for us to have a freight strategy, and so we decided that we would introduce a policy to have a freight strategy. Why?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As powerful as the member for Hartley thinks that I am, from the backbenches of Peake and West Torrens I was unable to have the influence that my young friend thinks that I have.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: The good old turbo days.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, they were the days, weren't they? They were the days, yes. Since we are talking about our youthful days, shall we go into some details? No? Okay, well, we won't. We won't, then. There are some awkward looks—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Maybe we won't talk about the 1990s then.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Maybe we won't talk about the early 2000s then. Anyway, we are introducing a freight strategy that will be headed up by Infrastructure SA. It will be a broad grouping of users from concerned industry—people like primary producers, the Freight Council, obviously truck owner-operator companies—to try to work out the best freight strategy for South Australia.

But again these national changes that are reflective of cost recovery were agreed by not only Labor ministers but Liberal ministers. This criticism of the Perrottet government and the Tasmanian government quite frankly shows how isolated the current Speirs opposition is from the rest of the governing Liberal parties that were left in the country.

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia: Things are going up. Do something about it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: While the member is shouting at me, 'Do something about inflation,' I do note that the Treasurer has already announced cost relief measures in the budget—

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia: He wants to claim the good news but not the bad news.

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —that are not inflationary, to do everything we can to try to make sure that we can deal with this. But ultimately roads are to be paid for by someone. I know the member took to the election a policy of charging everyone with electric vehicles a new tax on their vehicles. We abolished that tax.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We abolished their tax.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Florey! Member for Hartley! Member for Hammond!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Quite frankly, sir, I would ask my young friend to think carefully about the questions he asks, lest they end up right back at him.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for King, I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of year 11 and 12 legal studies students from IQRA College, guests of the member for Davenport. I also see Shimada Junji, who is Counsel-General of Japan in Melbourne, serving also as Counsel-General of Japan for Victoria, Tasmania and South Australia. Welcome to parliament. I also see former Speaker Graham Gunn.

*Question Time***LYELL MCEWIN HOSPITAL**

Mrs PEARCE (King) (14:17): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister update the house on the progress of health infrastructure in the northern suburbs?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:17): Thank you very much to the member for King. Yes, I can update the house in relation to the development of health infrastructure in the northern suburbs, because this is critically important for making sure that people in a growing area of our state, in particular in the northern suburbs, can get the health care they need. One thing that we know we need absolutely in terms of our healthcare system is more hospital beds, and that is exactly what we are delivering at the moment at the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

It is fantastic to see the sights of the new crane that has been established at the Lyell McEwin Hospital and the works that are currently underway in our \$47 million plan to build 48 extra beds at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. I thank the member for King for her advocacy for those extra beds at the hospital. They will provide much-needed capacity.

It really was excellent foresight in the original Stage C redevelopment that happened about a decade ago to make sure that there was the capacity to expand on top of that building, underneath the helipad for more beds that would be needed in the future. We are now utilising that opportunity to build those additional beds, which are absolutely needed in the northern suburbs.

Of course, this comes after our project—which was announced back in the Weatherill government in 2017—to significantly rebuild and expand the emergency department at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. The Premier and I were delighted to open that last year. We have also announced an additional stage of that works. It was originally going to go from 56 treatment spaces to 72; we are now taking it up to 76 treatment spaces in the emergency department, acknowledging the great need for additional health care. In addition, at the Lyell McEwin Hospital we have put in place nine additional dialysis chairs at a cost of \$1.2 million because there is a significant need for dialysis in the northern suburbs.

But we know that there will keep being more demands for those healthcare services in the north in the future. That is why I am delighted to announce today that the government is compulsorily acquiring land adjacent to the hospital to make sure that we have the pathway to expand the Lyell McEwin Hospital into the future, because this is a government which thinks about the long term. We know that in the northern suburbs there is going to be greater and greater need for that hospital to expand over coming years. If that land had gone somewhere else, if some other commercial development had been bought there, then that would severely limit our ability to expand the Lyell McEwin Hospital into the future.

Obviously, we have been working with the City of Playford in relation to that, but we are using our compulsory acquisition powers that we have to acquire that. That is some 1.8 hectares of land that is coming into government hands through that compulsory acquisition. Of course, this is not the only project that is happening in the northern suburbs as well, particularly in the north-eastern suburbs.

We are investing very heavily at Modbury Hospital. We are building 44 new mental health beds, replacing the current 20 mental health beds that are available at Modbury Hospital in an outdated facility. Those plans are going very well. We are undertaking a very detailed consultation with our clinicians at the moment to make sure that we get them right, because we do know that mental health care is a significant limiting factor in terms of access block that we see in hospitals, so we critically need more mental health services available, particularly in NALHN as well.

But I think really excitingly also as part of that development at Modbury Hospital is going to be a new cancer centre for the first time at Modbury Hospital so people will be able to get their care closer to home in the north-eastern suburbs. That is something that has been called for by a lot of people in the north-eastern suburbs, and we are delighted that this government will be delivering it.

RIVER MURRAY FLOOD

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:21): My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Will the government establish an independent inquiry into the preparation, response and recovery of the 2022-23 River Murray flood event and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (14:21): I can advise that there is no imminent intention of the government to institute an independent inquiry. This flooding event has been to every extent, both possible and in a planned way, managed in a considered, appropriate way and in a way that has been responsive to community concerns, notwithstanding the fact that this has been one of the most significant natural disasters in our state's history.

There is a body of work being undertaken that is being led by the emergency management council of cabinet and will be reporting directly to cabinet. Some of those matters have been ventilated in this house already, particularly the whole-of-government work being undertaken in respect of levees. It's not a matter within my portfolio responsibilities, but I can advise the member that that is a key priority of the government.

But in direct response to his question, there is absolutely no compelling argument that has either been put to the government or been made by anyone else that would indicate why an independent inquiry into a response by our first responders and our emergency agencies, which I think was exceptional, is warranted.

FELMERI GROUP

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Consumer Affairs. Is the government providing assistance to customers of Felmeri Group? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: South Australian home builder Felmeri Group was placed involuntary administration in recent days, leaving many customers anxious about whether their homes and associated infrastructure will be finished.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (14:23): I want to thank the leader for that question. It has been a challenging time for a number of customers of Felmeri. I actually really feel for them. A lot of these people are in their 20s and 30s, going into first-home ownership. To say the last couple of years for some of those people has been quite distracting and really a distraught process for them is probably not underselling it.

As the leader said, Felmeri did go into administration, I think on 19 May, and about a week later ceased trading. The administrator is still there dealing with, obviously, the close-out issues. I understand there are about 53 projects that are incomplete at the moment, 57 contracts that haven't yet commenced and about 160 completed projects that are still covered by statutory warranties if any defects or the like are found.

Consumer and Business Services Commissioner Dini Soulio has been helping consumers for quite a period of time in the lead-up to the administration. The administrator was then appointed. That probably gave customers some relief in that the building indemnity insurance which QBE provides and which is a statutory requirement has now kicked in, so those consumers will be able to access their \$150,000, or up to \$150,000, under QBE to be able to get the work finished.

I understand there may be some customers who don't have that insurance. The commissioner is investigating at the moment, so I can't comment too much further on that, but if there have been any breaches of the Building Work Contractors Act the commissioner has the ability to prosecute if that is the case.

Having that insurance in place, anyone in this place who has constituents who have been affected, please get them to contact QBE. They have builders that they can refer people to to get that work done or to get rectifications done with access to that insurance policy. Consumer and

Business Services is still helping many of those consumers as well through the process. Again, if anyone has consumers who are not clear on what the process is, please contact Consumer and Business Services and the commissioner and his team are well on hand to be able to support them through this difficult time. I do hope they get their homes finished and get into them as soon as possible now that the administrator has been appointed.

B-DOUBLE TRUCK TRAFFIC

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (14:26): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Does the government have any plans to reduce the number of B-double trucks using Cross Road?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:26): You might be aware, Mr Speaker, that the state government and the commonwealth government are co-funding the Truro bypass.

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia: The one under review.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Not by the South Australian government.

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia: But by the federal government.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What we haven't done is give people false hope by saying that they are going to build—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have not heard any news of them cancelling.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: Why is there a review then?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You would have to ask the commonwealth minister that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will check to see how many times the member has written to me about B-doubles on Cross Road. I am sure that, just like the shadow minister for health, the letter is on its way any moment now. I am sure that if I check with my electorate office and my ministerial office, there will be tens of letters from the member for Unley worried about Cross Road and B-doubles. In fact, since we are interjecting on each other, how many letters have you written to me about Cross Road?

The SPEAKER: No, minister, you are not interjecting and he is not either.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order under 134. The member for Unley, your colleague is seeking to raise a point of order with me.

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

The SPEAKER: Very well. I may have been able to focus on these matters if there were not interjections from either side. I bring the minister to the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir. Cross Road is an important route to the north-south corridor, as is Portrush Road to our ports and harbours, and there have been a lot of promises made about both roads by members in this house. Some members promised a freight bypass and a brand-new airport at Murray Bridge. That never happened. That never happened—never eventuated. It never eventuated, so I am not going to be lectured on freight bypasses by people who I think openly misled people about what their intentions were. That openly misleading was in the terms of GlobeLink.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order from the member for Morialta: standing order 134.

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

The SPEAKER: Very well, I will listen carefully.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The South Australian government has no plans to put extra B-doubles on Portrush Road or Cross Road. None. But we do want to have a freight strategy. Our freight strategy is something that is vitally important for the state's prosperity, and it is vitally important for our freight users to keep the cost of groceries down, to keep inflation down, to make sure that the nation keeps on working.

One of the great investments the previous Labor government made into our freight network was the duplication of the Joy Baluch Bridge, which was announced in the 2017 budget and Mid-Year Budget Review before the 2018 election. It was opened by Minister Brock in an ultimate sign of justice—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hammond!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It was a great contribution to the freight network in this country—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey! Member for Unley!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —because if the Joy Baluch Bridge ever went down or were closed, it would—

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hartley, you are now on three warnings. Minister, you have the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My young friend seems quite excited, sir. Perhaps it was the State of Origin rugby last night. Perhaps he is just excited to see me again in the parliament; he's missed me for the last two days. I am not sure what it is, but ultimately—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —this state government wants to see, as much as we possibly can, the decongestion of South Australian roads, which is why we are spending more on infrastructure now than any other government in the state's history. We have fixed the errors of the north-south corridor, we have fixed the tunnels, we have fixed the exit/entry ramps, we have fixed the consultation—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —we have fixed all the errors of the previous four years on that corridor. We are doing all we can. I will go back and check how many letters the member for Unley has written to me about Cross Road.

AGRITOURISM SECTOR PLAN

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (14:31): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Can the minister update the house on the Agritourism Sector Plan recently launched for the tourism industry conference?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:31): Thank you very much, member for Davenport. I had great joy on Tuesday, at the Tourism Industry Council of South Australia's conference, in front of nearly 350 delegates to announce the sector plan, the Agritourism Sector Plan. There is such exciting potential.

We already have great depth in this area, but about 90 per cent of agritourism is around cellar doors and wineries, of which we have 340 here in South Australia. What we want to do is take the next step in that economic advantage. We know the demand is increasing, particularly in some of those high-end markets that we are interested in gaining back—the US, the UK, and across Europe.

People want to touch, taste and feel. They are disconnected from how produce is grown, packaged and created, and we saw during COVID a real desire for not just for adventure tourism but wellness tourism. Although we are incredibly well known for our food and our drinks, people really are interested in agriculture.

Some of the great things we see are examples like Beerenberg, where people can go and pick their own strawberries, or Lenswood, where they can pick their own apples. My personal favourite at the moment is the Jurlique farm. What a fantastic international product for South Australia—and it's all made here—and you can actually go and see the ingredients that go into those amazing products. But this is just the start. Whether you love a lavender farm—and we have some beautiful ones in KI at Emu Bay—this is an opportunity for us to progress this further.

The aim of this plan is to increase by 295 million by the end of 2025. It's ambitious. Currently, this is only 10 per cent of tourism, agriculture tourism. It's made up of these on-farm experiences or farm-to-fork experiences. The next step is a working group, and I encourage any members who would like to contact my office if they have suggestions as to who might like to be part of that working group. Obviously the regions are a key part of this opportunity, and we are consulting with different head offices and people representing different groups. Food SA, of course, and PIRSA will be involved.

The industry action plan that will follow from this will lead the way. What are the barriers for this to grow? What are the opportunities we have going ahead? Those of you who know me well know that I talk about agritourism a lot, and I think this is a very exciting opportunity for South Australia. We have the depth already in wine, and we have seen cellar doors really increase what they have with their product offerings. This is an opportunity for us to sell South Australia even more.

On another note of tourism, what a night last night was. There were nearly 50,000 spectators at the NRL. I have just had some last-minute figures in, so I'm pleased to share them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: It was the best TV ratings since 2018 for State of Origin last night. This is a great opportunity. South Australia is on the map. The updated figure is that there were more than 15,000 people from interstate. The crowd reached an enormous number.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: It was a great night. It was a great opportunity for us to go after what is one of the most fantastic sporting events, sporting rivalries, in Australia.

YAHL PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister inform the house of his recent visit to Yahl Primary School in the electorate of Mount Gambier?

The SPEAKER: Minister, I'm keen to hear.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:35): I thank the member for Mount Gambier for his important question. I did indeed get an opportunity recently to join the member for Mount Gambier at Yahl Primary School, which for those who are unaware is a picturesque little primary school in the South-East. I had the opportunity to take a tour there with the member for Mount Gambier; the principal, Chris Morrison; and the governing council chair, Brad Crisp.

It is always great to see governing council chairs, particularly in regional areas, take the time away from their work and their jobs, in this case like Brad did, to come along and introduce themselves and say hello and proudly show the minister the school and of course take the opportunity, as the member for Mount Gambier always does and principals always do—and I would be disappointed if they did otherwise—to tell me some of the things that we could do to improve the learning environment and the school's surrounds for the kids who go to school there.

Yahl has 110 students. It was established way back in 1868 and I have to say that it is very, very similar to the primary school that I attended across the border an hour away, which was built in 1863 and had about 40 students. I do have a bit of an affinity for the young people who go to school at Yahl and the parents and all the staff who are trying to make sure that the quality of education the young people at Yahl get and other schools like it—and there are many in the member for Mount Gambier's patch—is of the same quality that students in metropolitan areas get.

We started off our tour with a really beautiful smoking ceremony. I love to see our schools doing that and making sure they involve local Aboriginal people—Indigenous people—and teaching our kids from a very early age the importance of that. Then we got into having a bit of a look around at some of the very ageing infrastructure at Yahl Primary School.

I have to be honest, there was a fair bit of work that needs to be done there. We have a lot of demountable buildings with undergrowth, moss growing in lots of places, stormwater that was running off into different parts of the school where it shouldn't have been, a damaged roof and a lot of damp in different spots as well. We also saw firsthand the state of the covered outdoor learning area, which I could only say has an unbelievable amount of bird droppings sitting on top of it, so there are a few things for us to do there.

As soon as I finished the tour with the member for Mount Gambier, I went back and spoke to the department around what we can do and I'm pleased to say that they are already taking action in terms of the stormwater following the visit, which of course is really important. I'm hoping that I might be able to come back into this place soon and update the member for Mount Gambier and other members of this chamber as well around other action that I hope we can take around Yahl and other schools like it.

But I do just want to take the opportunity that the member for Mount Gambier has given me to put on the record that, as someone who went to a school just like Yahl, which was the same school my father, grandfather and great-grandfather went to, I do have a real affinity for regional students. I remember very well the feeling when I went to school of jealousy, you might say, of what metropolitan schools got that we didn't get and I know the feeling is exactly the same still now right around Australia, not just in South Australia.

I always said to myself that, if I ever got the opportunity like I'm lucky enough to have now to be responsible and a decision-maker for schools and regional schools, I will do everything I can to make sure that we offer the same levels of support to regional schools that we offer to metropolitan schools. Yahl is a fantastic example of a school that has battled along without much investment over many years and I'm hoping that that is something this government can turn around.

GREATER ADELAIDE FREIGHT BYPASS

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Will the minister fund the Greater Adelaide Freight Bypass? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr BATTY: At a public forum in my electorate last week, representatives from the minister's own department stated that investing in this freight network would be 'economically positive' but also stated that the project was not funded at this time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:39): Given the question and the advice that followed the question—that it's got a positive BCR—the question then remains: why hasn't the member called on his own side to fund it?

An honourable member: We ask the questions.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: 'We ask the questions.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: 'We ask the questions.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Badcoe!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It would be—

Members interjecting:

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

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There would be more credibility from the opposition if they said: 'We are prepared to fund the entire cost of the Adelaide freight bypass, not like last time when we said we were funding GlobeLink.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: 'This time it's different. This time we mean it. This time we really mean it. Pretty please with a cherry on top, we mean it.' Seriously, why would we, the state government, fund this project in its entirety by itself without the commonwealth government? Why would the opposition call on us to fund it without wanting to fund it themselves? Perhaps there is an announcement they are going to make. Perhaps the shadow treasurer—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, they are all shaking their heads saying, 'No, we are not funding it.' This is the scenario we are in now. The scenario we are facing now—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond! Member for Flinders!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —is the opposition want us to fund a project that they themselves will not fund. Is that how it works?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Okay, so, 'Please fund a project that we won't fund ourselves.' That's quite the slogan. What bumper sticker are you putting that on?

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Colton!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It was very disappointing to see my younger friends opposite engage in a partisan attack on public servants at a recent public meeting—public servants who were then dead, who worked tirelessly to improve the safety and efficiency of the transport system within South Australia. To attack them for doing their jobs properly reflects poorly not only on those who make these attacks.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond! Member for Morialta!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It may also surprise members opposite—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —but business cases are generally required to secure commonwealth funding for significant projects. The Greater Adelaide Freight Bypass avoids the fiasco of GlobeLink.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That being said, freight productivity improvements remain an economic priority for our government, with the current freight planning studies looking at statewide expressions of a high-productivity vehicle network.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I know you will.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I often sit at home and think, 'What would we do without David Speirs? What would we do without John Gardner?' Thankfully, we still have them. The truth of this matter is that the freight bypass often—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —is used by some political parties to try to frighten communities or to try to secure community support. What this government does is speak the truth to those local communities about what it is we can actually deliver. The most important part is the business case. The most important part is the economic evaluation. What we won't do is break people's hearts like members opposite did by promising a freight bypass and then doing the work afterwards, and then ultimately killing it.

RED-LIGHT CAMERAS

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. Will the minister install a red-light camera at the pedestrian crossing at Marryatville High School and, if so, when?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (14:44): I can inform the member that it is not for me to install a camera; it is for us to act on best advice from the Department for Infrastructure and Transport. That department

advice is yet to be forthcoming. It is still being worked up and as soon as we receive that advice, and as soon as the government considers the options in front of us, we will let the member know.

TONSLEY INNOVATION DISTRICT

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Can the minister please inform the house about the implementation of the Tonsley Innovation District over the last 10 years and what the future holds for this important state asset?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Planning) (14:44): I thank the member for Elder for her question, and I just want to acknowledge her strong campaigns for the community for more drinking fountains and the public toilets being opened on the weekend for local residents.

Tonsley has been going for 10 years and is just about to enter its second decade as one of Australia's leading innovation districts. Recently, Tonsley was inducted into the Global Network of Innovation Districts, which is a group of advanced 21st century innovation precincts seen as globally significant sites. In 2008, vehicle manufacturing ceased, and in 2010 the Rann government bought the 61 hectare site from Mitsubishi with a view to turning it into an innovation hub. The government at the time identified four sectors to focus on: health and medical devices, cleantech and renewable energy, automation software and simulation, and mining and energy services.

Tonsley's success has come from a willingness to share ideas and knowledge. We have had specialist companies such as SAGE Automation, Micro-X, BAE Systems and others mentor and promote careers in STEM and that has fitted perfectly with having academic campuses on site providing direct access to a pool of trained job-ready workers, enabling businesses to rapidly upscale. We have Flinders University and TAFE with around 8,500 students currently using the site for their studies, 140 organisations calling Tonsley home and more than 2,000 people working there, more than double than when Mitsubishi closed.

Some of the really great outcomes from the innovation projects that have come out of Tonsley include SAGE Automation having manufactured control panels for Singapore's Changi Airport and lane-change sequencing technology for Sydney Harbor Bridge, Micro-X lightweight X-ray machines supporting doctors on the frontline in Ukraine, Accurate Dosing Systems creating robots to formulate some of the world's top fragrances—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: That is a popular one—BAE Systems and Flinders uni are using Tonsley as a test bed to find ways to make Osborne one of the safest and most productive shipyards in the world.

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Good to hear from you, Sam, as always.

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Flinders!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Along with all of that, importantly at Tonsley, 500 residents calling Tonsley home and more than 1,800 when the project is complete, helping to answer many of the demands of our housing crisis at the moment. In the energy space, the site is very energy efficient: 13,000 solar panels on the main assembly building producing up to 80 per cent of Tonsley's electricity; a new 10-megawatt battery to be installed on the site, further adding to the energy efficiency; Hydrogen Park, Australia's first green hydrogen production facility and currently home to Australia's largest electrolyser—not for long, though, not for long.

A measure of Tonsley's success is that we had to build a hotel there to accommodate all of the national and international travellers coming there for business and study, La Loft hotel, which I opened, with 88 rooms down there servicing the needs of visitors at the site, a very modern bar—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I open all sorts of stuff—and we are only half way through the 20-year master plan. That is just the first 10 years. The next 10 years will be even more successful for Tonsley.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I hear those opposite—they hate success.

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: There's nothing that gets them going, there's nothing that gets them more animated—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: —than progress and success, green energy, jobs—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: —there is nothing that makes you more upset.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Nothing gets you more upset than progress. That is why—

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: —you oppose major events, that's why you close innovation districts, that's why you oppose economic growth.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister, your time has expired.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

FORESTVILLE HOCKEY CLUB

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (14:49): My question is for the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. Who is responsible for providing planning approval for the Forestville Hockey Club's proposal at Unley Oval? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I have been advised orally by government officers that the City of Mitcham is the relevant body; however, the minister has not responded to requests to confirm this.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:49): I have been patiently awaiting a question from the member for Unley about the Forestville Hockey Club, and I am generally pleased to finally get one.

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I will, of course, answer the member's direct question around the planning approval, which is an important question, but perhaps I could provide little bit of background to members first around how we have got here.

The SPEAKER: Yes: context.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: This is a much sought-after commitment from the Forestville Hockey Club for a new synthetic pitch, which of course is essentially the base level of infrastructure needed

to compete at a high level now. All those high-level competitions don't operate on grass anymore, they operate on synthetic turf, and Forestville Hockey Club have been able to provide that. They are a growing club, hockey is a growing sport, and of course we want to promote any opportunities for people to take part in sports like that.

What the Labor government (then in opposition) committed to after some fantastic advocacy from the member for Badcoe and the member for Elder, amongst others, was to move and provide that synthetic pitch—a multi-use pitch, I might add, which is not just for hockey, but for touch football and for soccer as well—on a piece of land next to Unley High School. Of course, the school has very much supported this proposal.

I spoke to the principal Mr Greg Rolton just a week or two ago after an interview that was done by the member for Unley on 891 during which he changed his position entirely on support for the proposal, which was very interesting indeed, and has done everything in his power over the last few weeks to walk away from the commitment that was made. I have in front of me a letter that was sent by the former minister on 7 December 2020—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe! Member for Elder! Order, member for Taylor! Order, member for Hartley! Your colleague has a point of order.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: 137, sir.

The SPEAKER: Very well. I will listen carefully. As I understand it, the minister is about halfway through his contribution. Minister.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Thank you, Mr Speaker, but I think it is important that I refer to this letter because it goes to the heart of the question that the member for Unley has asked about this very important election commitment from the Malinauskas Labor government. I think it also would be remiss of me not to reflect on the kind of casual attitude that those opposite have to the delivery of election commitments: that they would propose halfway through an 891 ABC interview to completely change their position.

That is not the position, of course, that this government takes on election commitments. We make commitments and we meet them. As I was saying before the member for Unley's point of order, I spoke to the school recently, and the principal Mr Greg Rolton, just to say, 'I understand the local member has now changed his position on supporting the project. Is it the case that the school and you and the governing council have also changed your position?' He said, 'Absolutely not. We are still completely in support.'

That really goes back to the letter sent by the former minister on 7 December 2020, in which he offers in-principle support for it. It's a very detailed letter talking about what will be there:

The school has advised it is supportive of the proposal in line with the government's wish to promote community use of school facilities, and schools as community hubs.

I am supportive in principle of providing the club with a long-term occupancy arrangement over a portion of the site should the proposal proceed.

Which I think is the key thing here.

The member for Unley would rather us get caught up in the semantics now around where planning approval rests. It is a legitimate question—and the piece of land that we have committed to putting the synthetic turf pitch on is a piece of education land, so there is a question around whether planning approval will be handled by the local council or the education department. But I can say that there is absolutely no question that this has incredible support from the local community, incredible support from an enormous school, and I think it is a very bold local member who would be out there proposing to take away an incredible piece of shared-use infrastructure like a synthetic turf pitch from the biggest high school in their seat.

Ms Stinson interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Hartley, you are on three warnings. Member for Hammond, too—also on three warnings.

LIVE MUSIC SECTOR

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Arts. Can the minister advise how much the government has spent on its live music election promises? Will the government be spending any unspent funds in live music or returning the money to Treasury? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: When justifying cuts to other parts of the arts portfolio the minister has repeatedly cited the Labor election commitment of \$10 million to live music, amongst other commitments. But this funding includes \$5 million to a fund in relation to COVID cancellations that has been little used, and \$2 million on an e-voucher scheme that the opposition has been advised has been undersubscribed.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (14:54): I thank the member for his question. Yes, it was a \$10 million election commitment comprised of a range of commitments particularly around venue improvement grants, and that was fully subscribed; certain event grants to assist music festivals, etc., and that has all been spent; there was \$5 million for the COVID cancellation fund, and that is sitting there, as I understand it, in the event that there is a government-imposed shutdown, effectively. The commitment was there; it was clear in the election commitment, and we are sticking to that election commitment.

In terms of the e-vouchers, they are going through round by round to make sure that they are spent at the venues, to engage live music in those venues, and to pay those musicians. That has been a huge success. A significant amount of money—I don't have the figure with me right now but I can get that figure to you—has gone out the door, and we continue with our rounds to make sure those musicians are supported to get through what was a really—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: Yes, the minister tells me, the great mental health support program I think was half a million dollars, in terms of providing support. Getting through that COVID and supporting live music to get back on its feet is a really important focus for the arts portfolio. Going into the last election, these commitments were made by the government and these commitments have been executed. It is really good to see live music getting back on its feet and getting through that COVID period, and that is really important for us.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FILM INDUSTRY

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for the Arts. Can the minister update the house on how the South Australian government is supporting the South Australian screen industry?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (14:57): I thank the member for her question. It is excellent that she has such strong support for the screen industry because it is a vital part of the South Australian economy and the arts ecosystem. What we want to see from our screen industry is some great local content being produced here in South Australia.

I know the member herself has passionately advocated for what was Mercury CX and, as of Tuesday night, is now the Mercury. The Mercury is a really important part of the screen sector in South Australia in supporting emerging film makers to get from really that university training into being professional screen makers here. To have a really strong screen sector is important to be able to tell our stories. It is a really important part of capturing our imagination. Allowing us to experience life through someone else's eyes is actually really important, as well as obviously the economic boost that it gives, and the employment opportunities.

Particularly with respect to the Mercury, for a long time it has been a critical part of the ecosystem for the screen sector in South Australia. It provides incredible development opportunities for emerging talent. It has traditionally done this through professional development opportunities for emerging writers, directors and producers.

Soon after being sworn in as the Minister for Arts, I was made aware of the quite precarious financial position of the Mercury through a report that the former minister had commissioned. That landed on my desk and, without going into the details of the past year or so, this has ultimately resulted in the election of a new board. Very highly experienced industry professionals came on to the board of the Mercury late last year. They have taken the reins of the Mercury and they are steering it in a new and very promising direction.

On Tuesday night, as the member might be aware, I was at the AGM for the Mercury. It was very pleasing to hear the board's new strategic plan and its plans for a new sustainable business model, which I am very impressed with. The new business model is going to be based on a subscription membership base. That will provide opportunities for members not only to see films at the Mercury but to develop their skills as emerging filmmakers with some of the resources that are there. Co-chair of the Mercury, Peter Hanlon, said at the AGM that the Mercury will now be providing everything needed to produce exceptional quality film except, of course, the creativity that's needed—that is, those incredibly talented filmmakers.

I was very happy to share with members at the Mercury AGM that the government is going to be providing a grant of \$150,000 over two years to help with the implementation of that new business model. The membership-based approach at the Mercury will make sure its members continue to be provided with the opportunity to develop their skills and have their work showcased to local audiences. I hope that grant funding will continue, with the SAFC Board supporting the Mercury with a \$240,000 industry development grant. That was confirmed on Tuesday night as well.

The board, including co-chairs Peter Hanlon, Kirsty Stark and CEO Lisa Bishop, has done an incredible amount of work since late last year to get the Mercury back on track with a really solid foundation. It does have a very positive future ahead. As I said to the members at the AGM, we really need the membership support to make sure this independent association continues to be able to support the emerging film sector.

Grievance Debate

STATE BUDGET

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:01): Mr Speaker, I want you to cast your mind back to before the 2022 election, when Labor vowed that there would be no new taxes, no tax increases, and that the state budget would be kept in surplus. Well, we know two of those three things have already been broken in just the first 12 months: fees and charges are up two budgets in a row, despite the Treasurer's murmurings of potentially stepping in to take pressure off in the cost-of-living crisis if inflation remained high.

But, just two weeks ago, the Treasurer sat here last sitting week telling us in this chamber that the budget will not be in surplus this financial year. That is right: the \$233 million forecast surplus for 2022-23 announced in last year's budget has evaporated. Labor promised fiscal discipline, but what we are getting is a masterclass in financial mismanagement. They promised that the budget would be kept in surplus and, just a year in, the wheels have well and truly fallen off.

We saw a vintage performance in this place yesterday from the Treasurer, trying to shift the blame onto the former federal Coalition government and his own federal colleagues for changing the way the GST is distributed to the states (into the future, I may add)—but absolutely nothing to do with this budget. The reality is that, between the Treasurer handing down his budget in June 2022 to the most recent federal budget forecast, South Australia's share of GST has increased by nearly \$324 million.

Yesterday was just another example of the litany of excuses this Treasurer is using to cover up. But we know that, whilst he might be able to run, he certainly cannot hide from the fact that this was just another broken promise and also a clear sign that Labor cannot be trusted when it comes

to managing the economy. As *The Advertiser* front page stated a fortnight ago: 'Stephen blows the budget'.

We had a projected \$233 million surplus and \$324 million in additional GST revenue. That is over \$550 million just there, and that is not including the uptick in additional state-based taxation revenue: gambling taxes, stamp duty taxes, payroll taxes. This is a government that cannot control their own spending. They have not just missed it by a little bit: they have missed it by that much—same old Labor, same old excuses, same old spending.

We were dealt another blow last sitting week with the news that South Australia has now the single worst unemployment rate in the country, skyrocketing to 4.3 per cent, all while the state is dealing with the crippling cost-of-living crisis and nation-leading inflation of 7.9 per cent. The condition of the South Australian economy not only reveals Labor's inability to manage our state's finances but highlights their mismanaged priorities—their financial mismanagement and leaving South Australian families to bear the brunt of an escalating cost-of-living crisis.

What is more, in the federal budget just a couple of weeks ago it became starkly clear that the Premier's own federal colleagues do not have confidence in him. The brain drain, as they say, is coming back to South Australia, with net interstate migration forecast to return to levels that we have not seen in four years—up to 3,500 to 4,000 people leaving our state. Young South Australians who are looking for jobs in industries are leaving our state. The tap has been turned back on.

The reality is that the state's finances should be in a place to provide relief to all South Australians who need it. With an unanticipated GST windfall and historic tax revenue due to inflation, this government should have been in a place to help more South Australians, but according to the Treasurer there is just nothing left.

MAJOR SPORTING EVENTS

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:05): Last night, there were 48,000 people at Adelaide Oval to watch one of the great rivalries in sport: the Blues versus the Maroons. I was really happy to do work on this back in 2017. We announced the State of Origin in January 2018, and we locked it in for every third year. It was terrific to be there last night and see the Blues and the Maroons. Of course, I had the Maroons gear on. It was great to see Queensland prevail by eight points.

Today, we have also announced another coup for South Australia. In 2025, South Australia will host the Beach Volleyball World Championships. This is the first time that these championships will be held in Asia or Oceania. As well as the world championships, we have locked in an Asian championship and six national events over the next three years. So, between 2024, 2025 and 2026, we are going to have eight beach volleyball and indoor volleyball events here in South Australia, which marries up with our commitment to a sport that has called Adelaide home in the men's program since before the Sydney Olympics, down at the South Australian Sports Institute.

What we want to do is provide a pathway for our emerging athletes and also have training centres here for athletes around Australia who come and want to be part of the national team. That follows on from the investment we are making at the South Australian Sports Institute, where we are building a new centre next to the South Australian Athletics Stadium at Mile End.

I want to thank a whole bunch of people, including those who run the world governing body of volleyball. I was in Switzerland last year meeting with the International Olympic Committee and a number of different sporting federations. As I worked my way around from meeting to meeting, the question I got the most was, 'Where's Adelaide?' It just proves that you actually need to get on a plane and go and tell people what Adelaide has to offer. When you do that, they take notice and look at alternatives other than maybe some of the bigger cities in Australia.

What we have proved through the Major Events Attraction Committee that I chair is that this is all about relationships. Some of the other states have been bidding more money for events that we have won already or that we are close to agreements on because of the relationships we have with these international and national sporting bodies.

I want to thank Andrew Dee, the CEO of Volleyball Australia, who has been terrific to work with over the past few months as we have honed the negotiations and discussions about where we

will host these different events. The world championships will be hosted at Memorial Drive because grandstands and a roof are already in place, which were a great investment by the previous government—credit where it is due—in sporting infrastructure. We will have seating for 8,000 people, we will have great media facilities and we will have facilities there for the corporates as well.

We will be taking some of the world's best players out to film games that will not count as qualifying games, but they will be at places like Port Willunga, Grange Beach and Glenelg. The ones at Glenelg will figure in the championships in some cases. We will take them to Kangaroo Island. We will use these world championships as a vehicle to promote our wonderful beaches here in South Australia, not only along the metropolitan coastline but right throughout South Australia.

I think sometimes people interstate and overseas do not appreciate just how good the beaches are here in South Australia. Sometimes we have visitors over and they say, 'We went down to Henley,' or 'We went down to Port Willunga and cannot believe that you've got these beaches and everyone is not actually crowded all on top of each other.'

I also want to thank Craig Carracher, who started life as a young lawyer, as Kerry Packer's legal counsel, and owns a business now called Scape, which is the biggest provider of student accommodation in Australia. He is a former beach volleyball player himself. He is on the Australian Olympic Committee, he is the President of Volleyball Asia and he is the President of Volleyball Australia. Craig is a very astute businessperson who has been a pleasure to deal with over the past few months. Not only do we now have a great relationship with him around volleyball competitions here but also he is keen to invest in South Australia. That is terrific news, and it just shows that some of these events bring a lot more than just sport to South Australia.

STIRLING HOSPITAL

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:11): On 1 August 1927, the community of Stirling and Mount Lofty and surrounding districts gathered for what was a truly momentous occasion for the Mount Lofty districts, and nearly 100 years on that proud history, the opening of the Stirling districts community hospital, continues. I might reflect on the remarks of Mr Rudall on behalf of the board on that special occasion. When speaking to the large crowd that was gathered, he went into detail concerning the fine civic spirit which had prompted people to ensure that the hospital was successfully established.

Looking through the financial statement of the donations, which were too numerous to mention singly, he said, as *The Register* reported at that time, that he was struck by the item which showed £5 raised by a concert at Scott Creek. That was not a place like Mount Lofty with its stately residencies, but consisted of the houses of working people. Such effort had enabled them all to build up such a splendid foundation that permitted the acquisition and establishment of the hospital.

I can tell the chamber today that that community spirit remains unabated. It remains as strong as ever, because on 11 May, at very short notice, in the Stirling RSL Hall gathered a crowd that burst that place to the seams. More than 200 people came out on a cold night to express their solidarity for the Stirling community hospital to remain open in Stirling. They had been moved by news that the much-loved hospital, which will soon celebrate its centenary, may have an uncertain future. They had heard that there may be the possibility that the hospital will close its doors and relocate to Mount Barker.

I say to the chamber, and I say to this parliament and to all South Australians, that that truly would be a most unfortunate outcome—a most unfortunate outcome indeed. We know that over its nearly a century Stirling Hospital has maintained a reputation as among the safest in South Australia. In fact, clinicians and treating GPs have told me in recent days and weeks that if one is looking for a place where it is important to maintain infection control and the avoidance of infection risk, then you refer them to the Stirling hotel.

I say 'hotel': it is known as the Hilton of Stirling because of its great reputation for quality and cleanliness, the Stirling Hospital that is so affectionately known. It remains much loved, and I can tell members that it takes a fair amount to move the community of Stirling and districts, but when it does it speaks loudly and with great credibility. I hope that message is coming through clearly to the board.

At that gathering on 11 May, and in the days following that, 56 or so submissions containing a very large number of questions were identified and have been submitted to the board, and I am grateful for the board's indication that it is diligently going about the process of analysing those questions with a view to providing answers. There have been many communications that I have received over this period of time since the prospect of a future other than 100 more years at Stirling has been raised.

Let me make it very clear: among those in the audience on 11 May were board members of long standing, including my predecessor Isobel Redmond, who served 27 years on the board of the Stirling Hospital, and board chairs including Ross Sands, John Venus and Barrie Lloyd—people who exemplify community service at Stirling. They spoke as one when they said that not only do they have a strong and abiding personal connection to the hospital, but they will make sure that those who are charged with the responsibility for its management today do all that is necessary to ensure it has a strong future at Stirling.

LIMESTONE COAST

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:16): Every year the state budget announcement heralds the government's focus on our state—and in particular the Limestone Coast. This year two key priorities for budget allocation are very clear: housing and health. Our city's health needs include additional mental health services, end-of-life care, and addressing the city's pressing skilled healthcare professionals shortage.

Earlier this year I spoke out in state parliament about the need to support and grow our regional nursing workforce, which was broadly supported by both sides in this chamber. Subsidies to support regional students through metropolitan placements would be a great start to growing the state's healthcare workforce in line with our needs. Just on that point, I received an email from a nursing student I will call M. This is what she wrote to me on 29 May:

I'm writing to you as I am [a] very frustrated, upset, stressed and overwhelmed Mount Gambier UniSA second year nursing student, and have just received my placement, which is at the Royal Adelaide Hospital from 24/06/2023 to 20/07/2023. This has given me three weeks' notice, which is absolutely appalling on UniSA's behalf.

For UniSA to expect me to find accommodation and save money for a metro placement in three weeks is unrealistic. I have been emailing CPU (who allocates our placements) and the course coordinator for weeks before now and [even] calling CPU to find out my placement allocation but I was not even given the respect for my emails to be acknowledged.

I've looked at accommodation tonight which is over \$4,000 for that period of time and I won't be getting paid as I won't be able to work. I personally cannot afford that and with only three weeks' notice it is now too late to apply for Centrelink or to be granted scholarships/grants. I may even have to drop out of my course due to the un-organisational effort UniSA have shown to me in this situation.

I look forward to hearing back from you, and hopefully having a resolution to this matter...I would be happy to meet up to discuss...further.

So, again, what I have raised in here is being brought to life in very real terms as we speak.

In Home Hospice Care run a very special, holistic, end-of-life service, and they are in the position of needing ongoing funding to continue their work. After receiving \$150,000 from the state Liberal government in 2020, their funds are running out.

I cannot mention health without mentioning the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme. My electorate is one of the biggest utilisers of this scheme. I have spoken previously about this. At \$40 a night, it is very difficult for people seeking accommodation in Adelaide. Even a small rise in the accommodation subsidy would make a huge difference to the many Mount Gambier people who have to travel outside the region to receive specialist health care.

A particular focus of mine over the last few years has been medical cannabis and the tremendous opportunities this industry could provide for our region while producing quality healthcare products for South Australians who need them. It is my belief that regional South Australia, including the city of Mount Gambier, has a big role to play in the production and manufacturing space, and I will be speaking about this later this year.

In August 2021, I wrote in the Future Mount Gambier document that housing would be one of our greatest challenges in coming years and this statement, sadly, is revealing itself as a fact. It is clear we need more affordable public, community and professional housing options in Mount Gambier and across the state. When we have teachers and nurses living in caravan parks, the situation is pretty dire. When we have people living on the streets of Mount Gambier because they cannot find a secure, stable house, it is a crushing situation.

Housing underpins everything. A housing boom has seen real estate skyrocket, pushing homes out of reach for first-home buyers and making rental properties unaffordable. Service agencies are reporting the lack of affordable housing as their number one issue, forcing many into homelessness or insecure situations, resulting in increased demand for crisis and emergency housing and this is affecting those who are on an income. Additional housing options would allow our city to retain those all-important skilled workers, as well as alleviating pressure on the public housing waitlist and the private rental market.

BRAVE FOR DAVE

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:21): Last year, I sadly attended the funeral of Dave Fiebig. He was a remarkable man, and his passing was such a devastating tragedy for all those who knew him, his family and his friends. He was one of these extraordinarily positive people. He was so fit, so healthy and so active and he was one of these people who could just fit so much into his day. It was on one day in December 2021 when everything changed for him; his wife, Chloe; and their two sons, Duke and Banks, because they received the devastating and life-changing news that Dave had brain cancer.

Chloe was immediately thrust into the role of primary carer, navigating a really uncertain medical world whilst also raising their two children who were four and three months at the time. They did not know where to turn. They did not know what this meant. They did not know what the day-to-day management of living with brain cancer would look like. They did not know anything about palliative care and, frankly, they did not know how much time they had left together.

Just like Dave and Chloe, there are so many patients who do not know where to turn to when they get this life-changing and devastating diagnosis. Chloe and Dave were so fortunate in some ways because they did receive some support from Ginta and the NeuroSurgical Research Foundation, as well as their neurosurgeon, Dr Adam Wells, who by all reports provided such deeply caring clinical and emotional support, but of course he is a neurosurgeon and Ginta is part of a research organisation.

Dave lost a very brave battle to cancer. It lasted seven months and now Chloe, who is just one of the most amazing, strongest women I have met, is using her grief and fighting for better outcomes for families who are going through those same challenges. She has started a foundation called Brave for Dave for families who are going through the same troubles. There are around 300 families each year in South Australia who receive the devastating news that they have a brain tumour and neurosurgeons and clinicians will tell you that it is one of the hardest things to manage.

Over the weekend, the Leader of the Opposition, Ginta, Chloe and I stood together calling for there to be a brain tumour support coordinator in South Australia and Chloe's experience really does show why we need one. We are actually the only state in the nation that does not have such a coordinator role, and we believe it is about time we did, just to really connect patients and their families to the services that are out there but that patients do not have the time to be able to go searching for. Having a brain tumour support coordinator would help ensure that patients and their families can spend that last precious time together.

I have known Chloe, Dave's wife, for well over a decade now. We knew each other through netball. We were at the Institute of Sport together and I remember when Chloe first met Dave. It was something that was so special to see. Chloe has always operated with a real sense of passion and determination to get things done, and she is now directing that passion and determination towards supporting families who have received this devastating news that their loved ones have brain cancer. She speaks with honesty and a genuine desire to help other families.

Having this role is about alleviating some of that burden. It has unanimous support from all the neurosurgeons from across South Australia and now we just need the government to provide some of that funding. It is estimated that such a role would cost around \$100,000, and the NeuroSurgical Research Foundation are willing to stump up some of that money. In a SA Health budget of around \$8 billion, \$100,000 is a drop in the ocean financially, but we know it would make such an extraordinary difference to those who are going through so much. I would like to thank Chloe and Ginta for their advocacy work. To all the patients and the families who are out there suffering with a brain tumour, we will keep fighting for you.

I hope we can work in a bipartisan way to get things done. The minister laughs but over the weekend we actually made it very clear that this is not something that we sought to politicise. We made that clear at the press conference, and I thought it was a shame that the minister sought to do so yesterday because, frankly, I do not care who gets the credit. This is not about political one-upmanship.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order, member for Schubert. Please be seated. There is a point of order from the minister.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I ask the member to retract the comments that were made in relation to allegations made against me.

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert, offence has been taken.

Mrs HURN: If the minister could repeat the allegation, that would be helpful.

The SPEAKER: It is a subjective standard.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The allegation that I politicised the matter in relation to brain cancer.

The SPEAKER: Very well. Member for Schubert, it is a subjective standard as to whether a member is offended by language you have used. The swiftest path is to withdraw and apologise.

Mrs HURN: I withdraw, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: And apologise.

Mrs HURN: And apologise.

The SPEAKER: Very well.

GILES ELECTORATE

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:27): I rise today to talk about a number of issues in my electorate. The first of those issues is the intent by Rex to pull its airline service out of Whyalla. I would have to say that this has been something of an ongoing saga initiated by the federal government. It is the federal government's imposition of particular security arrangements on regional airports. Some of those regional airports might well be able to afford what is done. They might have passenger numbers that are such that a passenger head tax to pay for the very costly impost might not be of great impact, but in Whyalla it is of great impact.

The security that has been imposed looks like coming in at something like \$1.2 million or \$1.3 million a year. The previous federal government partly came to the party in assisting with some of the capital upgrade to the airport and the capital around the security. At the time, we lobbied for that to happen and I joined with others—the council and some Senate members—to see that happen. I have to say that the federal member, Rowan Ramsey, was supportive of that as well.

The important issue—and I had some discussions with the council about this—and the killer was going to be the recurrent costs associated with that. What the previous federal government did not do was put in place a framework beyond some interim funding to address this high cost impact on small regional airports.

I would have to say that the last budget by the current federal government was a great one in a whole range of ways, but one of its failures was the failure to address this impost on small regional airports. That is despite the fact that myself and a whole range of other people and organisations and councils have lobbied for a framework to be developed. So what has now

happened in Whyalla is that the council were put in an invidious position: either they absorb the cost, which would have represented a 13 per cent increase in rates just for the security, or they do the right thing and impose the cost on the airline, which in turn imposes the cost on the passengers.

Whyalla is serviced by Qantas and Rex, and it is Qantas that triggered the need to upgrade the security arrangements, so you could argue that Rex were right to be peeved, in that the council attempted to spread the cost across both the airlines. As a result of that, Rex has said, 'Well, we're going to pull the pin.' So that is going to be fewer services for Whyalla, and it does not just impact Whyalla; Port Augusta does not have any commercial airlines, and obviously some of the smaller communities closer to Whyalla do not have any commercial airlines.

Whyalla plays an incredibly important role, and it plays an important role when it comes to a whole range of medical services and businesses that rely upon frequent and flexible services and pricing when it comes to airlines. The costs are often high anyway with both airlines, but I think it would be fair to say Qantas tends to be more expensive. What this is going to do, apart from reducing the number of services per day flying to and from Whyalla, is also remove competitive tension.

There is a solution to this and it will not cost the federal government anything: impose a federal framework, a passenger head tax federally, and it would cost less than a dollar. The estimate is 75¢ per passenger, given it is spread over millions of passengers, instead of imposing this onerous cost on small regional airports. When it comes to this issue, the federal government needs to pull its finger out and do the right thing by these small regional airports.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:32): I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 13 June 2023 at 11:00am.

Bills

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY (DOMESTIC ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (15:33): I am incredibly proud to be speaking to this bill today, as I always am when given the opportunity in this place to stand up for those experiencing domestic family violence and abuse. I have spoken in the house on multiple occasions not only about my own experience with domestic and family violence growing up but also about cycles and the cyclical nature of that abuse. We do know that without action cycles continue, and my family is but one example of how that cycle continued longer than it should have.

It is in fact the defence of women, particularly women and also children, who grew up in situations like I did with significant family and domestic violence that has given rise to my ability to be in this place in the first place. I think it is something so incredibly important to stand up for and stand up against, particularly for those of us with lived experience to speak out about our experiences to see betterment and change.

As we have heard earlier today in the criminal consolidation bill, speaking up is incredibly important. It is important to use our voices in this place, to acknowledge the real impacts of domestic violence on people across our state, and also the names and the faces of those people because using statistics is not enough. It is important to acknowledge the real lives and the real stories of people domestic and family violence and abuse affects.

I spoke on a previous bill with respect to domestic and family violence about my experience seeking accommodation support as a child. I thought I would share a sentence from a letter I received in response to speaking on that bill because it is one of the most important and special things that I have received. The letter said:

Dear Olivia,

Thank you for sharing your story and helping to further destigmatize this issue. The devastating truth is that family and domestic violence is all too common in our community. It occurs in all neighbourhoods and in all regions. That's why speaking up on this legislation is so critical—it will literally save lives.

I often think of that when I think of the role that we have as members of parliament and representatives of our community in this place. The role is not just to represent our communities: it is to stand up for our communities and stand up for those who may not have the ability to do so themselves.

We know that the statistics are incredibly high, particularly against women, knowing that one in four women has experienced intimate partner violence since the age of 15 and that one in four women has experienced emotional abuse by a current or former partner since the age of 15 as well. The statistics on domestic and family violence are even greater, particularly those effects on children which often are not in the statistics because those children do not have a voice of their own or the ability to report on those statistics.

This bill is incredibly important. It adds domestic abuse as a new protected attribute against discrimination and it does progress a key election commitment made by our government. It is part of a suite of policies on women's safety, equality and wellbeing, and on not just equality and wellbeing but also economic policies because we know that domestic violence and domestic abuse have significant economic impacts. In fact, those are the ones that often play a role in individuals being unable to leave circumstances and leave those abusers because of their economic circumstances and the situations at work that prevent them from doing so.

We are prioritising women's safety and empowerment in our government and the many different facets that come with that. Discrimination, particularly within the workplace, is another thing that needs proactive and thoughtful legislation. We know that domestic violence is not just a social issue. As I mentioned before, it is an economic issue, and the impacts on women, particularly women at work, are particularly significant.

We see the economic challenges for women facing domestic violence, and those barriers are significant to those wishing to escape from family and domestic violence situations. We want to ensure that those individuals do not have to choose between their safety and independence on the one hand and their economic security on the other. We know that economic security is probably the major barrier a lot of women do experience when making that decision about whether or not to leave. In particular, if they feel they will be discriminated against in their workplace, that may impact their choices as well.

Earlier this year, we passed a bill with respect to domestic violence leave further to the bill passed by the Albanese Labor government. That bill made it a criminal offence for an employer to disclose information obtained without the consent of the employee to whom the information relates. The leave that we were able to succeed with sends a clear message to the community, and to workers and their families, that the biggest employers in our state do not and will not tolerate domestic violence.

Prohibiting this level of discrimination in the workplace is just one more step towards achieving better equality and better outcomes, and allowing for greater economic security for those individuals experiencing domestic violence, particularly in their workplaces. The Attorney's office has worked very closely with the Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic And Family Violence in order to develop this bill. A large number of stakeholders were invited to comment on the bill throughout the consultation process.

The bill proposes to make it unlawful to treat someone unfavourably because they or their relative or associate have been subject to domestic abuse. I think it is really important to note here the inclusion of 'relative' and/or 'associate' because, of course, there are a lot of people who are often trying to assist or protect family members or dear friends, particularly in the workplace, knowing that those individuals often need support from those closest to them, so I do think that inclusion is a particularly important aspect of this bill.

This bill provides protections to prevent perpetrators of violence from disingenuously claiming to be the victim under the proposed legislation. We know that unfortunately that is all too common: people returning with a counter accusation or perhaps claiming they are the victims of the offence in order to rid themselves of the rightful shame they should have for perpetrating those acts in the first place.

This proposed legislation will also not prohibit employers from taking reasonable action in relation to an employee who is underperforming who is experiencing that abuse if there is a reasonable policy that applies equally to those employees in the first place. The bill will prohibit discrimination in all areas of public life covered by the Equal Opportunity Act, being employment or engagement in work, which does include unpaid work, and the provision of education, decisions of associations and qualifying bodies, and the provision of land, goods, services and accommodation.

A number of different scenarios come into play in consideration of this bill. For example, criticising or treating an employee differently because they made the decision or needed to take the time off for domestic violence leave, which is something that would indeed preclude a lot of people or make them feel that they were unable to take that leave in the first place—that would be the undue criticism or perhaps the stigma that that creates at work. It also prohibits scenarios such as refusing to rent a property to someone because they are protected under an IVO.

It is really important in terms of accessibility because there are also elements in this bill that mean you do not have to necessarily be pursuing criminal charges or have an IVO or have an individual who has been convicted of domestic violence related charges for this to apply. It is so important here to note the level of freedom that gives to victims who are experiencing domestic violence but for many reasons, whether it be reasons of safety—physical safety, emotional safety or economic safety—or whether it be for other reasons, such as not having enough evidence to pursue criminal charges or wanting to keep the family together to some degree. Those individuals will still be able to benefit from this bill and not be included within the parameters of the bill because they have not sought criminal reparations towards the person who has been abusive.

I think that that is really important. It is not often easy for individuals to seek those reparations against those who have been abusive, particularly in the case of those who have children. You hear time and time again stories of particularly women—but not always women—who do not want to take actions further because they do not want to broaden the stigma, or they want to keep a connection between the partner or the ex-partner and their children.

I have a lot of respect for those who make the decision not to pursue those charges, but I also would like to acknowledge that it is often difficult to get to that stage—difficult from an emotional perspective, difficult particularly if you have been suffering emotional abuse and you are unable to accept the ramifications or be aware of what is actually occurring to you in your relationship, and that is all too common. It is also difficult in terms of process. Being able to pursue those reparations is quite significant, and it does take an emotional toll and, for a lot of people, it retraumatises those individuals as well. I think that that is an incredibly important aspect of the bill, allowing individuals to be protected even if they have not sought those further actions or an intervention order against those individuals.

So I am incredibly proud of the work that we are doing as a government here. It is incredibly pleasing when you have discussions and we know that there are different things that we are doing all the time to make individuals feel safer and that they will be more protected under our government because the government are making a decision to intervene and to assist those individuals who are, unfortunately, still, in 2023, suffering from domestic violence and abuse. I am very happy to support this bill today.

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (15:45): I rise in support of this bill. I would like to thank the Attorney-General and the Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence for all of the work that they have done. As an industrial advocate in my previous employment, I managed many cases where it was clear that discrimination was prevalent. I did manage cases sometimes where staff were trying to access domestic violence leave. It was an incredibly tricky topic: to protect them and their privacy but also make sure that they got their entitlement that they so desperately needed to access.

I managed a case where a member was in a relationship and was experiencing domestic violence. Her treatment from her immediate manager was incredibly poor. While she was up-front with her manager about what was happening, her manager ignored her cries for help. She proceeded to try to performance-manage the member and spoke about her situation with others, who included people she worked with. The behaviour was just appalling. The member had some small children and was effectively couch surfing to try to find a safe place to live. Whilst the employer in question touted themselves as being an employer of choice and one that often announced publicly their support and their policies on domestic violence, underneath there was this discrimination and bullying.

I am glad to be here today to talk about a bill that will prohibit criticising or otherwise treating an employee poorly because they have taken time off to take domestic violence leave. The bill proposes to make it unlawful to treat someone unfavourably, which is just absolutely what is necessary because if they or a relative or an associate have been subjected to domestic abuse, then they need to be treated with care, not with discrimination.

No-one should have to live in an abusive relationship, whether it is physical, emotional or financial, or experience coercive controlling behaviours. The bill amends the Equal Opportunity Act 1984 to add domestic abuse as a new protected attribute against discrimination. People experiencing domestic or family violence need every support they can get, and establishing the experience of domestic abuse as a ground protected under the antidiscrimination laws is an important first step in helping them break free from these abusive relationships.

Under the Equal Opportunity Act, someone is found to be treated unfavourably based on an attribute if they are treated less favourably than someone else in similar circumstances without the relevant attribute. When my member was ready to return to the workplace, she was asked within a few weeks why she was not performing, having been on leave for nearly six months. If someone had returned from sick leave or long service leave they would not have been treated this way, and I am glad this bill will add protections for workers going forward.

The bill also seeks to protect people in their public life, in all areas covered by the Equal Opportunity Act: employment or engagement in work, including unpaid work (volunteering); the provision of education; decisions of associations and qualifying bodies; and the provision of land, goods, services and, of course, accommodation.

Refusing to rent a property to a victim of domestic abuse if they are protected under an intervention order will become illegal. Where a survivor has been living in crisis accommodation or couch surfing, as my member had been, or staying with family, they may not be able to provide what would be deemed a stable rental history. The bill prohibits indirect discrimination. This form of discrimination is found to occur when a general requirement is imposed that persons with a protected attribute (in this case, subject to domestic violence) cannot comply with or will find more difficult to comply with (in this case, stable rental history).

Mr Speaker, I have recently been watching an incredibly emotive series called *Maid*. I am not sure if you have seen it. There were a lot of tears when watching it. Whilst I have not been a victim of domestic violence, there were some things in there that really spoke around warning signs, that things can escalate quickly. It is a very confronting story of a domestic violence abuse survivor. There is a point where the survivor is searching for accommodation for her and her baby. They left the house with nothing. They are on welfare and are turned away from house after house, as the rental assistance they have been provided with was not something many landlords wanted to accept. Whilst this is a fictitious story, one can perceive her experiences will not be uncommon. I am glad that this bill seeks to right those wrongs.

Putting stories like these on the TV allows people to really take a second look at what domestic violence survivors actually go through and the battle that they have to even leave the relationship and the number of times they may go back to the relationship, thinking things will only get better, only to find out that they again end up in a similar situation and then the shame they feel for doing it and for going back. It was clearly demonstrated in this film. I know that that definitely would be something that people deal with when they are trying to escape the situation. I think it is

good that these stories are on the TV and on the movies so that we can talk about domestic violence more and we can do what we must to try to stop it from happening.

This bill also contains a power for the equal opportunity commissioner to decline to take action on a complaint of domestic abuse discrimination if there is insufficient evidence that the complainant was subject to domestic abuse. What we sometimes see is perpetrators, in order to get out of the stigma of being a perpetrator or trying to get their partner back or just trying to avoid prosecution, say that they, too, are a victim of domestic abuse. The commissioner will be able to make sure that the evidence that is provided is sufficient, that it is clear that domestic abuse has occurred.

It is sad that this is something that happens. Sometimes they may not even think that what they are doing is abuse until it is really given to them and then turn around and pretend that they are the victim. In this case, the bill will protect the actual victim. It gives a clear basis for the commissioner to screen out these complaints in addition to her existing powers to decline to take action on complaints that are frivolous, vexatious or lacking in substance. The disingenuous complainant will then be unable to access assistance or conciliation through the commissioner, so there will be no course for them past that, although they will be able to access SACAT if they feel that they have that right.

The requirement for providing sufficient evidence does not seek to place additional difficulties and burdens on the victims of abuse, however. The bill intentionally provides a broad definition of what can constitute evidence of abuse, including an intervention order, medical records or evidence of seeking or obtaining assistance from a charitable organisation that will protect them if they are not ready to go to police but they have sought some help. This bill will cover them.

Our government is doing all it can to help prevent and end domestic violence and help rebuild the lives of survivors. This legislation will ensure that those who face discrimination for experiencing domestic violence can access support and an avenue for recourse through the Equal Opportunity Commission. I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (15:52): I rise today to speak on the Equal Opportunity (Domestic Abuse) Amendment Bill and commend it to the house. This amendment bill is a really important step in addressing the issue of domestic abuse in South Australia. The amendments we are looking at seek to protect and support victims of domestic abuse through the improvement of existing laws and, in particular, amends the Equal Opportunity Act 1984 to prohibit discrimination in all areas of public life covered by the act. That includes employment or engagement in work (including unpaid work), the provision of education, decisions of association and qualifying bodies, and the provision of land, goods and services and accommodation.

Specifically, this bill would further define domestic abuse as a form of discrimination. As such, it will be illegal to discriminate against someone or their relative or associate who has been or is being subject to domestic abuse. For example, the bill will prohibit criticising or treating an employee unfairly due to taking domestic violence leave for refusing to rent a property to someone simply because they are protected under an intervention order.

It covers abuse in a wide range of relationships, as specified under the intervention orders legislation—for example, relationships including spouses, intimate partners, family members and carers. The bill will also prohibit both direct and indirect discrimination. Indirect discrimination in this instance would occur when a general requirement is imposed on a victim of domestic abuse which may be difficult for them to comply with or which they find more difficult to comply with than others.

An example in my portfolio area is an application that requires proof of recent rental history. This type of requirement is usually imposed on all applicants. However, a domestic violence victim may be unable to comply because they have been residing in crisis accommodation or have an unstable rental history with many short-term tenancies. Indirect discrimination would be unlawful if the requirement is not reasonable in the circumstances of the case.

As the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, I have been working hard with my team to standardise rental application forms in an attempt to discourage discrimination of any kind but

particularly including domestic abuse discrimination. This change proposes to reduce the amount of information a prospective tenant can be asked to provide in a rental application, relieving some of the administrative burden involved and protecting the privacy of prospective tenants where information is not reasonably necessary. Prohibiting the disclosure of certain information will also help reduce opportunities for discrimination to occur in the tenant selection process.

This amendment bill would have significant practical implications. Victims of domestic abuse would be able to access greater legal protections and support as well as be provided with a much-needed safety net for victims, who often feel vulnerable and isolated. These amendments also provide protections to prevent perpetrators of violence from disingenuously claiming to be a victim. Not only is evidence, such as an intervention order or medical records, required but the equal opportunity commissioner will also have the power not to review claims that do lack evidence or seem disingenuous.

Further, these amendments will not prohibit employers from taking reasonable action in relation to an employee who is underperforming if it is in accordance with fair and reasonable policies. According to a study by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, one in six women and one in nine men have experienced physical or sexual violence by a current or former partner since the age of 15, and it is very important that we do not forget the emotional and psychological abuse in the form of coercive control.

The Malinauskas government—and I want to thank the Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence—has been working tirelessly in progressing policies on women's safety, quality and wellbeing as a key election commitment. Earlier this year, we passed legislation to amend the Fair Work Act to assist domestic violence victims by increasing family and domestic violence leave.

This is instrumental in protecting victims of abuse and an important safeguard to ensure that anyone attempting to escape family and domestic abuse situations does not have to choose between their safety and their independence or being able to go to work for their financial security. If they need time off work, they should be entitled to it. This legislation ensures any worker accessing these leave entitlements would not suffer any financial disadvantage or discrimination for choosing to do so.

The bill before us today further builds on this foundation and strengthens our stance in combating and protecting victims of domestic abuse. We also granted a significant increase in the funding to an organisation that is quite dear to my heart: Catherine House. It is an amazing not-for-profit organisation that provides significant support for domestic abuse victims. Catherine House offers safe and secure short-term accommodation for women who are escaping domestic abuse.

They also offer outreach support for women who are experiencing domestic abuse but do not need or cannot access emergency accommodation. They provide support services such as case management, where each woman is assigned a support worker who assists them in assessing their needs and develops a tailored service plan to help them. They also help women access legal and other services as required. Particularly with the legal advice, I want to thank those firms that offer pro bono support to Catherine House. They can also provide counselling and advocacy, offering counselling support to residents and nonresidents who are affected by domestic abuse and other issues.

Catherine House's mission is to support women not only to secure safe and sustainable housing but also to build their skills and confidence, improve their health and wellbeing, and achieve their personal goals. What is really important in what they do is offer a range of educational and training programs, including help with financial literacy, computer skills and job-readiness training. I have been a long-time supporter of Catherine House, and I want to thank the staff for the incredible work they do.

At its core, the Equal Opportunity (Domestic Abuse) Amendment Bill is about ensuring that victims of domestic abuse are treated with dignity and respect and given the support they deserve. It is about providing practical solutions to the complex and often overwhelming challenges that victims of domestic abuse face.

The legislation before the house today only complements the amazing work that is already being done to combat domestic abuse issues and support victims. This bill is about sending a clear message that domestic abuse is not acceptable. It is about making it clear that we will not tolerate violence or discrimination against anyone and that we will take every step necessary to protect the most vulnerable members of our community.

Again, I want to thank the Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, our Attorney-General and the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity for their collaboration in the development of this bill. I also want to acknowledge the support and comments from over 20 stakeholders during the bill's consultation process. Their collective commitment to the protection of victims of domestic abuse is admirable and I appreciate all their efforts.

This is a bill we hope will never be needed—but of course it is desperately needed. That is why I commend this bill to the house.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (16:01): I would like to make a contribution on this bill as well because it is a very complex issue and, as an employer, I had a situation with one of my staff where I got quite involved in supporting that person in the domestic violence situation they were in with a relationship; it was the first time I had experienced it—the way they were treated, such awful treatment from someone who claimed to love someone else, .

I will not go into details, but it is fair to say that I welcome these laws because they make it very clear that there is a social responsibility on us as a community. That is in complete contrast to what the view was about domestic violence 50 years ago, when people would say, 'That's between him and her. That's their business to work out.' That was just an easy way out. Over the years, culture has changed, but it is important we call out any culture that supports the coercion of women or domestic violence as part of that culture, calling it out and saying that it is not acceptable, regardless of your culture.

We had that culture in Western culture. Women had to give up their jobs when they were married. My mother was married at 18½; she started in the workforce at age 14 and by 18½ she was done because she had married. That was a double whammy because one of the tools women need to leave domestic violence situations is financial security. How were they to gain financial security if the culture prevented them from working? The law allowed that, and women were paid different rates of pay back then as well. Again, that was cultural, and it took legislation in the parliament to correct it.

This legislation will go a long way to correcting any misconceptions people have out there regarding victims of domestic violence. For example, how many times do we hear the excuse, 'She asked for it. Have you heard the way she talks to him?' or, 'Look at the way she spends his money,' or, 'Look at what she's wearing,' or, 'Look at the way she keeps that house.' How many times have you heard people try to justify a man's action of domestic violence with those ignorant lines that I have just read out?

It is still a stigma. I witnessed with my own employee how difficult it was for that employee to start that conversation with me and she really felt she had no choice when she turned up late for work one morning with a black eye.

This piece of legislation, of course, is one of many changes in new legislation to be brought to this parliament in the last five years. If you recall, then attorney-general Vickie Chapman brought a bill to this place that enabled women who may have had some concerns about their new partner's violent past to contact the authorities and get a report card, if you like, that was specific to what was considered to be red flags for somebody entering a relationship. It was a very progressive policy and was supported by women, in particular, and taken up. There was an article in the paper not that long ago about how often it has been used.

Of course, we also have a brand-new act of parliament to specifically identify the strangling of somebody as an offence and, 20 years after every other state had done it, the removal of the gay panic defence as well. What was important about that legislation was that it still gave women a window to move out of a violent situation in extraordinary circumstances. There was always an excuse for removing the gay panic defence from those who for some reason were opposed to it,

arguing that it could make it more difficult for a woman to protect herself or respond to a very violent relationship that she might be in, but that was dealt with in the changes to the gay panic defence.

I am not sure whether the minister can clarify this in her response, but I am also interested in whether this has an effect on forced marriage—people who may be in a forced marriage situation or in fear of a forced marriage and people, particularly women of course, who may be in a culture that is coercive when it comes to their social lives, such as adult women who might still be living at home with their parents constraining what they are able to do either for a living or in their own time or who they can see, for example. What if they are going through that sort of a situation? I ask if the minister is able to clarify that in her response. I would be very interested in the answer.

I agree with previous speakers that it is still a stigma for those who are victims of domestic violence, and it should not be a stigma. It is not a stigma for someone who may have been involved in a random act of violence in the street or have been in a building where an armed robbery occurred or have been the victim of a reckless driver. There is no stigma there, so why is there a stigma for those women who are victims of domestic violence? We still have a long way to go.

This morning, I saw on a bus stop a very good advertisement. It was a photograph of a young man with a line on it that said, 'I don't like it when she goes out without me.' That is coercion. I think that is a very strong message, because you do see that, and you do witness that, and you say to yourself, 'What on earth is going on here? I hope she gets out of that relationship because that is not going to end well.'

I think we need young women and their families to understand that, when they identify that, it is a concern and is simply not acceptable. A couple are still two individuals and a healthy relationship is a relationship based on trust. If you cannot trust a partner, forcing yourself on that partner or forcing your views on that partner or forcing rules of the relationship on that partner is simply not the answer in a relationship.

I am not sure whether there is some plan that we will see after the legislation becomes an act of parliament, signed off by the Governor and proclaimed. Certainly, I think it is important for industry organisations, including the Real Estate Institute, Business SA and others, to have a clear understanding of what the expectation is and that these are new rules.

I know from my own personal experience that it will be the exception for many small businesses in particular to have to rely on the law in order to take an interest and support somebody who is in that situation, but it is important that every employer knows and every landlord knows what the law is and why it is there, because it is all about changing culture. Sometimes the parliament is ahead of the public; other times, the parliament is behind the public approval, or social licence is gained for that change many years before the change is implemented by the parliament.

Congratulations to the minister on bringing this bill to the house. I am certainly very pleased that we are seeing a much more progressive agenda under this government on social issues than what we saw under the 16 years of the previous Labor government with attorneys-general such as Michael Atkinson and John Rau, who were extremely conservative. I know that this has been driven by key progressive members of the Labor Party. Congratulations on bringing this to the parliament.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (16:12): I rise to close this second reading debate. In doing so, I want to wholeheartedly thank all the members who have contributed for sharing their thoughts, their views and also for what was inherent in all of their words: their shared determination to help drive change that makes a real, sustainable difference in the lives of those who experience domestic violence. I will come back to the member for Unley's question later in my remarks.

I will make some broader comments first. This legislation is part of a very strong, comprehensive legislative policy, community awareness-raising agenda around the prevention and eradication of domestic violence. This legislation has been very long in the making and it is now a giant step closer to becoming law, hopefully not too far away at all—a law that will ensure that victim survivors are heard when they experience discrimination, that acts on their wishes, a law that

supports their ability to access and sustain employment, education, services and suitable accommodation provision.

I am really proud to be part of a government that supports and empowers victim survivors of domestic violence. As I said, this commitment to doing so was shown through all the members' speeches. It was shown through the member for Elder's contribution, who reflected on her time working with the excellent women at Women's Safety Services and the importance, as she notes, that this simple bill will have on the lives of victim survivors. I thank the member for Adelaide for her contribution and for sharing a really important story about a woman who attended her electorate office, a woman who had experienced domestic violence and whom her office rightly assisted to reconnect to community life upon leaving that relationship.

Many members through their electorate offices, through involvement in their communities and through personal connections, of course, often meet women experiencing domestic violence. Many women, as I spoke to in my second reading explanation, have examples of when they have faced circumstances of discrimination that they have shared with various members of parliament. The member for Newland spoke really courageously to the cyclical nature of domestic abuse, to her own experience, and so rightly about the importance of speaking up and about the importance of empowering the voices of others.

I thank the member for Waite for speaking to the importance of this reform for employees. I thank the member for King, who is a passionate advocate in this area, the member for Davenport, the member for Hurtle Vale and the member for Enfield. I also thank the member for Unley for his contribution. I was very pleased to hear the member for Unley's support of this bill and also that he noticed our See the Signs campaign on a bus stop, perhaps on Goodwood Road, possibly this morning. I know there is one—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: King William.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: That's very good—very nice. There is another one there. I think from what I heard the member for Unley has noticed our advertisement, which is a part of our See the Signs campaign. A couple of months ago, in the middle of March, we hosted here in Adelaide Sue and Lloyd Clarke, the incredibly courageous parents and grandparents of Hannah Clarke and her three beautiful children who were murdered by her ex-partner.

On that evening, we launched that ad campaign. I must say that since it has been running on social media in a way that is very much targeted particularly to a younger audience, and since it has also been on bus stops and tram stops etc., we have had a remarkable response in terms of people noticing it, and in terms of people saying things similar to what the member for Unley just said, that is, that the messages are very clear. They are young people talking in their language, I guess, articulating what coercive control and domestic abuse look like.

There is the advertisement that the member for Unley spoke about, which is a young man speaking. There is also a version where a young woman is speaking about her experience of domestic abuse and being controlled, so I am very pleased to hear that the member for Unley has seen that really important advertisement. We intend to continue that campaign right up to and beyond the point when we introduce legislation to criminalise coercive control.

As I have spoken about in this house, we are currently consulting in a very targeted way with particular groups on that legislation, and I so much look forward, when that consultation concludes, to that bill being in this house. To answer the member for Unley's question, potentially about forced marriage etc., and particular circumstances that may arise in the course of those relationships, I think there is an opportunity in that legislation to consider that particular issue, and it is certainly something that we can look at in a more fulsome way.

In terms of this legislation, it may, in particular circumstances, touch on that issue in the way that this legislation is applied, but this legislation is very much focused on when a person experiences domestic violence and experiences discrimination as a result of that experience in the course of their employment, in the course of their education and in the course of their seeking particular services or accommodation.

Previously, prior to this legislation, should they experience discrimination as a result of that experience of domestic violence, there was no recourse for the equal opportunity commissioner to hear that particular complaint. This legislation fixes that. In response to your question, I think the coercive control legislation will provide us an opportunity to explore that particular issue and those issues around coercive controlling behaviour that might arise through those particular circumstances. So, again, I thank you for that question.

As I said, I really do thank all members who have contributed to this debate. I absolutely thank the Attorney-General and the equal opportunity commissioner for working closely with me, and indeed the Office for Women also, to progress this legislation. I again take the opportunity to acknowledge the extraordinary and courageous advocacy of a number of people in the lead-up to the passage of this bill—brave women, victim survivors who shared their stories. I also acknowledge domestic violence service providers, advocacy organisations, unions, the Working Women's Centre and others who have advocated alongside me for some time for this change. I am really pleased that today we progress it.

I also acknowledge Elliette from the Attorney-General's office, Hilary from my office, and Lara and others from the Attorney-General's Department who have also worked toward this. I am so pleased that this bill finally progresses, and I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (16:21): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION (OBJECTS OF ACT AND BOARD ATTRIBUTES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 May 2023.)

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

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There not being a quorum, ring the bells.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (16:24): I rise on behalf of the opposition to make a brief contribution to the Environment Protection (Objects of Act and Board Attributes) Amendment Bill 2023. It will be a relatively minor contribution because what we have before us is a bill that seeks to make relatively minor amendments to the EP Act. It is, in fact, a bill that I do not think will have even a minor effect on mitigating or adapting to climate change in South Australia; I do not think it will have any effect at all.

That is because what we are dealing with is quite a discrete bill that does little more than pepper the objects of the EP Act with the words 'climate change mitigation' and 'climate change adaptation'. Importantly, what this bill does not do is create any new requirements for businesses or the community or polluters. It does not create any new powers for the Environment Protection Authority, and it does not really create any real regulatory impact at all. At its highest what this bill might be seen to do is to make explicit what is already implicit in the EP Act. That begs the question, of course: what is the point? What is the point of these amendments?

I think the minister, in her second reading explanation, has gone some way in trying to explain what the point is, seemingly by trying to imply that this bill represents the government taking some real action when it comes to climate change, which is curious given that all the bill does is pepper the objects of the act with the words 'climate change'. It does not look like real action to me. The

minister goes on to talk about the government's efforts to minimise the impacts of climate change. She references the state's goals to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 and our interim target of 50 per cent by 2030 on 2005 levels.

What the minister fails to point out, however, is that these are references to targets set by the former Liberal government. Although South Australia has had a net zero target since 2015, it was the former Liberal government that introduced that interim target and announced that interim target of a 50 per cent reduction on 2005 levels by 2030. Of course, it is this side of the house that is trying to enshrine those targets in legislation, but it has been scuttled every step of the way by those opposite.

The minister goes on to make other references in her second reading explanation to the government's record of adaptation to climate change and the great progress towards urban greening strategies. But once again she fails to point out that in fact it was the former Liberal government that was the champion of so many cooling initiatives and greening initiatives, which, very sadly, have been axed or defunded by the Malinauskas Labor government since the March election last year.

Indeed, I think it was one year ago this week when the minister saw fit to declare a climate emergency in South Australia. It is the one-year anniversary of the minister declaring a climate emergency, yet we have seen absolutely no emergency action at all, of course making that whole declaration entirely meaningless and virtue signalling at its very worst. Indeed, this week during the one-year anniversary of the minister declaring a climate emergency Labor have come into this house and voted against practical initiatives like banning corflutes, enshrining the climate targets in legislation and protecting our Parklands. On one side of the house, we see real practical action; on the other side of the house, we see meaningless words and virtue signalling.

Do not be fooled about this apparent record of cooling and greening initiatives from the Labor government. Indeed, it was this very government that slashed the Greener Neighbourhoods program, which was a scheme that would have seen over 10,000 trees and shrubs planted in suburban streets right across Adelaide. It was this very Malinauskas Labor government that slashed Greening Adelaide's Heart program, which again would have seen a range of practical greening and cooling projects for the CBD to respond to a warming climate, and it would have created more wetlands and plantings along the River Torrens.

While this bill may be perfectly harmless, in that it does not do anything at all, I think we are once again seeing the hypocrisy of Labor when it comes to its environmental credentials: all talk, all gesture and, in this case, all words but absolutely no action.

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (16:30): I rise today in support of the Environment Protection (Objects of Act and Board Attributes) Amendment Bill 2023 to amend the Environment Protection Act 1993. I would like to start by thanking our Deputy Premier and Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, as well as her team, for their work in bringing this bill before us. As one of your portfolio responsibilities as Deputy Premier (I presume she is listening at home because who does not when they are home sick?), this parliament is simply made better by your leadership in continuing South Australia's proud history of direct action on climate change.

Appreciation must also be given to all those stakeholders who contributed to the consultation on this bill. I would particularly like to highlight the Premier's Climate Change Council and the Conservation Council SA for their support of this bill and ongoing work in this space. As I understand, some of South Australia's largest greenhouse gas emitters contributed to consultation on this bill and were also largely in support of strengthening the Environment Protection Act and policy. This consultation is further evidence that good government can bring along business on our journey towards decarbonisation.

With more and more South Australians passionately demanding greater action on climate change, it should be clear to everyone in this place that even profit-driven business is turning towards more immediate decarbonisation. We know now more than ever that to say that addressing climate change is bad for business is simply not true.

Environment protection agencies and governments more broadly right across Australia are being rightfully challenged on not only what they say but what they are doing to mitigate the

developing impact of climate change. All power to those who continue to respectfully challenge and demand better of governments of any persuasion right across the world, calling on us to use the power of government to influence and enforce climate change mitigation strategy across all sectors of the economy.

We have known for years now that over 70 per cent of global industrial greenhouse gases can be attributed to only 100 companies worldwide. We must consciously and rapidly adjust not only our consumption but, increasingly so, our production methods to reduce greenhouse emissions. As South Australia's principal environmental regulator, the Environment Protection Authority will continue to play a key role in assisting our government to meet our commitment to stronger action on both climate change adaptation and climate change mitigation.

This bill seeks to amend the Environment Protection Act to strengthen the Environment Protection Authority's existing powers to further consider climate change issues when administering the act. Amendments included in this bill provide definitions for climate change mitigation, climate change adaptation and greenhouse gas emissions within section 3 of the act. Climate change mitigation and climate change adaptation are both necessary in responding to our changing climate.

Further amendments included in this bill to section 10 will strengthen the objects of the act to specifically include addressing climate change adaptation and mitigation when the act is administered. This bill also seeks to amend the Environment Protection Act to provide for the addition of climate change knowledge and expertise to the membership of the Environment Protection Authority's board. This amendment to section 14B of the act will require climate change adaptation or climate change mitigation experience as a required attribute of the membership of the board, ensuring that the necessary expertise is provided while the EPA carries out its important work.

While the existing Environment Protection Act does not specifically mention climate change, it does allow for consideration of climate change and greenhouse gas emissions in development referrals and environmental authorisations if those matters are relevant to the determination of an application. These amendments clarify the already existing powers to consider the impact of climate change during the administration of the Environment Protection Act.

This is an important clarification and shows again how all of us as individuals, collectives, businesses big and small, and indeed our parliaments, should always consider our impact on the environment and the actions we can all take to reduce the effects of climate change. By better articulating the Environment Protection Authority's roles and responsibilities, this bill will empower the EPA to support our government in accomplishing our objectives in urgently addressing the climate crisis.

We are utterly dependent on this Earth—consistent weather patterns, clean drinking water, fish in our oceans, crops in our fields and bees in our gardens. We need all of this to continue learning and growing as a global community. We need this, our children need this, and the next generation needs all of this. Not only do we obviously need our planet to survive but we want to enjoy the beauty it has to offer. We love the wilderness. We love our environment. South Australians enjoy our gorgeously diverse and welcoming environment each and every day.

Last year, I had the absolute pleasure of touring the Marion Riding Club, absorbing the scenery of the Shepherds Hill Recreation Park in which they are situated. Whether on horseback or pushbike or just my two little legs—well, they are not that little; they are pretty long and pretty tall—the people of Elder and nearby Waite and Davenport have a simply stunning background to enjoy our natural environment. While on the flatter side terrain-wise, the member for Gibson's electorate has some beautiful wetlands and beaches too.

Like much of my constituency, I have also had the pleasure of enjoying the River Murray. I remember learning to kneeboard on the river, but I am yet to master wakeboarding. In fact, I am absolutely terrible, and there are some excellent photos around of me trying to wakeboard. But I loved learning to kneeboard and soaking in how important the Murray is as the lifeblood of South Australia, which I got to do a lot when I lived in Renmark for a year when I worked for the ABC.

So much of our state's wealth and environmental sustainability come from this river and it must be protected. The Malinauskas Labor government will do just that. We are committed to the

Murray-Darling Basin Plan and will make the River Murray a priority for South Australia once again. By acting on every recommendation of the Murray-Darling royal commission and engaging with Aboriginal people on their water needs and interests, we have a plan to ensure our fair share of this precious water system both today and for the next generation.

Today, we acknowledge that, while South Australia has a strong reputation for leading both our nation and the world when it comes to renewable energy, we must do more and we must do it quickly. I am proud that for 16 years under a Labor government our state led Australia in renewable energy generation and moved away from our reliance on fossil fuels. In 2002, it was a Labor government that set the 26 per cent renewables by 2020 target, harnessing the abundance of wind and solar resources our state has to offer. We did not just reach that target: we more than doubled it by 2020.

In 2007, it was a Labor government that introduced the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act, making South Australia the first state to legislate targets to reduce greenhouse emissions. In 2017, it was a Labor government that built the world's largest lithium-ion battery, and now it will be a Malinauskas Labor government that builds a hydrogen power station, electrolyser and storage facility to generate clean energy and power new jobs and industry in South Australia.

It has been Labor governments that have protected our environment, and we will build upon this legacy by taking ambitious and immediate action to address climate change. The Malinauskas Labor government's Hydrogen Jobs Plan, as already flagged, will deliver three key elements: a 200 megawatt hydrogen power station, harnessing South Australian renewable energy to supply cleaner and cheaper power to South Australian businesses, factories, manufacturers and miners, creating new jobs and helping attract new industry to our state; a 250 megawatt electrical capacity of hydrogen electrolysers, using excess renewable energy to produce hydrogen, reducing the need to remotely switch off rooftop solar for households and businesses and unlocking the \$20 billion pipeline of renewable energy projects in South Australia; and a hydrogen storage facility holding the equivalent of two months' operation or 3,600 tonnes of hydrogen, providing additional capacity when required.

South Australia has a proud history of direct action on climate change under the leadership of Labor governments, not under the leadership of those opposite. Liberal governments have refused to recognise the reality of climate change that we are already facing, burying their heads in the sand while global temperatures and sea levels continue to rise. We will not bury our heads. This bill amends one of South Australia's most important pieces of environmental legislation. Strengthening the Environment Protection Act only serves to improve the Environment Protection Agency's capacity to carry out its roles and duties, and I commend the bill to the house.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (16:40): I rise to support this bill because I will always advocate for the environment, and the people of Gibson feel the effects of climate change every day. I recently reflected in this place that I can feel the heat map change as I doorknock across the suburbs of Gibson due to the increased built environment and urban infill and the loss of our beautiful trees and open space.

My community raise their concerns with me about infill development, loss of trees, loss of habitat for native wildlife and loss of open space, so I am pleased to see these amendments to the Environment Protection Act. Environment protection authorities and governments across Australia are being challenged as to whether they are taking the best action they can regarding climate change adaptation and climate change mitigation.

We are lucky in South Australia to have the Malinauskas Labor government that is committed to stronger action on both climate change adaptation and climate change mitigation. I would like to acknowledge our climate, environment and water minister, the member for Port Adelaide, who is so committed to our environment and ensuring a better future for our children and grandchildren. Dr Close knows that we are undeniably facing a climate emergency that has the potential to have catastrophic effects across our planet.

As humans, it is our activities that are having this effect on the planet, and it is our responsibility to act to halt climate change and undo any damage already done as much as possible.

Currently, the Environment Protection Act does not specifically mention climate change. However, the objects of the act are sufficiently broad to permit consideration of adaptation to climate change and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by the Environment Protection Authority when assessing development referrals and applications for environmental authorisations.

The design, location and operational controls that reduce greenhouse gas emissions reduce exposure to climate-related changes, and increased resilience to such changes will become increasingly important. Therefore, this government believes that the objects of the Environment Protection Act should be clarified to add climate change knowledge to the attributes of the membership of the board of the EPA. The board cannot be expected to give due consideration to climate change adaptation and mitigation if it does not have the relevant expertise amongst its membership.

These amendments will provide certainty and transparency for industry and within the broader community and government itself of the role of the Environment Protection Authority in this critical area of environment protection. The objects of the act are very important, as they underpin all the functions of the Environment Protection Authority. It is therefore critical that the objects reflect community expectations and the role of the EPA in modern South Australia.

The EPA must have regard to them and seek to further them when considering applications for environmental authorisations under the act and when considering development applications that are referred to it under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. This is where it will be critical for the authority to examine issues raised by my community members to ensure that new developments mitigate their climate change impact to be environmentally sensitive.

The objects of the act also inform the environment protection policymaking powers in part 5 of the act, in that an environment protection policy may be made for any purpose directed towards securing the objects of this act. The proposed amendments will also support future development of an environment protection policy under the act that will provide more detailed climate change policy.

An environment protection policy would be able to specifically set out matters that are to be taken into account by the EPA in relation to environmental authorisation applications or development application assessments. The development of a climate change focused environment protection policy will provide clarity, transparency and consistency of regulatory approach for licensees and development proponents, and will also provide a pathway to assist reaching the state's ambitious climate change targets.

The EPA has consulted thoroughly with key stakeholders on the elements of this bill and the future work the agency intends to do regarding strengthening its role in regulating climate change matters, and the vast majority of those who were consulted were supportive.

I am proud to be part of a Labor government that is committed to a future that values our natural environment, and this bill is part of that process. We are listening to the scientists, the experts and our community to ensure South Australia's future. While those opposite focus on themselves, we are focused on the future. I commend this bill to the house.

Mrs PEARCE (King) (16:45): I rise in support of the Environment Protection (Objects of Act and Board Attributes) Amendment Bill as part of this government's commitment to having stronger action on both climate change adaptation and mitigation.

We understand that around Australia governments, as well as environment protection agencies, have been facing challenges on the adequacy of their policies and actions in response to climate change, adaptation and greenhouse gas mitigations. While the current Environment Protection Act does not have a specific mention of climate change, the objects of the act are broad enough for the consideration of climate change and greenhouse gas emissions in development referrals and environmental authorisations in the determination of an application.

Therefore, these amendments clarify what are already existing powers to consider climate change issues when administering the EP Act. With specific inclusion of climate change adaptation and mitigation definitions in the EP Act, the EPA's role and responsibilities will be clearly identified by administrators and courts in climate change action.

This bill proposes three changes to the act, the first of which is changes to section 10 that will strengthen the objects of the act to specifically include addressing climate change adaptation and mitigation when administering the act. Specifying this in the objects of the Environment Protection Act are important, as the objects underpin all the EPA's regulatory functions.

It means that the EPA must have regard to and seek to further these objects when considering applications for EPA licences under section 47 of the Environment Protection Act. The same must be done when considering development applications that are referred to them under the Planning Development and Infrastructure Act through section 57 of the Environment Protection Act.

Section 14B will require climate change adaptation or climate change mitigation experience as a required attribute of the membership of the EPA Board, and section 3 will include the following definitions added to the interpretation section:

- 'climate change mitigation' to mean any process of adjusting to the actual or expected effects of climate change;
- 'climate change adaption' to mean measures or activities that relate to reducing the rate of climate change including (without limitation) by limiting, reducing or preventing greenhouse gas emissions; and
- 'greenhouse gas emissions' as having the same meaning as in the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act 2007.

I understand that the EPA has met with key stakeholders to inform them about the proposed bill we have before us today and has also contacted all of South Australia's largest greenhouse gas emitters.

During the EPA's consultation, they provided key stakeholders with an overview of proposed amendments to the act, with the vast majority of stakeholders engaged with being supportive of the amendments to the act. With many of these companies themselves having plans to achieve net zero by 2050, they are appreciative of a clear direction being set by the government to help guide their transition to net zero.

Around this time last year, in May 2022 the Malinauskas Labor government led the declaration of a climate emergency. This declared our clear intentions to act on climate change and reaffirm our commitment to building up the science-based policies that will prepare South Australia for the realities of extreme weather, climate shifts and global warming. To help reduce our emissions to achieve a 50 per cent reduction by 2030 and net zero by 2050, we are building the foundations to achieve those targets and for ensuring longer term reductions in emissions.

One way we are setting out to achieve that goal is through our commitments, such as the Hydrogen Jobs Plan—building a world-class hydrogen power plant near Whyalla in the Upper Spencer Gulf. With it up and running, we will accelerate the growth of South Australia's hydrogen economy and with the opportunity to produce green hydrogen through renewable energy, we could see it being used in everything from heavy vehicles through to the construction and manufacturing industries, as well as a replacement for natural gas.

We are at the forefront of climate change policy in South Australia and have been for some time. Remember when we got the big battery up near Jamestown? There were some who wanted to stall it or prevent it from happening. They said it was barely worth a mention. But fast-forward to today and we see many others around the country with similar schemes in place and at a smaller scale.

We have also recently seen Tesla announce phase 4 of the Tesla Virtual Power Plant, which helps bring the benefits of renewable energy to South Australians on low incomes. Supporting more than 4,000 public housing tenants, phase 4 will bring cheaper power to an additional 3,000 South Australians who can also enjoy the benefits of the battery backup system. Just like the decision to proceed with the big battery, Tesla's announcement for stage 4 of the program is a testament to the previous Labor government that invested in the program that still sees benefits to our state being delivered today.

Of course, delivering action on climate change is not all relegated to the area of how we power our state and we are working to deliver on our goal of 50 per cent by 2030 and net zero by

2050 in other ways as well, such as the development of carbon farming in South Australia, which will help our primary industries and other sectors to reduce their emissions through the generation and purchase of high-quality carbon offsets.

With more than \$600,000 having been awarded to a variety of projects across horticulture, livestock, cropping and dairy industries, these projects are all helping to build on the growing carbon farming pilot scheme in South Australia and to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions, particularly in the agricultural sector. We are also committing \$6 million to protect nature on private land, enhance biodiversity and build ecological resilience to climate change.

With microgrants up to \$1,000 and other grants up to \$100,000, landowners can help maintain areas of native vegetation on properties. Since the Native Vegetation Heritage Agreement program came about in 1980, it has supported more than 2,800 landholders to ensure the long-term protection of more than one million hectares of the state's native vegetation. Programs such as this are helping to protect nature, enhance biodiversity within our state and build up our ecological resilience to climate change.

This bill today furthers our commitments to addressing climate change by amending what the Deputy Premier quite rightfully points out is the most important piece of environmental legislation we have in this state. This bill acknowledges the immense challenges posed by climate change and emphasises the importance of having experts on this matter, bodies like the Environment Protection Agency, to bring in the expertise needed to address these issues of great urgency.

It is also in recognition of the many contributions we have had from experts on climate change, as well as the general community, who are concerned about the potential impacts of climate change, putting it front and centre when administrating the act. With that, I commend the bill to the house.

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (16:54): I rise to speak in support of the Environment Protection (Objects of Act and Board Attributes) Amendment Bill. Building on some of the earlier comments we heard when we talked about things like the big battery and some of the solar farms that have been approved in the state over the years, this is just one of many things that builds on our credentials. Although small in word count, the significance of such a bill should not be underestimated.

As I see it, the bill does two key things that will strengthen the act and better calibrate government towards addressing the realities of climate change. This includes amending the objects within the Environment Protection Act 1993 relating to climate change adaptation and mitigation, and ensuring there is knowledge of these principles within those appointed to the EPA Board.

As a government, and broadly across the community, I am pretty sure it goes without saying that climate change is something that we all take very seriously, but I do accept that not everybody is convinced. In saying that, I also note that the resistance is often linked to those now on the fringes of mainstream economic policy. While I will be talking about this bill through the lens of economics, I will begin by reinforcing the fact that this is undoubtably an environmental bill with the key intent of benefiting our environment.

Irrespective of the truth of the matter I just raised, it would appear that the market believes in the realities of climate change, and we should therefore have legislation that reflects this. I am no economist, but I understand that it is going to get harder and harder, without policies in place, to mitigate this risk. If we want to see investment from offshore, even from interstate, we need policies to accept and underpin the realities of human interference in our climate. This bill is one piece in the puzzle that does just that and helps reinforce our commitment to the statewide goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by more than 50 per cent against 2005 emission levels by 2030 and to achieve net zero emissions by 2050.

I think we have all been around long enough to have heard the cries of business seeking certainty on key policy issues that impact on the markets they operate within. Most in the community accept the realities of climate change and the need to adapt, but rightfully resent moving goalposts on targets, strategies and policies. It also does not help that the current iteration of the act does not specifically mention climate change. These amendments help provide clarity and transparency, which I am sure will be well received by anybody seeking to do business in South Australia.

In prioritising our commitment to the environment, we also recognise that sound environmental policy is good for business. With this in mind, I suspect that, by the end of this political term, there will be an abundance of bills like this before us that will reflect on the realities of climate change and make amendments to the objects of their respective acts.

I have seen this firsthand through my own experience in the Northern Territory working as their government's planning adviser and seeing the significant time and effort that went into achieving something similar through the Territory's Planning Act. While we were focused on reforming the planning system on multiple fronts, the passage of the planning amendment bill 2022 through the NT parliament was a successful opportunity to ensure climate change was front and centre of the act and, obviously, underpinning planning within the Northern Territory. We did not just do this because of environmental lobbyists, but also because business could see the writing was on the wall and was calling for certainty.

With an act that now has 12 objects, four of these are included and embrace the need for a greener tomorrow through an acceptance that the climate of our planet is changing. These include the following objects:

- (e) to promote the sustainable development of land;
- (f) to promote the responsible use of land and water resources to limit the adverse effects of development on ecological processes;
- (g) to maintain the health of the natural environment and ecological processes;
- (h) to protect the quality of life of future generations...

Having been part of the consultation process, there was a huge appetite to mitigate the dangers to the planet over several objects and expand on the environmental objects in the act in its previous iteration. Moving back to the present day, I had a brief look over the acts allocated to the executive, and could not help but notice the sheer volume allocated to the Minister for Climate Change. I do not wish to frighten anyone, but I suspect there will be a number of these that will receive similar treatment as time goes on.

Having cited an example from planning in the Northern Territory, existing acts that are not primarily focused on the environment will ultimately need similar amendments to embrace the principles and realities around climate change. As mentioned earlier, the argument can be debated now until we are blue in the face but, irrespective of where you sit, sound environmental policy is now good economic policy, and we can expect this to be reflected in revisions to many acts that are already in place.

With the change in objects, we will see an alteration to the key expectations and knowledge from those this act enshrines to serve on the EPA Board. This is a bit of a no-brainer, as clearly we want those with the right expertise to mirror the new objects clarified in this act. I should not see this as a big problem, given the credentials of the EPA Board, in accepting and embracing the realities of climate change already. As we heard from the Deputy Premier when this bill was introduced, the EPA published a role statement in early 2022, outlining its contribution to our response to climate change and the South Australian Government Climate Change Action Plan.

Noting that they act autonomously, I am sure the board will appreciate additional amendments that make it clearer that the existing role and function of the EPA is to consider the revised objects when administering the act. I understand that awareness of climate change is an expectation we will see more of in government boards. With this in mind, I would also expect similar amendments to appear before this chamber as the parliament proceeds. Again, this is all about rewriting our legislative framework to ensure it aligns to both market and global expectations. That said, when we think globally we must act locally, and South Australians have elected a government that will do just that.

They are seeing this through our commitment to establish the state-owned hydrogen plant and our move to ditch the blatant grab for cash through the electric vehicles tax. While I agree that the intention of this bill is to back up what I have been saying around business certainty, the EPA should be commended for meeting with key stakeholders to consult on this bill from December 2022 through to February 2023. This included the 17 largest greenhouse gas emitters in the state. In

further reinforcing the credentials of the intent behind this bill, this includes names such as BHP, OZ Minerals and AGL.

I am told many of these businesses already have plans in place to achieve net zero by 2050. Again, this reinforces my statement from earlier, that irrespective of how you may feel about climate change the market accepts it as a reality. While I have placed a business slant on my thoughts on this bill, it does not escape me that beyond this and everything else this is an environmental bill. For this reason, I am also pleased that consultation has occurred with groups from the environmental lobby, including the Conservation Council, the Climate Change Action Steering Group and the Premier's Climate Change Council.

Before finishing, I note there are many people working behind the scenes who have done an excellent job in their contributions towards this bill. I take this moment to thank them and to express my willingness to meet with them if ever they feel the need. It is reasonable that the Environment Protection Authority, as South Australia's major environmental regulator, should play a significant role in assisting government in addressing its climate change targets. I believe this small but significant bill will help deliver on this, and with this in mind I am happy to commend it to the house.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Planning) (17:04): It is a great pleasure to speak on the Environment Protection (Objects of the Act and Board Attributes) Amendment Bill. In doing so, I would certainly like to commend the Deputy Premier for bringing this important bill to the house.

As you know, Deputy Speaker, and as the house knows, the government recognises that we are in a climate emergency. We are committed to serious action on climate change, and this bill is yet another step towards addressing that commitment. Through this bill, the Deputy Premier is providing us with the opportunity to strengthen our response to climate change mitigation and adaptation through statute. Our laws must continue to evolve to meet our contemporary conditions.

In recent years, South Australians have experienced firsthand the effects of climate change with the increased frequency and intensity of extreme weather events, such as droughts, heatwaves, bushfires and floods. We have to make every effort to mitigate the release of emissions that are causing, accelerating, enhancing or worsening these climate conditions. Adapting to our changing climate is vital to ensuring our communities are both resilient and continue to thrive.

Climate change mitigation seeks to reduce the release of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere, and that includes both reducing the sources of emissions and increasing the sinks that accumulate and store greenhouse gases, such as wetlands and forests. Climate change adaptation is a process of responding to the changing climate and its effects. Adaptation works through managing the risks caused by climate change already in train and also those caused by potential future climate change. As the Deputy Premier said in her second reading explanation, inclusion of these important definitions and strengthening the overall objectives of the Environment Protection Act will ensure that the act is sufficiently broad.

The objects of the act play a significant role in underpinning all the functions of the EPA, the agency. The bill will ensure that the EPA has regard to climate adaptation and climate mitigation when considering applications for any environmental authorisations under the act. They will also be required to seek to further climate adaptation and mitigation outcomes. Importantly, the broad objectives will provide a firm foundation for environmental policy improvement.

Environment protection policy can be directed towards securing the objects of the act. This provides an avenue for environmental policy specifically aimed at increasing adaption and mitigation responses. It also provides an ability for policy to set out specific considerations that the EPA must take when considering applications. That will include all development application assessments that have been referred to the EPA through the planning assessment process.

As Minister for Planning, I am particularly pleased to see the addition of objects that define and place focus on climate change adaptation and mitigation. There is a great deal of interaction between the Environment Protection Act 1993 and the planning legislation, regulation and policy. As I have mentioned, certain development applications lodged under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 are referred to the EPA.

If this bill is successful, it will provide that the EPA must have regard to climate adaptation and mitigation when considering those development applications. That will both strengthen and complement the significant work we are doing in planning with respect to climate change. Consistent with this bill, the South Australian planning system aims to promote climate change mitigation and adaptation.

By undertaking both mitigation and adaptation solutions in planning, we can deliver tangible climate change outcomes. An example of this is the promotion of urban greening, which can act as a store for greenhouse gas emissions. At the same time, it helps to adapt by cooling our suburbs as average temperatures rise. That is something I know that you, Deputy Speaker, would be particularly concerned about. As northerners, we are a little bit further away from the beach than the rest of the city and temperatures are regularly just one or two degrees higher in the northern suburbs and on the Adelaide Plains and go higher again as you move north.

This sort of urban adaptation, the greening of our suburbs, is particularly important. I have certainly seen myself the importance of that because I have seen maps of the heat sinks, where urban heat becomes so dramatic. That has an effect on communities: it has an effect on activity, it has an effect on people's perception of what it is like to go out in summer but, importantly, it also has a degree of cost-of-living impact because, if you create hot suburbs, then everybody's air conditioner has to work just that bit harder. As a result, you have both hotter suburbs and all your infrastructure working just that little bit harder, so it is really important that we cool our suburbs.

There are a number of other ways our planning system is responding to climate adaptation and mitigation. We have State Planning Policy 5. It is an important policy, and I will read aspects of it:

The State Planning Policies set out a framework for land use that aims to improve the liveability, sustainability and prosperity of the state.

State Planning Policy 5 acknowledges that climate change impacts affect all of our society. The policy recognises that the wellbeing of our communities depends on how well we adapt to and mitigate the impacts of climate change. This is also vital to ensuring the resilience of our built and natural environment. The policy provides direction to the regional planning process, and it includes ensuring provisions for development that are resilient and responsive to climate change impacts.

The policy also directs the Planning and Design Code to include a range of overlays to ensure climate resilient development. A number of overlays exist in the Planning and Design Code that specifically address climate change adaptation and mitigation. We have the urban tree canopy overlay, the water protection area overlay, the native vegetation overlay and the Ramsar wetlands overlay. This government is committed to the continual advancement of climate responsive laws, and the code is regularly reviewed with a view to improving that.

That is why we are currently finalising investigations for a flood and bushfire code amendment. I have recently also initiated the Murray River flood code amendment that is in part a response to the floods that we saw affect the state most recently in all our river communities. I know those opposite are particularly concerned with and supportive of that code amendment process. All those code amendments are about adapting our city, helping adapt our planning laws and giving some guide to development applications and the like to this challenge before us of a changing climate.

We also have a new publication, 'Planning for climate change', which will soon be released. It is a publication that is a joint initiative between the State Planning Commission and the department. It seeks to highlight how the state planning system is responding to those challenges and opportunities of climate change (I do not suspect there are that many opportunities), more opportunity for adaptation around energy efficiency and the like. It really highlights the continuing work that this state is doing as we promote more climate-friendly policy outcomes. That work has been endorsed by Green Adelaide and the Climate Council and will soon be available to download on the PlanSA website.

I have also had the great challenge, I would say, of helping to adapt our National Construction Code to new energy efficiency provisions, and so from 1 October 2024 all residential buildings will be required to meet a thermal construction rating of seven stars. I am pleased to report to the house

that Renewal SA and SAHA already have that target in their building of housing stock to that higher energy rating.

That higher energy efficiency rating in the building provisions helps to mitigate climate change by, firstly, lowering greenhouse gas emissions through lowering demand. It is a demand management strategy and is driven by energy ministers from across the country, I might add. Secondly, it also helps households to adapt to climate change by significantly increasing the year-round comfort of new homes and also lowering energy costs over the life of the building.

We are also committed, as an election commitment, to having tree regulations that match Australian best practice. As I said before, the retention of our urban canopy is an example of how we can both adapt to and mitigate climate change. The work of the State Planning Commission and Green Adelaide, which involves significant analysis, is ongoing. There are a couple of pretty significant and detailed reports on the PlanSA website: one is an arborist's report and the other is a report from the University of Adelaide about our tree canopy and our tree laws.

There is currently an ongoing inquiry by the Environment, Resources and Development Committee and, of course, we have had the expert panel into planning also look at the tree regulations as part of the review of the Planning and Design Code. That is really important work. There will be recommendations for the government to consider and, of course, I am in the process of considering that as the minister. All of these planning responses are, I suppose, a clear connection to the merits of this bill, part of the ongoing work of the government.

I also acknowledge this bill seeks to ensure the membership of the board of the Environment Protection Authority reflects our climate response needs. The amendments provide that at least one member of the board has practical knowledge of and experience in climate change adaptation and climate change mitigation. I support that amendment. It provides that all the necessary expertise and guidance to the board will be key to ensuring the regulatory role of the authority continues to drive best practice climate outcomes.

In concluding, I certainly commend the Deputy Premier for bringing this really important set of amendments to the Environment Protection Act. The Environment Protection Act is one of the state's most significant pieces of environmental legislation, and it should have adequate regard to our climate emergency. These amendments will support environmental decisions that address climate change adaptation and climate change mitigation, and I think they are a further demonstration of this government's commitment to climate action here in the great state of South Australia.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (17:18): I also rise in support of this bill, the Environment Protection (Objects of Act and Board Attributes) Amendment Bill. It is an important piece of legislation, and I guess in some ways when it comes to the EPA it is the initial building block. We will see other actions flow from the move in this direction.

It was actually very interesting, what the member for Bragg had to say. It was an interesting take on the history in this state when it comes to mitigation. I am sure, over the years, the member for Bragg is going to make an amazing contribution to the house.

The Hon. N.D. Champion: Who knows how big? Who knows how large?

Mr HUGHES: Well, who knows? It is still to be tested. The speech he gave in relation to this bill left a little bit to be desired. They are trying to create a dichotomy between our side of the house and this side of the house. The emphasis was that, while they are practical and they do stuff and so on, we are just symbolic; we just change a few words here and there. I think, 'How can you possibly come to that conclusion, given the leadership that this state has provided when it comes to mitigation?' If we were a country, we would be up there with Denmark—probably solely with Denmark at this stage.

The Hon. N.D. Champion: We beat Denmark.

Mr HUGHES: We beat them. We did overtake them. I visited Denmark back in 2004. I visited manufacturing—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I just remind the member for Giles to direct his comments through the chair, please, not to each other. I warn the other two members who have been participating.

Mr HUGHES: Thank you for that guidance, Deputy Speaker. I will take that on board. Anyway, back in 2004 Denmark was incredibly impressive when it came to the installation of wind technology and a number of other initiatives. As someone who spent part of his life in manufacturing, it was their manufacturing facilities that especially impressed me and everything that was wrapped around that.

Of course, Denmark became one of the major exporters of wind technology know-how. Indeed, one of the reasons for that visit at the time was in the hope that the mandatory renewable energy target would be increased from where it was, at 2 per cent, to at least 5 per cent, hopefully 10 per cent. It was too much to expect under the Howard government to go any further than that.

It was interesting to reflect upon the committee that was set up to look at that. That committee came back with a recommendation to increase the mandatory renewable energy target. Indeed, on the committee was a South Australian who should be better known than she is: Monica Oliphant, part of the great Oliphant family. She ended up as the President of the International Solar Energy Society. She is an amazing woman who worked for many years for ETSA and then went off to do a lot in the renewable energy field. Indeed, I had a fair bit to do with her in those years past.

Anyway, we were over in Denmark. We visited Spain and had a look at England to see what was going on. It was my hope that the target would be increased in the hope that a number of companies that had already engaged with Whyalla companies would look at the manufacturing of towers in Whyalla. But what happened when the Howard government failed to increase the target? All of that interest evaporated. We could have become a manufacturing hub for the Asia-Pacific region, but all of that interest evaporated.

It was left to the states, especially as a frontrunner—by far the frontrunner—South Australia under the Rann government, to start the whole push into renewables. The first wind farm in the state was at Starfish Hill. I am not going to count Coober Pedy. There are a lot of stories about the wind turbine in Coober Pedy. I think it was put in by ETSA. Some people argue that it was put there to demonstrate that it was not a goer, and other people say, no, it was the first attempt.

Indeed, there was some good history with ETSA and Labor going back to the 1980s, when ETSA actually mapped out a lot of the wind resources in this state in order to prepare for a possible transition down the track. But it was left to the Rann government to start the ball rolling in this state, and then of course it was picked up by the Weatherill government.

A whole range of utility-scale wind farms came to our state. There was a tweaking of the Development Act and a number of other initiatives to smooth the path so that wind could establish itself in South Australia. Utility-scale solar came hot on the heels of wind, and to a degree the two do complement each other. This state has an incredibly proud history when it comes to being an early adopter—

Mr Batty interjecting:

Mr HUGHES: The member for Bragg says that, well, it is all symbolic over this side. I would point out that nearly 70 per cent of the renewables, when you look at that four-year interlude, not a single project had its genesis in that particular period. I would have to say some of the sounds coming out from the Liberals were good sounds, but when you look at nearly all the projects that actually did start construction during that interlude, all had their genesis under the Weatherill government and even before then, given some of the planning and their time lines, under the Rann government, so there is a very proud history there. Of course, we have built on that history by the 100-megawatt battery, delivered on time and on budget—

The Hon. N.D. Champion: Now hydrogen.

Mr HUGHES: I'm getting to that. I could not, as someone who used to work in the steel industry—

Members interjecting:

Mr HUGHES: The cynics on this side. As somebody who used to work in the steel industry, I have had a longstanding interest when it comes to the—

The Hon. N.D. Champion interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The minister may have developed some habits in the parliament federally which may not translate to this chamber. Member for Giles, could you continue your remarks through the chair.

Mr HUGHES: Yes, Mr Deputy Speaker, I will do that. I thought I had been doing that. I have had a longstanding interest in hydrogen, especially as it applies to the steel industry, but before getting on to hydrogen I want to return to the battery and the slagging off—there is no steel pond there—the battery was getting from especially the federal Liberals and the National Party.

The Hon. N.D. Champion: That's right.

Mr HUGHES: It was pretty disgraceful, and now what do we see? We see all the other jurisdictions and we see companies lining up, looking to invest in batteries. Batteries, of course, are not a major source of storage at this stage. They do play a role in storage, but they do play a very important role in grid stabilisation and ancillary services for the grid, so we should not by any means discount batteries.

Gas-powered peaking stations still play an important role in our energy system, and we have to be mindful about the transition and how that technology leaves the market, and this is partly the story of hydrogen in this state. Whyalla is the best place in the state to build it by far. Port Augusta would have been pretty good as well, but Whyalla is the best place in the state to build it. If we crack that—and I am confident that we will—this gives us something that we can over time replace traditional gas peaking power stations with, but we want to get there first.

Of course, the reason hydrogen is such an attractive proposition in this state is because of the penetration of renewables and it is because on the increments, the very short increments now—they are no longer half-hour increments—energy prices in this state go very low, and especially very low in the middle of the day, given our utility-scale solar and our very successful rooftop solar.

To have something that can be ramped up and down like electrolyzers makes good use of electricity that might be spilled or potentially exported interstate. We can use it here to run our electrolyzers and produce green hydrogen. Hopefully, we will take that extra step and draw nitrogen from the air to, if you like to simplify, add it to hydrogen to produce green ammonia. The hydrogen power plan is going to be a very important initiative, and the Hydrogen Jobs Plan overall is an important initiative.

The reason I was keen to see it in Whyalla is that we have a steelworks in Whyalla. We know the global steel industry produces about 8 per cent of global greenhouse gas emissions, so it is a significant contributor. If we can abate CO₂ emissions from this hard to abate sector through the use of hydrogen produced commercially at scale, it will be a big step forward.

I have said many times in this place that Whyalla is incredibly unusual in that it has literally billions of tonnes of magnetite on its doorstep in the Middleback Ranges. It is in a region with massive renewable energy resources, resources like wind and solar that overlap. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

EVIDENCE (ABORIGINAL TRADITIONAL LAWS AND CUSTOMS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 17:32 the house adjourned until Tuesday 13 June 2023 at 11:00.