

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 29 November 2023

The **SPEAKER (Hon. D.R. Cregan)** took the chair at 10:30.

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

PUBLISHING COMMITTEE

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (10:31): By leave, I move:

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

Motion carried.

Bills

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (WASTE COLLECTION) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (10:31): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Local Government Act 1999. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (10:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I would like to make a contribution on the Local Government (Waste Collection) Amendment Bill 2023, which sits today in my name. Right now, South Australians are suffering through a cost-of-living crisis not seen for a generation. Mortgage rates are skyrocketing, rent is going through the roof, the cost of food is increasing in ways that we have not seen for a significant period of time, the cost of power bills is skyrocketing, the cost of petrol is going up and the cost of general goods and services is getting beyond the reach of the average household. In fact, a typical South Australian family are now more than \$20,000 a year worse off than they were at the point of the 2022 state election.

The average household does not have an extra \$20,000 just sitting around. They have not had wage increases of \$20,000 in the previous 12 months—that is almost unheard of—so they have to dip into savings, they have to seek support from family members or, in some more extreme cases, they have to reach into the equity within their homes.

Many of these typical families live in communities that I represent in my electorate, communities such as Hallett Cove, Sheidow Park and Trott Park, which are amongst the most mortgaged communities per capita in our state. These families that I represent are representative of many other families across the state of South Australia. They are worried about opening their next energy bill, they are concerned about what the Reserve Bank will do, they are worried about filling up at the bowser.

As we head into Christmas, there will be many families who will be choosing to go without things so that they can afford to pay for presents for their children. We know that the tourism sector in particular is suffering because people do not need to go on holiday. It is a luxury, it is a discretion,

and they are choosing to stay at home to save money. That trend is magnified across many other sectors.

At a time like this, we need governments at both state and federal level to be doing their utmost to ease the cost of living but, unfortunately, there appears to be no relief in sight. In fact, during a recent Budget and Finance Committee meeting, it became apparent to the opposition that the state government was looking at potentially introducing a pay-as-you-throw scheme approach to kerbside collection of waste. Appearing before the committee, the Chief Executive of Green Industries SA, Ian Overton, was asked:

So pay-as-you-throw is an option that is on the table, where people get charged more based on the weight of their rubbish; is that right?

To which Professor Overton answered, 'It is an option on the table.' To charge people more based on the weight of their rubbish would place an extra financial burden on South Australian families. Families with young children would be particularly impacted as the weight of things, like nappies, builds each week. In fact, we know through the analysis of bins and their contents that nappies are the most common thing, from the point of view of weight, to be placed in the municipal bin.

To charge people more based on the weight of their rubbish is, in the view of the opposition, an abhorrent way to manage waste in this state. The opposition is all for finding ways to reduce waste and we had a solid record of doing so when in government, but what basically amounts to a nappy tax would unfairly target larger families and families with children at a time when they can least afford it.

These families are already bearing the brunt of cost-of-living crises. They are more likely to have higher than average mortgages, they are more likely to need to put more fuel in their vehicles, and they obviously buy more food at the supermarket. They will suffer more than anyone else as a consequence of the government's proposed nappy tax. On top of the extra financial burden on young families—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Listen to the outrage, Mr Speaker. At every turn the nappy tax—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Florey! Member for Elizabeth!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The architects of the nappy tax hate it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Deputy Premier! The leader has the call.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: They hate it because they have been caught out by their dodgy nappy tax behaviour.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey is warned.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: It was not me who was the architect of the nappy tax. In fact, I told the public servants to put the idea away.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Florey!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Get rid of it, get it off the table, Dr Overton.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Playford!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: It is disgraceful, but they allowed the boffins to continue it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson! Member for Florey!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: They allowed the model to continue to be developed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Waite!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: There is a great embarrassment, the member for Florey, stuck up the back there. We love them on the back bench. He is supposed to be one of their mates.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Listen to this. We are hoping you are going to come down the front over summer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Unbelievable.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I wonder what the good constituents of Florey think of the nappy tax that he is defending.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader, please be seated. Member for Florey, your interjections will cease. The leader has the call.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I feel I need to repeat the quote that I provided before. In the Budget and Finance Committee hearing, the question was asked:

So pay-as-you-throw—

which we are using euphemistically as the nappy tax—

is an option that is on the table, where people get charged more based on the weight of their rubbish; is that right?

To which Professor Overton answered, 'It is an option on the table.' When I was minister, I got it off the table—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Deputy Premier!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —because it is a disgraceful concept.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: It has not been taken off the table, but there is an opportunity to take it off the table today.

The Hon. S.E. Close: We have already ruled it out.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Well, we are just making sure it gets ruled out. We are going to legislate against it. We are going to try to legislate against it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Waite!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —so the good constituents of Florey are not pinged for the nappy tax that is so strongly supported by their local member by the sounds of it. The opposition is all for finding ways—

Mr BROWN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! Leader, there is a point of order from the member. Please be seated, leader.

Mr BROWN: Point of order: I will ask the member to withdraw that last remark about me supporting this imaginary nappy tax.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leader, the member for Florey has taken offence.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I withdraw that statement.

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey is seeking withdrawal and an apology as I understand it, leader.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I withdraw the statement with regard to the member for Florey, but clearly all the members—and they can all be offended; I was not asked to apologise.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leader, be seated. That will not be sufficient. As you may be aware, the standard is a subjective one and the member for Florey has taken offence. The convention is to withdraw and apologise.

The Hon. D.J. Speirs: He did not ask for an apology.

The SPEAKER: I understand that he is seeking an apology. I understand that he is.

Mr BROWN: Just for clarity, sir, I am seeking an apology for the false statements made by the member.

The SPEAKER: Very well. Leader, so as not to disrupt your contribution—

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I withdraw and apologise.

The SPEAKER: Very well.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: We have the nappy tax. I should probably pivot at this point and talk about the picnic tax as well, their other tax grab.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms Hutchesson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Waite!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: But today is not about the picnic tax; it is about the nappy tax—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Waite!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —so let us keep on talking about the nappy tax. What is next is the question. With the member for Schubert's recent very happy news, she is particularly concerned about the nappy tax.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: It is the best thing we have going for us.

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Listen to them. On top of the extra financial burden on young families that the pay-as-you-throw model—the nappy tax—approach to kerbside collection could have, there would also be some significant unintended consequences of such a model being introduced.

Those not wanting to pay the extra tax for their waste collection could resort to sneaking rubbish into a neighbour's bin. This would be difficult to police and could potentially result in ugly neighbourhood disputes. This is absolutely the last thing we want to see in our communities, but it could very much become a reality if the nappy tax were introduced in the seat of Florey, perhaps, or any other seat.

When I was environment minister and this idea was floated past me—and it was floated—I swiftly told them to put it in the bin, get rid of it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Playford!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I swiftly shut it down because the reasons I just mentioned were of great concern, but there would also be administrative burdens on local councils who would be forced by the government to subsidise and construct the nappy tax.

Reducing the amount of waste we send to landfill is something that I am passionate about, and I know there are many on this side of the house who are, but implementing a pay-as-you-throw scheme is not the way to do it. Implementing the nappy tax is not the way to do it. Implementing a nappy tax on families who are most vulnerable at this time of cost-of-living pressures—cost of living added to significantly by the inflationary pressures put on households by state and federal Labor governments—is just not the way to do it.

Education is the critical way to drive down the creation of waste at a household level. I think that Green Industries SA has done a fantastic job of promoting household recycling and green organic disposal over recent years. Many of the products we use today do not need to go to landfill and can be correctly disposed of via our yellow or green bins. This allows the products to be re-used or repurposed, which means that going to landfill is just not going to be necessary.

The Which Bin? campaign, which was run by Green Industries SA, was an effective way to educate South Australians on the best approach to household waste management, and perhaps there is an opportunity to increase funding to that education program.

Having raised the issue of a nappy tax through the media, I was actually heartened to hear the Premier come out very quickly and say that he would rule out implementing such a scheme. The scheme was on the table; it existed. It was an initiative of the Labor government.

Mr Fulbrook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Playford!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: But thankfully the Premier stepped in and got rid of the initiative that had been cooked up by the bureaucrats in his deputy's department. Thankfully, the Premier did show some common sense here. While it took the opposition to raise this issue publicly to have it killed off, there are still question marks hanging over its existence, the same way as there are question marks over the existence of the abhorrent picnic tax at the Wittunga Botanic Garden.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Waite!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The Wittunga Botanic Garden, the Mount Lofty Botanic Garden, the city Botanic Garden—

Ms Hutchesson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite is warned.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —but particularly suburban Wittunga to be charged—

Ms Hutchesson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Waite!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —to enter the botanic gardens—

Ms Hutchesson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite is warned.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —at Wittunga. The community up there are outraged that their local member will not stand up for them. She will not stand up against the picnic tax or the nappy tax.

The SPEAKER: Leader, please be seated. Member for Waite, I do not wish to give a formal direction but it may be wise for you to leave the chamber at this time.

The honourable member for Waite having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: Very well.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: It is important that the good residents of the seat of Waite know what sort of representation they have.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Mr Speaker, I was called a liar and I take offence.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: She will have to withdraw and apologise. She has not really gone. No-one can ever be gone from this place.

The SPEAKER: The member has left the chamber—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! However, I will raise it with the member on her return.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I am concluding. Pay-as-you-throw—the nappy tax—and of course the picnic tax which we will come to at another point, these are cruel tax grabs on South Australians when they are at their most vulnerable. While the Premier has wisely ruled out the nappy tax, we think it is critical that it is ruled out permanently in our state's statute book. We look forward to the government supporting it, because if they do not, the nappy tax is well and truly part of their policy platform. We look forward to them supporting the legislation that is before the house today to ensure that the nappy tax is killed off once and for all, that the nappy tax is put in the bin—because that is what needs to happen to it.

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Elizabeth!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: We are sick of the tax grabs from those opposite and it is time we got a way to end it into the statute book.

The SPEAKER: I see that the member for Waite has re-entered the chamber. I invite her to, from her place, withdraw and apologise.

Ms HUTCHESSON: I withdraw and apologise.

The SPEAKER: Very well, the matter has been resolved, but I do emphasise to the member for Waite that unparliamentary language will be addressed immediately upon my attention being drawn to it.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

PUBLIC SECTOR (MINISTERIAL TRAVEL REPORTS) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (10:49): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I indicate that the opposition were of the mind to support this bill in the upper house. Our position on that has not changed in its transferral to this house. We will be supporting the bill and look forward to its quick passage.

An honourable member: A compelling speech.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (10:50): Rich in detail. I rise to indicate that I will be the lead speaker for this bill on the government's side, and our support for the Public Sector (Ministerial Travel Reports) Amendment Bill 2023, subject to some minor amendments.

The bill seeks to amend the Public Sector Act 2009 to insert requirements that each minister who undertakes travel in their ministerial capacity outside South Australia must prepare a report within 45 days setting out the details of the travel, including the reasons for travel, the period of travel and a summary of activities undertaken in the course of travel. The minister's report must also include details of the total cost of their travel, broken down into the cost of airfares and other transport, the cost of accommodation, the cost of food and beverages, and the total of any other costs of travel.

The minister's report must include details of any public sector employee or any ministerial adviser who accompanies them and a separate breakdown of the abovementioned costs for each person. The bill requires copies of all receipts for all costs relating to the travel to accompany the report and provides that reports must be tabled in parliament within six sitting days after preparing a report.

This bill passed the other place on 14 September 2023, with the support from all non-government members, and was unopposed by government members on the basis that we would have a careful look at the bill between the houses to ensure that from a practical perspective it was workable and could be complied with by ministers. The government seeks to hold the highest standards when it comes to disclosure, transparency and accountability, and we are supportive of the measures that increase public confidence in government expenditure.

Much of the information about ministerial travel proposed to be published through this bill is already collated and proactively disclosed by government, and we have always supported such disclosure. Currently, proactive disclosures on overseas and interstate travel for ministers and chief executives are required at least every three months, and for Public Service employees every six months, with reports published on relevant government websites. The bill seeks to truncate the reporting period to 45 days and requires reports to be tabled in parliament.

The bill imposes some obligations that are more detailed than current reporting requirements, including duplicate reporting with respect to each member of the minister's official travel party, an itemised breakdown of each person's costs and a requirement to present copies of actual receipts, which are currently required to be presented for internal accounting purposes but which are generally not disclosed publicly.

While the reporting requirements of this bill are more administratively onerous than the current reporting requirements, the government believes there is merit in providing this level of transparency to ensure public confidence in government ministers and the important work undertaken for the benefit of our state through travel interstate and overseas. While the large majority of ministers, public servants and ministerial staffers—including past, present and future—will do the right thing, increased transparency is likely to ensure all parties think very carefully about how they apply public funds when required to travel, which can only be a good thing.

The government therefore supports the bill but will be proposing some minor technical amendments that seek to make the bill workable from a practical perspective. These include amendments that make provision for circumstances where it would not be reasonably practicable to

break down costs between the minister, public servant and ministerial staff member for reportable categories of expenditure or between the different categories of expenditure.

For example, in many circumstances payment for food and drink will be made for all parties in one transaction and it may be difficult, impractical or impossible to separate and itemise costs for each individual upon return home. Another example is where an event ticket includes catering, which could not be separately itemised. In these circumstances, the amendments require that the overall cost for the item is reported within the minister's report, with a description of the costs incurred and an explanation of why the costs could not be reasonably broken down.

Amendments are also proposed that ensure the scope of a minister's reporting obligations under the bill is limited to their own travel and that of public sector employees or prescribed staff members who are directly accompanying the minister as part of the minister's official travelling party.

Amendments are also proposed that make provision for situations in which ministers do not have information required to be reported under the bill reasonably available within 45 days. This is likely to occur from time to time due to the lead time required for receipt by the government of invoices and credit card statements, particularly where expenditure occurs across two months, and travel credit notes from the state's corporate travel provider.

These are provided in circumstances where flight bookings have been amended prior to or during the trip and historically take more than one month to be provided by the government's corporate travel provider. In such circumstances, the amendments would require ministers to prepare and table the report within the statutory time frame with an explanation as to why the report is incomplete and a description of the outstanding information. They would also require ministers to table a supplementary report when all required information becomes available.

Amendments are also proposed that permit redacted receipts or invoices in circumstances where disclosure of the redacted information would create a risk to the health or safety of a person or amount to a security risk to the interests of the state. For example, disclosure of receipts could pose a security risk with respect to accommodation frequently used by ministers, and disclosure of a confidential government account number might amount to a security risk to the interests of the state. Lastly, amendments are proposed that permit the submission of an invoice or a declaration in lieu of a receipt, noting that receipts will sometimes be lost or may not always be available.

These amendments seek to ensure the obligations conferred by the bill can be delivered from a practical perspective and deal with circumstances where those obligations are unable to be met by no fault of a minister while ensuring timely, open and transparent public reporting. I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I move:

That time for debate be extended until the bill has been concluded through all stages.

Motion carried.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

Mr McBRIDE: I move:

Amendment No 1 [McBride-1]—

Page 2, line 12 [clause 3, heading to inserted Part 3A]—Delete 'Ministerial' and substitute 'certain official'

Amendment No 2 [McBride-1]—

Page 2, lines 14 and 15 [clause 3, inserted section 12A(1)]—Delete 'Minister in their Ministerial' and substitute 'prescribed person in their official'

Amendment No 3 [McBride-1]—

Page 2, line 18 [clause 3, inserted section 12A(2)]—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'prescribed person'
Amendment No 4 [McBride-1]—

Page 2, line 19 [clause 3, inserted section 12A(2)]—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'prescribed person'
Amendment No 5 [McBride-1]—

Page 2, line 20 [clause 3, inserted section 12A(2)]—Delete 'Minister's' and substitute 'prescribed person's'
Amendment No 6 [McBride-1]—

Page 2, line 23 [clause 3, inserted section 12A(3)]—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'prescribed person'
Amendment No 7 [McBride-1]—

Page 2, after line 24 [clause 3, inserted section 12A]—Insert:

(1) In this section—

prescribed person means—

- (a) each Minister of the Crown; and
- (b) the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly; and
- (c) the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council; and
- (d) the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly; and
- (e) the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council.

Amendment No 8 [McBride-1]—

Page 3, line 1 [clause 3, heading to inserted section 12B]—Delete 'Ministers to report on Ministerial' and substitute 'Prescribed persons to report on certain official'

My first amendments to this bill, which has come here from the other place, are a number that relate to clause 3. The bill that has come from the upper house, moved by the Hon. Sarah Game and supported by the other place, is well justified. It is well within its rights to seek clarity to make sure that, in regard to travel, all of this place—government and ministers—is transparent with taxpayers' funds.

In regard to why these amendments have been moved, if this place is going to maintain a standard, if it is going to maintain transparency and if it is going to maintain accountability, as my amendments clearly highlight, when the government travels beyond South Australia the government has been asked to report back within 45 days. I think the prerequisite was 90 days prior to the amendments from the other place. The cause and reasons for pursuing this line are to make sure that money is well used and well accounted for because they are using taxpayers' funds.

As an Independent, and I note that all Independents in the other place unanimously supported these amendments, I am adding to these amendments to make sure that they cover both government and opposition in a fair and logical set of sequences. I can add further remarks later, but that gives the committee some insight into the amendments.

Mr COWDREY: Given this is the first time that the opposition has even set eyes on the amendments, this is not how we make good sausages—without any warning or providing copies of two sets of amendments, of which there are 25 in total.

The member for MacKillop has not shown due process, has not shown due consideration and has not provided any means of courtesy to the opposition in terms of bringing these amendments to the house. I make the point to the house today that it is incumbent on all members to ensure that due and proper process is adhered to.

We will take as much time as is available to us—all of the three minutes we have had these amendments—to consider these in detail, noting that there are significant implications and that this is an important bill. I make the point to the house that in future, if there is consideration of and want for support for amendments, perhaps it would be nice to at least foreshadow them to all those involved in making laws in this parliament.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Are there any further contributions on the amendments from the member for MacKillop?

Mr COWDREY: Did the member for MacKillop draft these amendments by himself?

Mr McBRIDE: These amendments have been suggested to me. It was coming from the upper house. It had been suggested to me that it was very one sided, and I have sought clarity regarding what was going on and was assisted in this process to make sure that it looked like it was bipartisan, that everyone was playing their part in the intent of the bill so that we were all on the same page.

Mr COWDREY: Who provided that assistance to you, member for MacKillop, to ensure that it looked bipartisan? Are you saying that it is now not bipartisan, that it was just a front to look bipartisan in nature? Who provided the assistance to you?

Mr McBRIDE: I have been supported through this parliamentary process over a number of days, and all I can say is that a number of people have been involved. They considered my request when I was questioning this process and this is the way I have landed. I do not think it will cause a lot of argument. It may cause the opposition to wonder why they might be considered differently to a government in any sort of travel claim. I understand that you might want to question that and that is fine.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Order! The member for MacKillop is trying to answer your question.

Mr McBRIDE: Mr Acting Chair, as you would note, this is not trying to find winners and losers here; this is making sure we all play the same game and be responsible and be accountable, and if this is going to happen on one side of the chamber, I cannot see why another side of the chamber should be considered any differently.

Mr COWDREY: Member for MacKillop, I make the point that the opposition are not opposing your amendments by any stretch of the imagination. I just want you to put on record and deny that the Labor Party drafted these for you.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Member for MacKillop, you can feel free to respond to that any way you feel.

Mr McBRIDE: I work through the parliamentary system in this house. There are obviously resources that we find from all sources, and I have utilised the parliamentary system to make sure that these amendments are professionally constructed.

Mr Cowdrey: You couldn't deny it though, could you. You couldn't deny it.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): He is attempting to respond to your question.

Mr McBRIDE: They may think it may come from one source over another, but in the end this is a parliamentary system and I am not sure whether they think they have special—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Order!

Mr McBRIDE: —let's say, assistance and help that I do not have. I have gone through the means that I have to have these amendments drafted correctly or legally and I think they stand well to make sure that everyone is considered the same in this place.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: If I might make a contribution and indicate government support for these amendments and in so doing note that they were circulated relatively recently. I would like to do a recent history lesson about the merit and attention span of the opposition when amendments are filed.

The Botanic Gardens Act has always had a provision to charge general entry, which has never been used. An amendment was filed in October by the government to say that we would, in fact, change the law to remove that provision. Despite that amendment having been filed and sitting

on that table, members of the opposition felt quite comfortable going out and terrifying people who go to the Botanic Gardens saying that we are going to start charging, so amendments being filed do not seem to have any attention paid by the opposition at any point, nor is there much adherence to the idea of truth.

I also note that the member had these amendments prepared by parliamentary counsel. It says it on the bottom. Parliamentary counsel are there for all members. That is not the case in Canberra. In Canberra, people who are not part of the government are largely left alone to try to come up with the correct legal language. Here I think it is a very great virtue that any member of parliament is able to have amendments, or indeed bills, prepared by parliamentary counsel, which therefore ensures a degree of integrity.

So I support the amendments. I support the intent of the amendments, which I do believe to be truly bipartisan in the sense that public money is public money, and I defend the member's right to lay on the table his amendments when he chooses, given that the opposition routinely ignores amendments that are tabled with some notice. I also note that parliamentary counsel do a fantastic job.

Mr TEAGUE: In light of that response, it might be a question to the Acting Premier. The Acting Premier has indicated that these amendments have been circulated recently. I think the member for Colton indicated when they first came to the attention of the opposition. Can the Acting Premier indicate when the amendments first came to the attention of the government?

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): It would be more appropriate to ask questions of the mover of the amendments, but if the minister wishes to make a contribution she certainly can.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I have seen these amendments being delivered here, but I had previously been aware of some consideration that was being given by the member for MacKillop to this reform and therefore we support it.

Mr TEAGUE: With that guidance, it was not a question personally directed to when the matter came to the attention of the Acting Premier. I might just note a question then to the mover. When did the mover first provide the amendments or, if it was before that, give notice to the government of the nature of these amendments to be moved by the member?

Mr McBRIDE: I think this bill has been around in the upper house since September. That was the first I heard of it, when it was going through the upper house. It was moved by, as I said, the Hon. Sarah Game. I was interested. I think Sarah even mentioned this whole process to me in conversation. So I learnt more detail around this whole process, and then it subsequently moved through the other place.

All I am going to say to you is that I have known about this sort of process for a number of weeks, and probably the idea of what was going on, from the other place. When I learnt further detail about its intent with regard to the government, I thought, from an Independent's point of view, that I could not see why, if the opposition were able to access funds for travel, they would not play by the same rules as the government.

I do not know where the opposition is coming from in the way of time lines, but I am sorry that they have not seen this early enough. I know that they are going to support it; I know they are going to believe in this. They would be very well advised to just say, 'What's good for the goose is good for the gander, and we will be bipartisan on this,' because these amendments are not huge. They are just tiny words in regard to government ministers in making sure all the opposition, the leader and the deputy leader in both houses are subject to the same sort of scrutiny.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I move:

Amendment No 1 [DeputyPremier-1]—

Page 3, line 2 [clause 3, inserted section 12B(1)]—Delete 'Each' and substitute:

Subject to this section, each

Amendment carried.

Mr McBRIDE: I move:

Amendment No 9 [McBride-1]—

Page 3, line 2 [clause 3, inserted section 12B(1)]—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'prescribed person'

Amendment carried.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I move:

Amendment No 2 [DeputyPremier-1]—

Page 3, lines 2 and 3 [clause 3, inserted section 12B(1)]—Delete ', within 45 days of the conclusion of the travel,'

Amendment carried.

Mr McBRIDE: I move:

Amendment No 10 [McBride-1]—

Page 3, line 6 [clause 3, inserted section 12B(1)(a)(i)]—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'prescribed person'

Amendment carried.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I move:

Amendment No 3 [DeputyPremier-1]—

Page 3, lines 19 and 20 [clause 3, inserted section 12B(1)(b)]—Delete 'accompanies a Minister undertaking the travel' and substitute 'travels with the Minister as part of the Minister's official travelling party'

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Member for MacKillop, I understand you have an amendment to this amendment. If you move it formally, you will be moving an amendment to the minister's amendment.

Mr McBRIDE: I move:

Amendment No 11 [McBride-1]—

Page 3, line 20 [clause 3, inserted section 12B(1)(b)]—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'prescribed person who is a Minister'

Amendment to amendment carried; amendment as amended carried.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I move:

Amendment No 4 [DeputyPremier-1]—

Page 4, lines 1 and 2 [clause 3, inserted section 12B(1)(c)]—Delete 'the Minister is accompanied by a prescribed staff member' and substitute:

a prescribed staff member travels with the Minister as part of the Minister's official travelling party

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Member for MacKillop, same procedure again: if you wish to, you can now move amendment No. 12 standing in your name, which is an amendment to the minister's amendment.

Mr McBRIDE: I move:

Amendment No 12 [McBride-1]—

Page 4, line 1 [clause 3, inserted section 12B(1)(c)]—Delete 'the Minister' and substitute 'a prescribed person who is a Minister'

Amendment to amendment carried; amendment as amended carried.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I move:

Amendment No 5 [DeputyPremier-1]—

Page 4, after line 20 [clause 3, inserted section 12B]—Insert:

(1a) Subject to subsection (1b), a report must be prepared under this section within 45 days after the conclusion of the relevant travel.

- (1b) If, in relation to a report of particular travel, the Minister does not have the information or documents necessary to provide all of the information required under subsection (1)(a)(iv), (1)(b)(iv) or (1)(c)(iii), the Minister must—
- (a) nevertheless prepare a report under this section setting out such of the information required under subsection (1) as may be known to the Minister; and
 - (b) set out in the report an explanation of why the report is incomplete and a description of the outstanding information; and
 - (c) as soon as is reasonably practicable after the Minister receives the outstanding information or documents, prepare a supplementary report containing that information.
- (1c) If, in relation to a report of particular travel, it is not reasonably practicable for the Minister to provide a breakdown of the costs in accordance with subsection (1)(a)(iv), (1)(b)(iv) or (1)(c)(iii), the Minister will be taken to have complied with those requirements if the Minister sets out in the report—
- (a) the total cost of the travel; and
 - (b) a description of the costs incurred in the travel; and
 - (c) an explanation of why the costs could not reasonably be broken down in accordance with those requirements.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Member for MacKillop, you have the opportunity to now move amendments Nos 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the second set of schedule amendments that you have filed, which is 92(3).

Mr McBRIDE: I move:

Amendment No 3 [McBride-2]—

Page 4, after line 20—In inserted subsection (1b) delete 'the Minister' first occurring and substitute 'a prescribed person'

Amendment No 4 [McBride-2]—

Page 4, after line 20 [inserted subsection (1b)]—In inserted subsection (1b) delete 'Minister' second, third and fourth occurring and substitute in each case 'prescribed person'

Amendment No 5 [McBride-2]—

Page 4, after line 20 [inserted subsection (1c)]—In inserted subsection (1c) delete 'the Minister' first occurring and substitute 'a prescribed person'

Amendment No 6 [McBride-2]—

Page 4, after line 20—In inserted subsection (1c) delete 'Minister' second and third occurring and substitute in each case 'prescribed person'

Amendments to amendment carried; amendment as amended carried.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Next on the list is amendment No. 13 of the first set of amendments moved by the member for MacKillop. Member for MacKillop, do you wish to move No. 13?

Mr McBRIDE: I move:

Amendment No 13 [McBride-1]—

Page 4, line 21 [clause 3, inserted section 12B(2)]—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'prescribed person'

Amendment carried.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I move:

Amendment No 6 [DeputyPremier-1]—

Page 4, line 22 [clause 3, inserted section 12B(2)]—After 'receipts' insert:

or invoices

Amendment carried.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I move:

Amendment No 7 [DeputyPremier-1]—

Page 4, after line 23 [clause 3, inserted section 12B]—Insert:

- (2a) However, a Minister need not comply with subsection (2) in relation to a particular receipt or invoice, or particular class of receipts or invoices—
 - (a) if the receipt or invoice relates to a matter to be addressed in a supplementary report prepared under subsection (1b), in which case the Minister must instead cause a copy of the receipt or invoice to accompany the supplementary report; or
 - (b) if a receipt or invoice in respect of a particular cost is not able to be obtained by the Minister, or has been lost or destroyed, in which case the Minister must instead complete a declaration containing any information required by the regulations in relation to the cost and cause a copy of the declaration to accompany the report or supplementary report under this section (as the case requires).
- (2b) If a Minister is of the opinion that to comply with subsection (2) or (2a) in relation to a particular receipt or invoice would create a risk to the health or safety of the Minister or any other person, or would amount to a security risk to the interests of the State (however described), the Minister may cause a redacted copy of the receipt or invoice to accompany the report or supplementary report (and in such a case the Minister will, to avoid doubt, be taken to have complied with the relevant subsection in respect of the receipt or invoice).

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Member for MacKillop, you may wish to move Nos 7 and 8 of the second set of amendments in your name, if you wish.

Mr McBRIDE: I move:

Amendment No 7 [McBride-2]—

Page 4, after line 23 [inserted subsection (2a)]—In inserted subsection (2a) delete 'Minister' wherever occurring and substitute in each case 'prescribed person'

Amendment No 8 [McBride-2]—

Page 4, after line 23 [inserted subsection (2b)]—In inserted subsection (2b) delete 'Minister' wherever occurring and substitute in each case 'prescribed person'

Amendments to amendment carried; amendment as amended carried.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I move:

Amendment No 8 [DeputyPremier-1]—

Page 4, line 27 [clause 3, inserted section 12B(4)]—Delete 'accompanies a Minister undertaking travel to which this Part applies' and substitute:

travels with a Minister undertaking travel to which this Part applies as part of the Minister's official travelling party

Mr McBRIDE: I move:

Amendment No 14 [McBride-1]—

Page 4, line 26 [clause 3, inserted section 12B(4)]—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'prescribed person who is a Minister'

Amendment to amendment carried; amendment as amended carried.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I move:

Amendment No 9 [DeputyPremier-1]—

Page 4, line 29 [clause 3, inserted section 12B(4)(a)]—Delete 'receipts' and substitute:

documents

Amendment carried.

Mr McBRIDE: I move:

Amendment No 15 [McBride–1]—

Page 4, line 34 [clause 3, inserted section 12B(5)]—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'prescribed person'

Amendment carried.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I move:

Amendment No 10 [DeputyPremier–1]—

Page 4, line 34 [clause 3, inserted section 12B(5)]—Delete 'report and accompanying receipts' and substitute:
report or supplementary report and accompanying documents

Amendment carried.

Mr McBRIDE: I move:

Amendment No 16 [McBride–1]—

Page 4, line 38 [clause 3, inserted section 12B(6), definition of *prescribed staff member*]
—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'prescribed person who is a Minister'

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (11:35): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Motions

LITERACY GUARANTEE UNIT

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:35): I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes the statewide results of the year 1 phonics checks and the improvements that have taken place since the first check was introduced in 2018;
- (b) congratulates the staff in the education department's Literacy Guarantee Unit, and elsewhere in public and non-government education, who have worked hard to assist educators and schools to develop and improve their practice in the teaching of reading;
- (c) commends the efforts of professional educators and volunteers in non-government organisations who have been working to improve reading instruction and literacy outcomes in South Australia for many years;
- (d) thanks all those South Australians who have helped reform the delivery of literacy programs in the early years of schooling in South Australia; and
- (e) encourages the government to maintain the Literacy Guarantee Unit, the year 1 phonics check and other reforms designed to improve literacy outcomes for young South Australians into the years ahead.

I am very pleased to move the motion standing in my name, recognising the extraordinary work of educators and students alike throughout South Australia through a journey of improved reading instruction, particularly over the last five years. The motion reads:

- (a) notes the statewide results of the year 1 phonics checks and the improvements that have taken place since the first check was introduced in 2018;

I will talk a little bit about this but, to very clearly put the improvements in a nutshell, in 2018, when the first mandatory statewide year 1 phonics check was undertaken in all government schools, only 43 per cent of our year 1 students, unfortunately, were at the mark—the expected achievement that

was anticipated. I will describe what that is in detail later, but, to be clear, only 43 per cent of our students in 2018 were at the level they were supposed to be.

It has been an enormous amount of work. In some aspects, it started before 2018 but was certainly turbocharged from 2018 onwards. The compulsory nature of the check was an important aspect of that, as was the work by teachers, by the Department for Education, by the contributions of people in the non-government sector, by advocates, by parents, by students, and, indeed, by none more than our year 1 teachers across South Australia who changed practice in many cases, who gave the checks a go and who put in the hours in their professional development. There was work done by leaders and other teachers in the school to have whole-school approaches that in many cases were entirely and radically different from those they had before.

Through a combination of heightened awareness of the need for intervention for students who were not grasping the critical building block of literacy that is phonics, and indeed through changed practice in classrooms and in schools, we saw improvement. In 2018, 43 per cent of our students were at the mark; in 2019, 52 per cent of our students were at the mark; in 2020, 63 per cent of students were at the mark; in 2021, 67 per cent of students were at the mark; and in 2022, 68 per cent of students were at the mark. The figures for this year have not yet been publicly released, but I understand that in the coming days or weeks we will have news that we have surpassed 70 per cent.

As I understand it, 71 per cent of students are achieving the expected standard in our phonics checks in 2023. The minister will, I am sure, correct me if my news is in error in any way. However, it is good news and it is good news that all in this house can share in the celebration of this, along with our teachers, along with our department, along with the professionals who have helped, and along with the many advocates who have worked very hard. I go on to suggest in this motion that this house:

- (b) congratulates the staff in the education department's Literacy Guarantee Unit, and elsewhere in public and non-government education, who have worked hard to assist educators and schools to develop and improve their practice in the teaching of reading;
- (c) commends the efforts of professional educators and volunteers in non-government organisations who have been working to improve reading instructions and literacy outcomes in South Australia for many years.

I want to particularly highlight the efforts of a couple of organisations. I am going to get in trouble because there are others as well. Dyslexia SA has been on this track for many years. A couple of years ago, Dyslexia SA folded itself into the other organisation that I will name, which is SPELD. Prior to that, they were an advocacy group particularly concerned about students with dyslexia and other learning difficulties and the way that the department and the whole sector, I think, for many years, the whole language approach to the teaching of literacy, had failed their children and was not giving their children every opportunity to succeed.

We talk a lot about the need for wellbeing in schools. It is a particular focus of the new minister, and it was a focus of mine as well. It is a focus of the department at every stage, but that is not, in my view, something that should ever be taken in opposition to a focus on literacy. There is no student whose wellbeing is going to be supported through school if they are unable to read and unable to access the rest of the curriculum and the opportunities for learning that they can experience through school. Without a focus on getting the basic building blocks of literacy correct in the early years of schooling, that student's wellbeing is a matter of luck.

Students with dyslexia and other learning difficulties will struggle in school unless there is an evidence-based approach to the teaching of literacy. Phonics has to be part of that, but for many years it was not. Particularly through the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s, the universities decided that it was unfashionable, and it was not really reintroduced as something that was departmental policy until much more recently.

In about 2015 or 2016—I think the Deputy Premier was then the minister—there was some work done on approaches to reading instruction. I think Jayne Johnston was the head of schools at the time. She gave evidence in an estimates hearing in this room that the department was going to

focus on the big five of reading. They are sometimes described as the big six, but one of them obviously is phonological awareness and one of them is phonics instruction.

In an explicit fashion and using systematic synthetic phonics as an approach, the department's policy was still on a journey. In 2017, the federal government's education minister was Simon Birmingham. I think it was him at the time, having replaced Christopher Pyne, but if it was Mr Pyne I apologise to him. Ministers Pyne and Birmingham had the federal government on a course where it was certainly announced in the first half of 2017 that the federal government was seeking that all states have phonics-based instruction as part of their approach to literacy.

I commended at the time the Deputy Premier, when she announced as education minister that there would be a trial in South Australia. Fifty schools signed up to a trial of a phonics check. This is something that was not new. Nick Gibb, former minister for schools in the UK, had introduced this in English schools some years earlier. He had been to Australia and encouraged Australian jurisdictions to take it up. Indeed, through the efforts of Dyslexia SA and SPELD, advocacy for the phonics check was important, and I will tell you why in a minute.

To the point, the former Labor government, in the last eight months of their 16-year term, did have a trial. The trial initially was headed in the wrong direction. It was aimed at self-selecting schools, to be done at a reception level, which is a time that was not seen as a relevant equivalent to the UK check because students were not at that point of learning the letters and the language in the Australian curriculum.

With my encouragement, and the encouragement of Dyslexia SA and SPELD, the then minister, now Deputy Premier, brought in a second set of eyes. She brought in Jennifer Buckingham, who I think at that stage was at the Centre for Independent Studies, to have a look at what the department was doing. With her advice, firstly the check was moved from reception to year 1 and the reference was taken to Flinders University to analyse how the trial went. The Flinders University researcher—I think it was Anne Bayetto; forgive me if I have misspoken her name—undertook an analysis of the trial.

This was all in 2017. This is the work the former government did and for which I gave them credit throughout our term. At the same time as the government was announcing the trial, the Liberal Party was announcing a full suite of measures: a literacy guarantee package of measures, including the year 1 phonics check being mandatorily rolled out to all government schools; teacher training; literacy coaches through our Literacy Guarantee Unit; and literacy guarantee conferences in school holidays that would be accessible by all teachers, including those in the non-government sector.

We also announced increased support for breakfast programs because hungry kids do not learn well, and too many of our children go to school hungry each day. There were a range of measures in this package, 10 measures aimed at improving the teaching of literacy and early years reading in our schools.

For months and months, we urged the government to release the Flinders University analysis of the trial in 2017, and they declined to do so because this was not something that was universally welcomed. It was uniquely welcomed in the fact that it had bipartisan support from the opposition, but many in the sector and the union—certain principals, certain people in certain sections of the department and, indeed, a number of teachers—were very sceptical of this approach. They were very resistant to the approach.

The Labor Party did not commit to it in government until, and I kid you not, sir, two days before the 2018 state election, by which time even the Xenophon party had committed to it all, but they did commit to it and it was a bipartisan project. I certainly appreciated that they made it easier through our four years of government in rolling out these checks, and the other package of measures, that it had the support of the Deputy Premier as shadow minister for education and then the current minister as shadow minister for education when he became the shadow minister.

It being a bipartisan project throughout the entirety of its tenure has assisted in ensuring that the department bought into it and that teachers and other stakeholders gave it a go. But I tell you what, the thing that meant that teachers gave it a go more than anything else is that they sought results in the classroom. From that first check in 2018, when only 43 per cent of students met the

mark, I spoke to literally hundreds of teachers one on one in groups, visiting schools over the subsequent 12 months.

Almost all of them identified that if they had been delivering phonics instruction in the classroom they were very supportive. Those who had not been, identified that there were students who would have slipped through the cracks; they were surprised that they had not done as well as they expected. They thought that they would do more. There are 40 words on the flashcards; they have to name 28 to be at the standard. Many students were not getting to 28 who those teachers thought would. That gave them pause to think, and they bought in.

No teacher in our system would go into this work with the calling they have, and the approach to their students and the care for the students they have, attempting to do things at anything less than in the best possible way. But they had been taught at university—it was part of the culture—that phonics was not the best way to teach these kids and so that was confronting for many people. Every teacher who had a look at this and identified that there were improvements in the classroom that were capable of being delivered through a different approach then took the opportunity to do so.

The Marshall government invested in more than \$13 million, as I recall, in 2018 in providing particular professional development opportunities, backfilling classrooms for TRTs so that teachers could not only get some training in the phonics check ahead of the delivery of the check. We supported TRTs in the classroom whilst teachers were delivering the check one-on-one with their students in a very sympathetic and compassionate environment.

There was also TRT time for schools in the weeks after the check so that those students who had been identified as not meeting the mark could have particular interventions planned for them by their classroom teachers. That was at significant expense, and it was an expense that was opposed by a large number of people. As I recall, it was questioned by the Labor Party at the time although, as I said, by and large they supported it in a bipartisan fashion.

Many people helped along this journey, and I commend those professional educators and volunteers. As per the motion, I also thank all those South Australians who have helped reform the delivery of literacy programs in the early years of schooling in South Australia. It is a significant list of people, and I am not going to name names. Many of those teachers and leaders who have been doing the work in phonics through their own research and their own understanding of the best way to teach reading prior to 2018 put their hand up and said, 'I would like to lead work in helping to assist my colleagues to get the most out of this opportunity,' and their work is to be credited.

There are a couple of non South Australians, and I mentioned Jennifer Buckingham before, but I also want to highlight the work of Professor Pamela Snow, who did some really important work with the South Australian education department through 2020 and 2021. Indeed, through her work—it was a review of the Running Records program that had previously been the broadly understood way to judge how students were reading—it was identified that that was not an evidenced-based and appropriate way that supported an accurate reflection of a student's progress. So, in the COVID year of 2020, we got rid of that as a mandatory check, and the department put it back as a mandatory check in 2021. As minister, I instructed that it be removed as a mandatory check again in 2022, and I understand that that removal has been continued by the new minister for which I commend him as well.

The last dot point is that we encourage the government to maintain the Literacy Guarantee Unit, the year 1 phonics check and other reforms designed to improve literacy outcomes for young South Australians into the years ahead.

I gave notice of this motion at the beginning of this year. It was drafted at the end of last year and, at that time, there was certainly a new government with potentially new ideas. I thought it was very important that we highlight the success of these innovations so that they be maintained by the new government. To this point, they have been. Indeed, as I understand it, the Literacy Guarantee Unit even has a couple of extra coaches now, and I commend the government for their renewed support for it.

I understand the Literacy Day, at the beginning of the year, when we brought together 1,200 principals and literacy leaders from schools around South Australia, has been replaced with a

numeracy day. I understand the importance of numeracy. It is the next step in developing those basic skills, but I urge the government to consider that without the foundational building blocks of literacy being successful for all students in our schools, it is impossible to believe that their wellbeing is capably being supported to their full extent.

Our kids need to learn to read, and it requires continual effort from the government to maintain literacy as a priority to ensure that standards are held high and that every opportunity can be taken to enhance the teaching of literacy. There has been an improvement from 43 per cent of our kids to apparently 71 per cent of our kids at the mark, but that still leaves 29 per cent of our kids we need to do more for. Every year, we should be striving to do better.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (11:50): I thank the member for Morialta for his contribution. I move to amend the motion by the member for Morialta as follows:

Remove (a) and insert in lieu new (a):

notes the statewide results of the year 1 phonics checks, and the improvements that have taken place since the first check was introduced in 2017 and expanded in 2018;

Remove (e) and insert in lieu new (e):

commends the Malinauskas Labor government for its commitment to:

- a. strengthen literacy education in schools by its strong support for the Literacy Guarantee Unit, the year 1 phonics check, new professional learning resources for staff, and other reforms designed to improve literacy outcomes for young South Australians into the years ahead;
- b. improve mathematics education in schools with an improved maths curriculum, an annual numeracy summit, and maths assessment interview trial being introduced in 2024; and
- c. improve education quality in schools through the delivery of the government's seven-point plan for teaching quality, which includes making more teachers permanent, scholarships to attract talented people from diverse backgrounds into teaching, banning mobile phones in high schools, empowering principals to lead, encouraging more teachers to take up roles in the country, and supporting more specialist subjects being taught by specialist teachers.

I rise to support the motion as amended and make a contribution on the back of the contribution from the mover of the original motion, the member for Morialta. It is true that there is an uncharacteristic amount of bipartisanship, I think it is fair to say, certainly when it comes to the phonics check and also a number of other policies and procedures that are in place around literacy.

I might first touch upon one that was covered in some detail by the member for Morialta, the Literacy Guarantee Unit, which I think has played a very positive role in increasing and improving the literacy of our students. This government supports it and will keep it. I make that commitment here in this place today. The member for Morialta is also correct when he says that we have actually increased the allocation in that unit, which I think is a positive thing because it can do more of its great work, but it is also an indication, I hope, of the faith and commitment this government has shown in the Literacy Guarantee Unit as well.

I might also touch upon the Literacy Summit which, again with bipartisan support, was introduced by the former government and is being kept by the Malinauskas Labor government. We have also introduced a numeracy summit and we have decided to alternate which of those occurs in person because it is a very big undertaking to get people from right around the state to come to Adelaide to attend in person. It is a huge crowd, which is a really good thing, but we thought it was too much of an impost upon our staff, particularly our rural and regional staff, to every year come to both a literacy summit in person and a numeracy summit in person.

This year, I understand, we did the Literacy Summit in person; next year, it will be the Numeracy Summit in person. The one that is not held in person for that year will be still held but it will be online. So we are not planning on making any changes in terms of removing it; in fact, we are adding a summit around numeracy and keeping the literacy one as well. I think all the feedback we have had has been very positive, particularly around staff from regional and rural areas who, of

course, often find it harder to get to those professional development seminars that staff who might work in the metropolitan area can get to much more easily.

I would also like to touch upon wellbeing, which was another matter spoken about by the member for Morialta in his contribution today. Yes, I have sought to make that a priority and a theme of this government and my time, however long that may be, as the Minister for Education. My view of why wellbeing is important is, of course, on a human level: we want our students—no matter whether they are at preschool, primary school or high school—and our staff to be healthy and happy.

I also very much see improved wellbeing as the path to improved results, including in standardised tests, whether it is NAPLAN or PISA or whatever it might be. I think if we have a look at South Australia's performance, or Australia's performance more broadly, in the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) test and the relative decline we have seen for the best part of 20 years, and you map that against the data that we hold, which is pretty significant now, around the mental health and wellbeing of both the students who take those tests and the staff who teach them, it has been on an inverse decline compared with the position of the PISA and standardised tests generally. I think the parlous state of the wellbeing of young people, and the workforce as well, has had a role to play in how we have performed in those tests.

I certainly do not support and have not in my time so far as the minister supported taking our foot off the pedal in any way on the literacy and numeracy paths that the member for Morialta correctly identified as being vital. It is true, and I agree, that if you cannot read or write it is not going to help your wellbeing. In fact, it is going to be detrimental to your wellbeing because your place in society, your place in the classroom, your place in your community once you leave school will be greatly marginalised and diminished if you are not able to participate in the workforce or all those things outside the workforce for which you need to be literate and numerate.

I think the fact that we have added the maths assessment interview trial, which we announced this year with Lisa-Jane O'Connor, which will start from next year; the fact that we have added a numeracy summit to have in addition to the Literacy Summit; the fact that we have stuck behind and agreed with the position of the former government around the Literacy Guarantee Unit; and the fact that the trial or the pilot, which I think was in about 57 schools, of the phonics check was started by the member for Port Adelaide, the now Deputy Premier, the then Minister for Education, in 2017 and then rolled out by the member for Morialta, shows that in a lot of these issues we are agreed and the position is a very bipartisan one.

The member for Morialta and I have made a concerted effort to work together on as many things as we can in the education portfolio and depoliticise many things that have been heavily politicised in the education portfolio in years gone by. We know that it does not do any good—and, in fact, does a huge disservice to the students out there—if we have the two major political parties fighting over issues around what we do in terms of increasing the literacy and numeracy of our young people. I think we have made a good fist of that.

I think that I have been pretty honest and forthright in backing in the things that both the former government did that we agree with but also moving away from some things that the former government and former Labor governments have done that we do not agree with. I will continue to hold that position.

I might just finish by talking a little about what I have seen of the phonics check and why it is so important and why it works. I have three daughters of my own who are in primary school. My twins are in grade 2, soon to be in grade 3, and of course last year they were part of the phonics check themselves. As the minister, but also as their father, I took great interest in how that process worked and what they got out of it. I saw it as extremely beneficial and I am happy to say in this place that for one of my children, who will remain nameless of course, it did identify a little bit of extra help that might have been needed.

That help was given and the benefits that we saw for her were demonstrable, really demonstrable. It was incredible and, as they say, you can read briefing after briefing—and I am sure the member for Morialta would agree with me on this—but nothing is as powerful as seeing up close how things like this work. I saw it with one of my daughters when the phonics check identified that

she needed some extra help and that extra help really accelerated her to help her catch up to her sister.

I commend the amended motion to the house, and I think it is worthy of acknowledgement in this place that those opposite and the government are at one on many issues here. I certainly hope that we can remain as such because a position like that is of great benefit to all the students in South Australia.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:01): For the sake of completion, I think this amendment is a bit unbecoming, a bit unnecessary. It is not as if there is any specific problem with any of the measures in it individually, but this motion was about phonics and literacy and expanding it to all the government's seven-point plan on this and three-point plan on the other and all of the others does take the focus off it.

In the five minutes remaining, I could go through each of the seven points in the government's seven-point plan on teacher quality and identify the ones that are sensible, the ones that are already happening and the one or two that are just plain silly. We could talk about the government's commitment to increase teacher permanency by 10 per cent which is in that and, after two years, I think the government is still as yet unresolved on how one measures what the 10 per cent is and how many teachers are permanent.

But that aside, I want to absolutely commend the minister for two things. While I disagree with his amendment, at least its necessity, I do commend him for what was genuine in his speech in his commitment to maintaining those programs that form part of the literacy guarantee. He explained why he is so committed to them, and they are authentic reasons, personally felt and understood by his analysis of the situation. I commend him not just for speaking about it in the house, but also for the work that he has done as minister to maintain effort so far there. I urge him to continue that; to continue that focus on it, which should be a focus not diluted by other matters.

I think that the minister would no doubt be familiar with the words of Ronald Reagan, a hero I am sure of the minister, who said: 'There is no limit to the amount of good you can do if you don't care who gets the credit.' I think that is relevant in this argument about whether the phonics check started in 2017 or 2018: it started years before that. It was invented by neither the member for Port Adelaide, nor the member for Morialta, nor the member for Wright. It was first introduced in England and, to the extent that we have taken not just the idea, we have taken their check. We have an agreement with the British government: we get their check and we adapt it for Australian use.

As a result of the Flinders University analysis of the trial in 2017, there were a number of suggestions. The UK sets their standard as 32 right, out of 40, on the flashcards. We were suggested to bring it down to 28, not because our kids are less capable, but because we are doing it earlier in their schooling journey than they are in the United Kingdom; so 28 was seen as an appropriate mark. The other adaptations people will be interested to know—and if this goes to the question about whether the check we are doing now was one introduced by the Labor Party or the Liberal Party—well, it is still the UK check.

We updated the fonts that are used in the training materials, because the Flinders University study found complaints from teachers, as I recall, that the fonts used in the training materials for the check were unfamiliar fonts and so a bit harder to read, so we replaced them with fonts that are in average use in Australian education literature. I do not know if we are talking about Calibri or Times New Roman or Arial, but apparently in the UK they use different fonts. That was a thing that we found as a result of the 2017 analysis.

Also, in the training material we use videos, and it was recommended we update the videos from the UK ones where they have British accents to Australian ones with Australian accents, and so we undertook that and, indeed, more than that, we used Australian teachers. There was an enormous body of work that was undertaken to get this done throughout 2018 because I insisted as the minister that we roll this out in August 2018, that we do it in term 3 2018 because that was what the experts had advised us to.

I think the amendment to point 1 of the motion is a bit redundant, but it is not the important thing. The important thing is what the improvement has been. We have talked about the overall

figures, but in the minute remaining I am going to highlight the people for whom it has been most important: for kids who need the extra help, and kids with disability. While 43 per cent of the population were at the mark in 2018, only 14 per cent of the population were at the mark in 2018 if they had a disability.

That 14 per cent last year had improved to 41 per cent, which means that assuming that the trajectory has improved again this year, and I look forward to the minister's advice of whether my 71 per cent figure was accurate and what the others are, it may well be that kids with a disability now are scoring what the whole population did in 2018. If that is the story, *The Advertiser* should put it on page 1 and who cares who they give credit to; give credit to the teachers. Kids with a disability being able to read effectively—41 per cent in 2022 compared with 14 per cent in 2018; that is an extraordinary story.

Aboriginal students are up from 21 to 40. English as an additional dialect were ahead of the curve to start with, but they remain ahead. Low-SES students had improvement from 18 per cent to 41 per cent, and country students improved from 36 per cent to 62 per cent. Kids who need extra support benefit from this the most. I encourage the government to redouble efforts on what has been a great bipartisan project over the last five to six years.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTEER DAY

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (12:06): I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes that 5 December 2023 is International Volunteer Day;
- (b) expresses thanks to the nearly one million South Australians who volunteer each year;
- (c) acknowledges the work of our emergency service volunteers and other volunteers who assist our community during times of natural disasters such as floods, bushfires and storm events;
- (d) acknowledges the support provided by Volunteering SA/NT as the peak body and the Volunteer Resource Centres; and
- (e) notes the work of the Malinauskas Labor government to support and promote volunteering in South Australia.

It is often said that South Australia, in fact our country, could not operate as it does without the work of volunteers, and that is indeed very true. The millions of hours provided by volunteers across our state and our nation each year would cost the nation billions of dollars if to be provided through paid employment. Yet Australians do not volunteer for recognition but because they believe it is the right thing to do.

The National Strategy for Volunteering informs us that 56 per cent of Australians undertook volunteering in 2022, and next week we celebrate these Australians on International Volunteer Day. On 5 December, we will celebrate and thank our volunteers while also raising awareness of the important role volunteers play in responding to the many challenges facing our world.

International Volunteer Day, mandated by the United Nations General Assembly, is held each year. It is viewed as a unique chance for volunteers and organisations to celebrate their efforts, share their values and promote their work among their communities, non-government organisations, United Nations agencies, government authorities and the private sector.

This year's theme for the day is 'If everyone did' and centres on the power of everyone and the power of collective action in a time where much of the progress made on the 2030 agenda for sustainable development adopted by all United Nations member states in 2015, including the 17 sustainable development goals, are stalled or reversed with only one—responsible consumption and production—now 40 per cent complete.

There is a sense of urgency to respond to global development challenges ranging from climate action to natural disasters, reducing inequality, hunger, health and rising poverty to endangered natural resources. All these challenges require collective action, as do so many other

challenges in our own community such as combating hunger, providing emergency assistance, saving lives and keeping our community safe.

I wish to express thanks to every volunteer in our community. Whether they give hundreds of hours every year or several hours a month, every contribution is valuable, and if everyone did something then it would further enhance our community. If everyone could find some time to volunteer, our world would be a better place. Imagine more than eight billion of us volunteering—the possibilities are endless.

I am proud to be one of those volunteers putting my hand up at Oaklands reserve parkrun. There are many volunteer roles that you can do at parkrun, so there is a place for everyone. You can be a timekeeper, or you can be a park walker. In fact, last Saturday I tried a new volunteering role as a guide for the vision impaired, for one of our park runners, Rolf.

We also have in my community the weekly St Jude's community meal, another event at which I volunteer where possible, not only serving a meal to those in need in our community but also, once they have had time to eat, sitting down and chatting with them and making some connection. I have also had the opportunity to volunteer at the Marion RSL, pulling beers on ANZAC Day so our veterans can spend time together. I know many of my colleagues also volunteer, and I look forward to hearing everyone's contributions. As I mentioned earlier, nearly one million South Australians volunteer each year, and I ask every member in this place to encourage our community members to exceed one million volunteers, as the need never diminishes.

Earlier this week, as the weather raged we saw that our State Emergency Service volunteers were on the frontline protecting lives and property. This is just the most recent example we have seen, from the extensive work that occurred through the summer floods to their work during the Naracoorte storm last week and fighting bushfires across our state, unfortunately on a regular basis. Combined, the services of the SES and the CFS have nearly 15,500 volunteers and attended more than 20,000 incidents during the 2022-23 year.

We especially thank these women and men as they put themselves in harm's way to keep us safe. In addition, I would like to thank the emergency volunteers from the Salvation Army and the staff from Housing SA who provide assistance on the ground in these circumstances. On the frontline in my electorate are our surf lifesaving volunteers who we know are so highly trained and thankfully not too often called upon. But, unfortunately, as we saw at Port Noarlunga recently, their critical work helps keep our community safe and save lives.

Mr Acting Speaker, if you decide today that you want to volunteer, how would you find out which organisations could use your skills? That is where Volunteering SA&NT and the volunteer resource centres come in. Through these centres you can inquire about what is available, what you can offer an organisation, and if there is any training you might need. These organisations provide referral services, quality training, research and information, and run the Aged Care Volunteer Visitor Scheme in several areas across Adelaide.

Volunteering is for everybody regardless of age, gender identity, background, sexuality or ability. Through a partnership between Orana, Southern Volunteering and Northern Volunteering, the Volunteerability program was developed to support volunteers living with a disability and volunteer-involved organisations to work together in a successful, inclusive way.

Of course, like every community, there are particular volunteers who stand out. In Brighton, we have Virginia Summers, a prolific volunteer in my local community. Her volunteering commitment to the community is seemingly endless. She is a church warden at St Jude's and works in support of St Jude's Community Meal; and, with her many contacts in the community, she sources food for those meals. She volunteers at the Seacliff Esplanade parkrun and is a Joey leader with Scouts Darlington and so much more. In fact, I was proud to be volunteering at the St Jude's Community Meal just a couple of weeks ago when Virginia was presented with a Certificate of Appreciation by Minister Cook, and flowers by Sophie from St Jude's. Thank you, Virginia, for everything you do.

In addition to Virginia there are hundreds of volunteers in my community. Our volunteers at Brighton and Somerton Park Surf Life Saving keep our beaches safe, provide first aid and youth

development opportunities. The Brighton and Marion RSL sub-branches facilitate fellowship for our veterans and ensure that we remember the fallen.

My local service clubs, such as Brighton and Marion Lions, organisations such as MarionLIFE, St Jude's Anglican Church and St Elizabeth of Hungary Anglican Church provide community services, care for those in need and provide connections in our local community. Every weekend, we have sport playing across Gibson, and all those teams require volunteers, be it coaches preparing training plans, volunteers running the lines or parents cooking the barbecue, washing kits or driving kids to and from training. Without these people our sports would not run so successfully.

Our young people, too, participate in volunteering in many organisations, including Scouts and Guides, Youth Collective and HoldUp youth committees, and many other places providing community service, learning skills, advocating for change and running events. And if you care particularly for the environment, in our local community we have the Friends of Minda Dunes and Sturt River Landcare—environmental volunteer groups, which I have also spent some time volunteering with.

In 2023-24, the Department of Human Services is providing \$718,000 in funding to the volunteering sector for a range of grants, including for sector support and advocacy, community capacity programs and volunteer support and recognition. This includes \$431,000 to Volunteering SA&NT for sector advocacy and impact as a peak body.

I am proud to be part of a Malinauskas Labor government that supports and promotes volunteering in South Australia. My friend Minister Cook knows the value of volunteering and that every volunteer is special in our state.

Every year we have the South Australian Volunteer Awards, which recognise the invaluable work that volunteers, volunteer managers, community organisations and businesses contribute to the South Australian community. We also have volunteer certificates and special volunteers' days for our volunteers each day on the second Monday in June. I thank every volunteer and commend this motion to the house.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:17): I rise to support the motion in an amended form and note:

That this house—

- (a) notes that 5 December 2023 is International Volunteer Day;
- (b) expresses thanks to the nearly one million South Australians who volunteer each year;
- (c) acknowledges the work of our emergency service volunteers and other volunteers who assist our community during times of natural disasters, such as floods, bushfires and storm events;
- (d) acknowledges the support provided by Volunteering SA/NT as the peak body and the Volunteer Resource Centre; and—

deleting paragraph (e) and substituting—

- (e) notes the work of all governments in supporting and promoting volunteering in South Australia.

I do not think there is anything greater than volunteering for your state and for your country. We have seen volunteers sign up to serve in our armed forces, and that has the potential of paying the ultimate sacrifice.

We also see volunteers sign up for so many other roles, and not necessarily signing up; it can be as simple as helping a next-door neighbour, it could be putting a bin out, doing the gardening, assisting with volunteer driving—which is quite essential in country areas—and getting people to medical appointments or out to do their shopping. Many people have a renewed, vibrant lifestyle doing this, meeting new people, being able to get people to appointments and look after them in that way.

We also have the sporting clubs. I got a letter from one of my sporting clubs—it was one of my local football clubs—noting that they need more volunteers. COVID obviously caused people to stay at home, and I think it had a real impact on the levels of volunteerism. You cannot just expect to turn up to junior netball, junior football or any other sporting event, drop the kids off, go home and

think it all just happens. It does not all just happen: it happens because of the work of volunteers, as has already been stated. It might be coaches, or it might be doing the time keeping or goal umpiring.

There is nothing like goal umpiring when you have your neighbour's young son questioning your decision quite vigorously to your face while you are waving the flag; he thought it was a goal and you signalled it as a point. You just get on with the game. It is such a necessity. It is said that a volunteer is worth close to \$50 an hour, but they really are priceless. No government, whether on a state basis or a federal basis, would be able to put up the money to pay the billions of dollars that would be needed over time for all the volunteer efforts that are made.

I mentioned COVID and sporting events and the issues there. Some people who were the heads of leagues and that sort of thing really stepped up and did massive COVID plans just for holding sporting events in communities, doing the square metreage and all the numbers that needed to be done with the health guidelines. Even the motorsport park in Tailem Bend, which I think covers over 1,700 acres, had to put these plans in place, but it obviously had plenty of room if you calculate all the space for the punters coming out to see motorsport.

Motorsport is another area where a whole lot of volunteers come on board to work, whether it is on the track out there at Tailem Bend or now with the new dragway, which was so good to see going the other day with 35,000 people turning up over the weekend. Sadly, I am old enough to have been there 44 years ago when *Waltzing Matilda* the jet truck went down the track from the other direction. It is so good to see the drags back there, and that is ably helped by many volunteers to make sure the teams can get out there.

Certainly, our service clubs are tireless in their efforts right across the state. I will name some, though I will not get them all. It could be Lions, or it could be Rotary—there are a whole range of service clubs that do things like catering in the community just to make sure that people can get an egg and bacon roll or have the barbecue running. I have seen some pretty exquisite barbecues set up by clubs to serve the community.

Our emergency services do such a great job. We have the SES, with over 1,750 members at 69 stations across the state. It was great to see the new station at Strathalbyn, and we commissioned that station to be built while we were in government. The new rescue vessel, the *Mulyawork*, is stationed at Murray Bridge. It was good to go to Loxton a few weeks ago with the member for Chaffey. We saw Cosi Costello and the crew doing a recruitment drive. There are fantastic facilities in Loxton. From all things, I understand quite a few people signed up when they saw the equipment and the facilities that they are dealing with there to work with people up and down the river and elsewhere.

I certainly thank the SES for all they do and obviously the Country Fire Service, the CFS, which I am a member of, as is the member for Waite and as possibly are others in this house. They do great work, not just in the fire season, which we are obviously into now, but right throughout the year: the road crash rescue and working alongside SES. In some cases the CFS are the lead agency, as we found out the other night when we had the incidents at Coomandook. I managed to get to one, but I was up here for the second one, with two trucks burning down within the space of four days on the Dukes Highway. But just to get there and see those volunteers work all night and then have to go to work the next day on their farms and their other businesses to make sure that everything is safe is fantastic.

I want to recognise the many, many volunteers, including those unrecognised due to being in an organisation like the CFS or the SES and particularly the SES and CFS volunteers who helped with the recent floods right up and down the river, from up in Chaffey around Renmark all the way down to Wellington and who did magnificent work. It was so good to meet people who had come from Adelaide and other places to help fill up sandbags or place sandbags and just get on with the job of supporting communities that a lot of them probably did not have any direct connection to. It is so good to see that level of volunteering.

In relation to firefighting I reflect on the Yumali-Netherton fire, where I took out my private unit that day. I want to recognise those farmers with their private units because they are the ones who are usually first on the scene, especially when a harvester lights up—and they do. They usually have enough facilities there, enough tankers, enough fire units—to get there and blow it out in a hurry

so it does not start a big event. In the Yumali-Nethererton fire, which was now over three years ago, I was so proud to see the farm firefighting units working alongside the CFS to get that under control. The best thing is late in the day when you see those strike teams come from out of area, as they did that day from down the South-East so that we could head home about 9.30 and get up at daylight and get going again. They made sure that we did not lose those structures that we had saved the previous day.

To all our volunteers, I just say thank you: we cannot get enough of you. It does not matter what you are volunteering for, it does not matter how big your role is; it is special, it is unique and it is necessary to make sure that this great state of ours functions. And it does not matter who is in government. We need the volunteers because if we did not have them we would not see the goodwill that is achieved by so many South Australians in this state.

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (12:28): I cannot say enough about volunteers, and my up-front appreciation of all the work that they do. More than 900,000 South Australians volunteer each year, many of them not only offering their help to others but also gaining so much more than that. Our community is so grateful to everyone who takes the time, donates their efforts and gives so much. Without them we would not be able to achieve a whole lot of things that we see in our communities and across our state.

I am so fortunate that volunteers throughout my community give so freely with care and love for what they do. Our Friends of Parks do an incredible job of caring for our parks. The work they do with weeding, planting, educating cannot be underestimated. The Friends of Belair, Shepherds Hill Reserve, Sturt Gorge, Brown Hill Creek, Waite Conservation Reserve, Blackwood Forest, Hurds Hill and the Woodlake Reserve Action Group—we have so many people who just give up their time to go out into nature and to look after it, and I thank them.

We also have an incredible group who operate along our rail corridor—the Friends of Belair Station, the Blackwood Action Group, the friends of Lynton, the friends of Mitcham—and all of their supporters keep our stations looking good. Having gone home on the train last night, I know the effort that they put in is definitely appreciated by our community.

Speaking of local community groups who do a lot, Blackwood Action Group and the members of the Blackwood Action Group look after so many smaller gardens. They have an incredible history group. They are in the throes of organising the Christmas Tree Festival. They love our community, they love looking after it and we absolutely appreciate everything that they do.

Pauline Dodd, the history coordinator and also the coordinator of the Christmas Tree Festival, is absolutely decking the halls of our new community centre with trees, which will be decorated by businesses and community groups from across the community. Everybody can walk through, have a look and even have the opportunity to buy one to take home. It is a huge job. She has had a lot of help. In fact, just the other day we had an event at the Blackwood train station where we made twig trees and reeds. There were so many people helping and I cannot wait for that to start. I make a quick call-out to Geoff and Liz Bartlett, who have given so much to our community and are both recovering from fairly serious health issues. We wish you all the best in your speedy recovery.

Sports clubs, schools, Scouts and many more could not operate without the help of volunteers. The hours and hours that they put in organising rosters, maintenance, coaching, cooking barbecues, and fundraising is extensive. Our sports clubs especially would not be able to continue without the help of volunteers.

Special to me are the Blackwood Lions and the Bike Shed. These two groups come and help me at the Mitchem train station to support our local mountain biking community. They give up their Sundays, they cook a barbecue, the Bike Shed guys check the kids' bikes and it is an overall great community opportunity to wrap some care around the mountain bike riders and remind them that they are part of a community.

On Friday last week, I attended the AGM and Christmas party of our Blackwood Meals on Wheels, a program that provides not only meals to our vulnerable but also a warm smile and a heartfelt conversation, which is quite possibly the only conversation that person has in a day. We thank them for all they do, including Heather to whom I presented her 30-year pin—what a

commitment to our community. Further, our chair, Cheryl Grey, retired this week, making way for Kate. Cheryl has done such an amazing job in keeping all the volunteers organised and I thank her.

Finally, it would be remiss of me not to mention our emergency services volunteers, our CFS and our SES volunteers who give so much, including the very real risk of their lives, to protect our community. We have the Blackwood, Belair, Eden Hills, Coromandel Valley, Cherry Gardens, Upper Sturt and Ironbank CFS brigades who respond in our area regularly. These volunteers get up in the middle of the night, they rush out to put out a fire, they rush out to cut up a tree or help people when they are at their most vulnerable in a car accident. They never flinch and they are there for us.

As well, we thank our Sturt SES and Metro South SES, who are busy just this week after the massive rains and storms that we had. They all work incredibly hard and never question what they have to do. They get out there and they keep us all safe. Thank you, our community are forever in your debt. This motion acknowledges all our volunteers, as well as the support that Volunteering SA&NT, as the peak body, and volunteer resource centres provide.

Our government appreciates, acknowledges and supports volunteers. The Department of Human Services is providing \$718,000 in funding to the volunteer sector through a range of grants, including sector support and advocacy, community capacity programs and volunteer support and recognition. I know many of the volunteer organisations in my community have taken advantage of some of that money to do some of the really great things that they do.

International Volunteer Day is 5 December, a day like any other, when we acknowledge and thank our volunteers. We should thank them every day because the work they do is priceless. If it were up to me, I would encourage everybody to take up volunteering. Personally, I know that not only does our community benefit but I benefit. I benefit from my volunteering in that I feel good about myself, I feel like I have been able to make a difference and I know many volunteers feel exactly the same way. It is a buzz that you cannot get from working, it is a buzz that you cannot get from anything else and I encourage anyone to take it up.

The theme this year is 'If everyone did', centering on the power of everyone is important. As I just said, if everybody took an hour, two hours or in some cases a day or two days to volunteer, we would see not only everything blossom but also the kindness in our community grow. We lost volunteers during COVID and we need everyone to consider giving it a go. We need to boost our numbers back up. We also see in our volunteer organisations quite often that they are slightly more experienced members of our community. Young people, I encourage you to think about the benefit that you will get from being a volunteer and consider just giving a little bit of your time.

I commend the member on her motion. It is very important to recognise our volunteers as much as we can. We could not do anything without them.

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12:35): I rise to speak to the amended motion that has been put forward in recognising International Volunteer Day, which we celebrate, of course, on 5 December. There are nearly one million volunteers here in South Australia each and every year and I think that deserves an extraordinary vote of thanks.

The fact is that we have one million South Australians who are willing to give just a small portion, and sometimes a large portion, of their time and effort to give back to our local community, but, as has already been reflected on in the house, we do need more of them. I am constantly seeing calls from my local CFS or footy clubs or service groups asking for people to put their hand up and just give a little bit of their time. I think COVID did cause a little bit of struggle in the volunteer community, but we thank each and every one of the people who give so much back to our local area.

Upon doing a quick google search, I found that the volunteering effort in South Australia is worth around \$5 billion, which I just think is so extraordinary, but of course the very nature of volunteering is people giving back to their local community without seeking financial gain and without seeking financial reward. They do it because they know that their little bit of effort is going to make an extraordinarily large contribution to our local communities in some way, shape or form.

I think it is fair to say that, particularly in regional communities, our volunteers are the lifeblood. I have heard the member for Hammond make comment about sporting clubs and communities particularly and it is so true to say that on a Saturday, or whenever your sport of choice

is played, that at every single point you rock up to your local sporting club, whether it is getting your ticket at the gate or you are a local barracker from the Lions Club, whether it is getting your bucket of chips from the canteen, watching the senior 1s or the modifieds, or whichever sporting group it may be, they are out there with significant coordination from volunteers and we would not be able to do it without them so we thank them.

We have the Lions Club, and I am a proud member of the Angaston Lions Club. They are a fantastic group and I give them a big shout-out, but there are many right across our region. We have our emergency services, whether that is our CFS or SES, and they have done an extraordinary job, particularly over the last 24 to 48 hours when we have had to batten down the hatches and deal with some pretty remarkable weather. In my local community, we battled a fire just two days ago at Mount Pleasant and that required some urgent action from the local CFS.

We have our Rotary clubs, our Probus clubs, our garden societies and all the people who work at the Barossa Bushgardens. We have our sporting clubs, as I have already mentioned. We have people who drive for hours on end in our community cars helping the sickest people in our community get to their medical appointments. Without them, who would be fighting our bushfires? Who would be pulling the beers at the RSL? Who would be coaching our under 12s or doing our sausage sizzle or even delivering meals to our most vulnerable?

If it were not for our volunteers, we would be in a real pickle and so on International Volunteer Day we say a big thank you because our community simply would not be the same without you. We know you do not do it for the praise; you do it because you genuinely believe and understand that all the time and effort you put in is for the greater good of the entire community, so we thank you. We encourage you to keep going and we look forward to thanking you and seeing you out and about at all the various community activities that we have particularly coming up over Christmas.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (12:39): I also take the opportunity to speak about some of the many wonderful volunteer organisations in Morphett, and also the many volunteers who really add that sense of camaraderie and giving to our community. Of course, being a beachside electorate, the beach is very important to people, not only for our community but also for many tourists and, of course, Adelaideans who come down to the beach. So keeping the beach safe is very important.

I have spoken before about the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club and what a wonderful service they do in keeping the beach safe. The new president, Pat Larven, and also the deputy president, Anthony Merchant, who many people will recognise on the beach, do a wonderful job of organising the patrols and making sure the club runs well. I was on patrol myself on the Saturday just gone, on the weekend, and it was wonderful to see the different people you meet.

On this occasion, we had over 33 international students come to visit the surf club. They are part of the Royal Life Saving South Australia's Beach Smarts for Life Program, which is a program that is also supported by the National Foundation for Australia-China Relations and is aimed at giving water safety, beach awareness and CPR training to these international students.

As we addressed the students to welcome them to the beach, one of the questions asked was: how comfortable do they feel about swimming in a beach environment? Only one of them put their hand up, because maybe they have been familiar with poolside swimming, as was pointed out to them, the beach is something totally different. While it might look benign on the surface, especially if it is a still day, of course it is not like a pool where, every time you go into it, it is the same depth and same flat surface.

Beaches are really a very interactive environment, heavily dependent on weather and what goes on underneath the water as well in terms of drift—where you might be walking in waist-deep water for quite a while, and if you suddenly go into a gutter you could end up being in over your head. Those sorts of safety messages were pointed out to these students.

It was really wonderful to be able to join another one of the surf club's great volunteers, Amanda De Ieso, who was awarded by Surf Lifesaving South Australia as the Assessor of the Year, as she took them through their paces and also introduced them to other volunteer lifesavers who were on patrol that day.

Of course, being able to patrol, being volunteers, we all have to keep our skills up, and that entails doing a proficiency test each year to make sure that our skills are there. Just yesterday, I did my dry proficiency, which involves CPR skills, radio skills and signalling skills. That was again done by volunteers. Because parliament ran late, I only got there at about quarter past seven, and they were giving up their time after their work as well, so I would like to recognise the chief instructor, Iain Mitchell, and also Rob Warne, who is the lifesaving manager. They really know their surf skills, which helps make our lifesavers proficient.

We have about 150 volunteer surf lifesavers at Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club, spanning 11 volunteer beach patrols. While I am not able to recognise all of the many volunteers, if I could just acknowledge the 11 patrol captains who do such a great job: Dave O'Shaughnessy, Dan Everett, Ursula Simpson, Shane Limmer, Angus Stevens, Tash Tunney, Damien Fox, Lincoln Jefferey, Shane Harris, Georgia Sumner and Benn Findlay.

Of course, there are so many terrific service organisations as well. The Rotary clubs do a wonderful service for our community. There are three really vibrant Rotary clubs in Morphett: there is the Rotary Club of Glenelg, the Rotary Club of Somerton Park and also the Rotary Club of Holdfast Bay. In July each year, these clubs do their changeover dinners and it is a great chance to say thank you to the previous presidents and welcome the new presidents and hear about some of the terrific work that those clubs have done over the years.

Glenelg Rotary celebrated its 70th anniversary, and club president Alison Rogers took us through some of the highlights, including raising \$1,000 for Foodbank for Christmas hampers, which will give so much love and be received so well as we come into the Christmas season. They also helped raise funds to donate to the Ukraine Crisis, which saw over \$100,000 sent to help in that war-torn country. The club also sponsored a student in Tanzania. This comes out of a school originally started by an Australian lady; she started that school in Tanzania with three students, and it now it has over 1,800 students, which is a wonderful measure in Tanzania and supported heavily by the Glenelg Rotary Club.

They also support the local schools in Morphett and give out good citizen awards to St Leonards Primary School and the Plympton International School as well. Another significant activity they do is to try to concentrate on engaging youth, because with volunteer organisations—and we have heard other members say they are encouraging new members to join—a great source of potential new members is our youth.

Glenelg Rotary Club really tries to engage with them through their *One and All* youth sailing challenge. In May this year, the Rotary International Convention was held in Melbourne, so to recognise that the Glenelg Rotary Club, along with the 32 clubs from the local district, supported 34 students to take part in this program, which was initiated by club member David Binks. They went on the tall ship, the *One and All*, and sailed from Adelaide to Melbourne to be part of the convention. It is such a great program; it has been nominated for the Premier's service club awards along the way. That is some of the great work they have been able to do.

I pay tribute to Alison Rogers as president—she had a tough year with family health battles. As she said in her speech, she was the driver of the bus but unfortunately had to get off, but she was ably supported by so many other volunteers in the Rotary Club. Chief amongst them was the secretary, Wayne Sachs. For his efforts he was recognised with the Paul Harris Award, a very prestigious award amongst Rotary as well. The night also recognised 50 years' service for one of the club stalwarts, Peter Heysen, so that is 50 years of volunteering and service in and around the Glenelg community, so thank you Peter for all your work.

I will talk briefly about the Rotary Club of Holdfast Bay. They do terrific work, especially in their signature program called Locals Doing it Tough, where they collect perishable food and goods from the Bayside Shopping Centre in Glenelg and in Brighton. It was wonderful to join them in June this year, and they raised over \$30,000 in food and personal items and donated it to some wonderful volunteer programs run out of our local faith groups, our churches—St Vincent de Paul, St Paul's Lutheran Church in Glenelg, St Peter's Anglican Church in Glenelg and Mary's Kitchen, which runs out of St Andrew's by the Sea as well. They are some of the great works by the Rotary clubs.

I finish off by acknowledging the many sporting clubs and all the volunteers who work so hard in allowing our kids, our children, to have such fun at the PHOS Camden Football Club. The president, Nick Smith, is handing over the presidency to Sarah Fitzpatrick. At the PHOS Camden Netball Club president Bruce Turner has done a terrific job in seeing the move of the club from the Golflands Reserve over to Camden Oval, which brings them together with the PHOS Camden Football Club.

That was supported by \$300,000 of funding from the former Liberal government, which I was pleased to play a part in, and that allowed for four new netball courts to be built, light towers and new clubrooms. The PHOS Camden Netball Club is a fantastic club in our local community, supported so well by Bruce. It has been 10 years in the making, and I congratulate him on and thank him for his service, as I thank all the volunteers and wonderful organisations for the work they do making all our communities so much better.

Time expired.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (12:49): I, too, rise to support the motion acknowledging the wonderful work that our volunteers do in South Australia. There are so many volunteer groups in my electorate of Torrens that I would like to acknowledge.

One thing I would like to start with is that on Saturday 2 December, this coming Saturday, the Lions Club of Gilles Plains is holding skin cancer checks. They will have a big bus out the front of my electorate office, and people from the community are invited to come and have their skin checked by the people who are going to be there providing the service. They are professionals who will be doing the checks. It can really be a life-saving decision to participate in that, so thanks to the Gilles Plains Lions Club for looking after that. Anyone wanting to participate, if you are listening, you can contact my EO and book a time.

I would also like to thank the Northfield Meals on Wheels—it is called Northfield Meals on Wheels but it is based in Oakden—and the wonderful people who have been working there for decades providing meals to members of our community, some of whom are unable to do it themselves and others who find it just a little easier to have their meals delivered. I have participated in that myself, delivering meals to the people in the local community. Thank you to the people who volunteer their time to work at Northfield Meals on Wheels. Many of them are retired and they tell me that they are busier now that they are retired, but they find it really wonderful to be able to do the things that they are doing to volunteer in our community.

As a patron of the Enfield Horticultural Society, I know that the volunteers there have a wonderful time. They know so much. Every now and then, I hand over a plant and it comes back looked after. I used to do that with my grandmother; she would look after the plants. We have wonderful volunteers at the Enfield Horticultural Society and also at the Greenacres Community Garden. They are fantastic. That was part of our Fund My Neighbourhood program and we now have fantastic flower and vegetable gardens in the Greenacres Community Garden. A number of people go out and look after that, and there is a lot of produce that comes from that garden as well.

The volunteers in our schools, the parents who come in and help out in our schools, make such a fantastic contribution. A lot of the things that go on in our schools would not be able to happen as well as they do without the support of the parents, and particularly the governing councils, who support sports days and gala days. I was at one only last Friday at the Hillcrest Primary School and they did a fantastic job there. Thank you to the parents volunteering their time on governing councils.

We also have all our sporting clubs and the people who volunteer by coaching, umpiring, running the boundary lines and fundraising. They do a fantastic job in our sporting clubs and without them, again, a lot of our community sports clubs would not be able to operate the way they do. I would like to mention the MetroStars Soccer Club and also the Gaza Sports and Community Club where we have football, cricket and darts. We have men, women and, importantly, families that participate in these clubs, and it is the volunteers who really do assist in making it happen.

Also in my electorate we have the North East Community Assistance Project (NECAP). People throughout the north-eastern suburbs—including in the area of the member for Florey, who is in the chair—benefit through the work that is done by the volunteers who come from right across

the north-east to the North East Community Assistance Project, providing food and other services. I know that leading up to Christmas, the volunteers will be preparing many packages with food and also toys for members of the community who perhaps would not be able to celebrate in a way that they will be able to because they do not have access to some of those things. So I thank all of the volunteers at NECAP.

We have the North East Community House as well. A number of people volunteer at North East Community House. As our community houses, we have someone who runs them, and the people who do that put in additional hours as well. They are not volunteers, but the extra hours they put in really make it possible. Volunteers deliver the programs there and also around the corner at Wandana Community Centre.

Thank you very much to all those people in our community. I have not mentioned them all. I know there are other people who want to speak on this. So thank you; we know we could not do a lot of what we do without you.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:55): I, too, rise to support the amended motion and to give recognition that 5 December is International Volunteer Day. It is a big shout-out to all volunteers from all walks of life, whether in metro Adelaide, regional South Australia or anywhere on the globe. Volunteers are the fabric of any community. Whether in a metro town or a regional community, I think it would be fair to say that they are equally valued for the time, care and activity that they create around their dedication to the job.

Obviously, people who volunteer are passionate. They are dedicated to contributing to make the community they live in a better place. It gives me great honour as a representative of Chaffey that I have many volunteer organisations that continue to make all our regions a better place to live, work and play sport and a safer place to live.

I cannot understate the importance of our emergency services and their volunteers. Obviously, there are a number of stations right around my electorate. Volunteers are called on many thousands of times a year to be first responders and make sure that they play their role in helping save lives and helping people navigate their way through some level of uncertainty.

Of course, our sporting organisations are also very important. They are the fabric of communities, particularly in the regions of South Australia. In Chaffey, there is no more important fabric of the community than sporting organisations. Volunteers give their time as coaches, admin, canteen, gatekeepers and bus drivers. Even motorsport clubs, of which there are many and varied up in Chaffey, do an outstanding job, and so I say thank you to them all.

Time is against me, but I want to have a big shout-out to all our volunteers. Some organisations have an ageing volunteer base. This is a big call-out to our young, up-and-coming, aspiring volunteers who want to play a role in making their community a better place by contributing to a sporting club or an organisation. Please, if you are considering volunteering, put your hand up, help out and make sure that your community is a better place for your service. I commend the amended motion to the house.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (12:58): I want to thank all members who have made a contribution to this important motion today: the members for Hammond, Waite, Schubert, Morphett, Torrens and Chaffey. It has actually been fabulous to hear about all the volunteer groups in your community and how highly valued they are, so I thank you and close the debate.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for West Torrens on a matter of privilege, I acknowledge the presence in the chamber today of the Consul of Italy, Mr Ernesto Pianelli, guest of the member for Hartley—welcome. I also acknowledge Ann Ferguson OAM, the immediate past Mayor of the District Council of Mount Barker, a guest of mine; Max Callum from Scotch College,

who I understand is doing work experience in the member for Bragg's electorate office; and Cynthia and Zuberi McHawala, as I understand, they are guests of the member for Waite—welcome to parliament.

Matter of Privilege

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:00): Sir, I rise on a matter of privilege. On 28 November (yesterday), in a grievance debate to the house the member for Dunstan made a contribution regarding the urgency and need for a South Australian trade office in the European Union. The member for Dunstan made this assertion to the house as fact yesterday, and I quote:

What also seems to have escaped the trade minister's attention is the fact that the EU is the third largest economy in the world, accounting for one-sixth of global trade. As I speak, South Australia still does not have a trade office anywhere within the EU borders. Brexit was completed on 31 January 2020.

On 9 May 2023, a press release was published stating the government's intention to open an office in the EU located in Frankfurt, Germany. On 15 June 2023, the Treasurer tabled the budget papers outlining the government's funding of the Frankfurt office in the Budget Measures Statement, page 70, including the funding profile for this financial year.

On 5 July of 2023, the Minister for Trade announced to the estimates committee of this house the government's funding of two new trade offices in Frankfurt, Germany, and Washington DC in the United States and took questions from opposition members regarding the opening of those two offices. On 16 October 2023, a press release was issued announcing the appointment of Pallavi Mishra to lead the new office in Frankfurt. South Australia's trade office—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: She.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: South Australia's trade office was open when the member for Dunstan made his contribution to the parliament yesterday. Frankfurt is in Germany and Germany is in the EU. South Australia has an open, active trade office in the EU and Ms Mishra is an experienced in-market trade and investment manager. For the benefit of the house, government press releases that I have referenced are published on the Premier's website at www.premier.sa.gov.au/media-releases, a web address I assume the former Premier would have been aware of.

Given the government's majority and our ability to establish a privileges committee at any time, given the bona fides of the motion, we, however, believe it is important for some independent adjudication. I believe the member has deliberately and intentionally misled the House of Assembly and that a prima facie case exists for the establishment of a privileges committee. I ask that you give consideration to my matter of privilege and rule if a motion to establish a privileges committee should be given precedence over other business of the House of Assembly, unless, of course, the former Premier decides to turn up and correct the record.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have the matter of privilege raised by the member for West Torrens. I will take in the matter and give it consideration. If there are materials the member for West Torrens would wish to furnish to me, I will receive them. Equally, if there are matters or materials that the member for Dunstan would wish to raise with me or provide to me, I will take those in and return to the house.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

*Petitions***FREELING POLICE STATION**

Ms PRATT (Frome): Presented a petition signed by 309 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to reinstate a resident police officer into the currently unmanned police station in the town of Freeling.

COLTON ELECTORATE BEACH MANAGEMENT

Mr COWDREY (Colton): Presented a petition signed by 500 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to rectify the access issues at Henley and Henley South beaches; and to outline and fund a long-term solution for sand management on our central beaches.

*Motions***NOTICES OF MOTION**

At the completion of the giving of notices of motion:

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (14:22): On indulgence, I would like to congratulate the house on how efficient and civil the introduction of notices of motion were today.

The SPEAKER: Indeed. It is right to recognise the efforts of the member for Unley and the member for Elizabeth in ensuring, as the whips, that this process is far improved, far advanced on the process that we have all to date earlier experienced.

*Parliamentary Procedure***PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Attorney-General's Department—Annual Report 2022-23
Classification of Computer Games—Guidelines 2023 Report
Coroner's Court—Annual Report 2022-23
Courts Administration Authority—Annual Report 2022-23
Law Society of South Australia—Legal Practitioner's Fidelity Fund Annual Report 2022-23
Legal Practitioner's Disciplinary Tribunal—Annual Report 2022-23
Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner—Annual Report 2022-23
Youth Treatment Order Visitor—Revised Report 2022-23

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

Chief Psychiatrist, Office of the South Australian—Annual Report 2022-23
Chief Public Health Officer's Report—Report July 2020 to June 2022
Health Advisory Council—
Mid North Annual Report 2022-23
Millicent and District Annual Report 2022-23
Mount Gambier and Districts Annual Report 2022-23
Northern Yorke Peninsula Annual Report 2022-23
Penola and Districts Annual Report 2022-23
Port Augusta, Roxby Downs, Woomera Annual Report 2022-23
Port Broughton District Annual Report 2022-23
Port Pirie Annual Report 2022-23
South Australian Ambulance Service Volunteer Annual Report 2022-23
Southern Fleurieu Annual Report 2022-23
Southern Flinders Annual Report 2022-23
Waikerie and Districts Annual Report 2022-23
Health Services Charitable Gifts Board—Annual Report 2022-23
Local Health Network—

Northern Adelaide Annual Report 2022-23
Riverland Mallee Coorong Annual Report 2022-23
Yorke and Northern Annual Report 2022-23

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (14:24): I bring up the 36th report of the Legislative Review Committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call questions without notice, I acknowledge the presence in the Speaker's Gallery of Dr David Hamilton, Rose Tierney and Sid Tierney, guests of the member for MacKillop. Welcome to parliament.

Question Time

DEFENCE NAVAL SHIPBUILDING

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): My question is to the Acting Premier. Can the Acting Premier update the house on how the government will achieve continuous shipbuilding in South Australia, including how many Hunter class frigates will be built here? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: *The Australian* reported on 23 November 2023 that the federal government's surface fleet review is set to cut the Navy's Hunter order from nine ships to six, or perhaps as few as three.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (14:26): I do feel somewhat *Groundhog Day* with the number of times that this question has essentially been identically asked—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: —but nonetheless I am always happy to talk about frigates and continuous shipbuilding. Now of course, as every person in this chamber understands, the procurers of the ships that are being built at Osborne are the Australian government. They have undertaken a review following up on the DSR. The DSR said that there ought to be, as a recommendation, continuous shipbuilding. The federal government has not only accepted that recommendation but also said that that continuous shipbuilding would occur at Osborne.

Subsequently, though, there has been the review into the kind of ships, the type of ships that are most suitable for the surface ship fleet, given the shift from one form of submarines to another form of submarines—being the nuclear submarines, which, because they have different capabilities subsurface, can imply different capabilities may be required on the surface to back them up.

That review has, of course, been completed and been provided to the federal government. We are awaiting their response. As has been said many times, but I will repeat again, both the Premier and I have urged the federal government to give that response as soon as possible but we are, of course, not in a position to give it for them.

What we have been assured by, though, is the repetition not only of the expectation that there will be continuous shipbuilding at Osborne but also the repudiation of the rumours that went around that were, perhaps embraced is too strong a word, perhaps it isn't, by members of the

opposition, who suggested that the entire Hunter class fleet building would be moved over to Glasgow. The federal government has ruled that out. These kinds of rumours, while they can be very exciting—particularly when you are not in government—can do tremendous harm to the confidence of not only South Australians generally—

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia: You know what would be better? An announcement. An announcement would be great.

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hartley!

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: —but specifically those companies that are investing in the supply chain in order to supply these ships. It is uncertain because there is a review, but the certainty is given to us by the continuous build that has been promised by the federal government, committed to by the federal government.

What is unhelpful in this context is for the opposition to continuously, and perhaps joyfully, indicate that there are a wild variety of different possibilities for the build, including, as I say, this rumour that went around—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: Reassure us, because it was in the paper.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Yes, as was building in Glasgow.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Of course, what is important is less the question of the number of frigates and more the question of if not frigates then what else is being built? As has been long understood, if frigates are not viewed through this—it is not news unless you haven't been paying attention. The question is whether frigates are the right ship to back up the submarines, what the number is and what alternatives might be being considered. We eagerly await the federal government's response.

SURFACE FLEET REVIEW

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): My question is again to the Acting Premier. Does the Acting Premier know when the surface fleet review will be made public? With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The federal Minister for Defence, Richard Marles, has indicated that the federal government will provide a response to the surface fleet review early next year. Australian Industry and Defence Network chief, Brent Clark, has asked, and I quote:

At what point is the government going to start issuing contracts because industry, particularly local industry, is suffering.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (14:30): The question was about when this will be made public. I recall when we were on the opposition benches, the then Premier would frequently say, 'I refer to my previous answer' and sit down, but I will do the courtesy to the opposition that maybe they didn't hear all of the question that I answered before. As I said, the government has made it clear that they will be responding in the first quarter of next year.

AUKUS SUBMARINES

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): My question is to the Acting Premier. When will construction commence on the AUKUS nuclear-powered submarines at the Osborne shipyard in Port Adelaide?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (14:30): Construction initially will be starting in the next very short period to build the shipyard itself. There is some \$2 billion that has been set aside by the federal government to spend in the next four years. The transfer of land was effected a week or so ago, and that was of course a very significant next stage for that to occur.

There will be the identification through a rigorous process of which company will be the primary shipbuilder. That will be announced, and then there will be, of course, the purchase—subject to what happens in congress—of the three Virginia-class submarines. The expectation is that as we head towards 2040 we will be building the submarines here.

HYDROGEN POWER PLANT

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): My question is again to the Acting Premier. Is the Acting Premier confident in the viability of the proposed hydrogen power station? With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: A recent report from Infrastructure Partnerships Australia has shown that hydrogen is one of the least attractive infrastructure project types in the market and, I quote, that 'investors remain uncertain about its realistic application and delivery in the near-term'.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:32): We are extremely confident in the viability of the hydrogen electrolyser because we are the party that released—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We're the party that began the path towards hydrogen. I note members opposite were celebrating their hydrogen advancements, which were basically the stuff that we had put in place before the 2018 election. Infrastructure Partnerships that the leader quoted are talking in fact about investments that are not subsidised by the commonwealth government to a large extent. Renewable energy, as per the commonwealth government's most recent announcement, now will be subsidised and their colour program of contracts will allow basically developers within the renewable sector to be almost guaranteed by the commonwealth government.

Hydrogen is not being given the same level of subsidy as renewables, so I imagine what Infrastructure Partnerships Australia is actually talking about is that, if you are a private investor and you are looking for a government subsidy, the most profitable way to invest in renewables is to attract a government subsidy. Hydrogen is in its early days, like grid-scale storage was when we built our big battery with Tesla.

The Hornsdale development was ridiculed by members opposite. They called it risky and they were ridiculing how long it would last. Of course, once they were elected they were nearly pulling hamstrings to get up there and get their photograph taken next to it, saying they were next to a South Australian government facility. The truth is that, because of the South Australian government's investment in grid-scale storage, it is now the template not just for every jurisdiction in Australia but for every jurisdiction in the world.

The world is decarbonising. The fight over decarbonisation is over. Only dinosaurs remain. The dinosaurs who remain, who don't believe that climate change is real and do not want to decarbonise, are doing everything they can to demonise any new technology—any new technology.

Hydrogen has the ability for us to invest in green steel. Why did we choose Whyalla? We chose Whyalla for a reason—because of the magnetite resources and because of the existing steelworks that are already there. We want to see not only hydrogen used as a form of storage but we want to see it in industrial applications as well. This is our way of trying to push that envelope, that arc of history, to make sure that we can be at the forefront of this technology. Why? Because we believe that climate change is real.

We know that the rest of the world is decarbonising. We know that the rest of the world needs alternative fuel sources. We can't keep on selling coal: it's over—it's over. We need to decarbonise and embrace the new economy, and this is the new economy. What we can't do is leave behind communities. That's why we work hard in Whyalla, hard in Port Augusta, hard in Port Pirie, hard in the South-East, hard in the Mid North of our state to make sure that those regional communities that are reliant on traditional forms of fuel and energy can find a future.

That's why members opposite, rather than criticising the government's investments in electrolyzers, the same way they criticised our investment and facilitation of wind farms, the same way they criticised our rollout of—

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

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Now the minister is straying past standing order 98.

The SPEAKER: Very well. I will listen carefully. He is in the dusk of the answer. There are 20 seconds remaining.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, we are confident, very confident. I tell you another government that was confident: the former Marshall government was confident. It invested money in Port Bonython.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Chaffey! The Treasurer, order! Member for Morialta, under 134.

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

The SPEAKER: Indeed, 10 seconds remaining. I uphold the point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir—wise judgement, wise, wise judgement. I was straying from the point of the question, just pointing out the incompetence and hypocrisy of members opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

UNIVERSITY PLACES

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (14:36): My question is to the Acting Premier. Can the Acting Premier update the house on the commonwealth government's allocation of university places?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (14:36): Yes, I bear good news for South Australia, specifically for young people in South Australia but also for preparation for the nuclear shipbuilding project.

As members will be well aware, we have been undertaking a lot of work on the profile for the workforce for the defence industry and undertook a task force alongside the commonwealth government. We have then determined a plan at each stage of education and career choices to support getting more people working in the defence industry right from school, including, of course,

the five technical colleges the Minister for Education is busily building, through to vocational training, where there has been a dramatic overhaul of vocational training with much welcomed additional expenditure allocated to vocational training and, of course, university places and then early career and mid-career transition to get people to think about taking their skills and applying them into that industry.

The university places one is absolutely crucial because we are, in many ways, dependent on the commonwealth that assigns these commonwealth-supported places, those that are funded by the commonwealth and through HECS. The commonwealth government announced some time ago that they would allocate 800 of the 4,000 places to South Australia. They would do 4,000 additional places that would be STEM focused in order to prepare people to be involved in STEM industries generally but the defence industry specifically, and 800 of those initially were allocated to South Australia as part of the agreement that was signed associated with the prospect of merging two of our universities, which, of course, this parliament assented to very recently.

What we have now been informed, which is excellent news, is that on top of that there are an additional 230 places over the four years that have been allocated to South Australian universities. That means that we have vastly overachieved in the number of places allocated, which I think is to the credit of the universities in South Australia. The fact that 330 were allocated to Flinders again is evidence of the quality of Flinders University, and of course the quality of the offering has convinced the federal government that it is a place worthy of having an additional 330 places, and 700 places were allocated to the University of Adelaide.

Obviously, in a couple of years' time, it will become Adelaide University that will have those positions allocated, but for the first two years those positions, which are spread over four years, will be allocated to the University of Adelaide—far more than any other university. Only about 16 universities were allocated any commonwealth-supported places through this program, and for us to have a quarter of them and for so many to be allocated to the University of Adelaide is evidence not only of the commonwealth government's commitment to continuous shipbuilding and to submarine shipbuilding in South Australia—because they are so committed that they know that this is where they need to invest in having more people educated. As I say, it is also absolutely evidence of the high quality of our universities and the confidence that the federal government has in the merged institution that will be called Adelaide University being able to make these offerings.

I do say, although there are many different degrees that are of value and of importance, it is crucial that we have more people studying STEM subjects all through school and into university because it is that skill set—that knowledge set and that skill set—that will be transformative for our economy. While we do not have as many people studying those subjects, we won't be able to make the leap in complexity that is required in order to have a higher standard of living and greater productivity.

GREEN STEEL

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:40): My question is to the Acting Premier. Is the Acting Premier confident that there will be a green steel market available for any offtake arrangement with the proposed hydrogen power station? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PATTERSON: In a 16 November article in the *Australian Financial Review*, the Mitsubishi Heavy Industries president said that there remain many uncertainties around green hydrogen and that it was still unclear how it would be used in the steel industry in Australia.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:41): It's a fascinating question—a fascinating question. Given the opposition's now new-found scepticism on hydrogen, especially green hydrogen—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —it begs the question: why announce a hydrogen hub? Why announce a hydrogen hub with the Morrison government?

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Why would you claim that there might not be a market for green steel, which is generated through green hydrogen, but yet commit to the sale of Port Bonython land for the purposes of a hydrogen hub for the export of hydrogen for companies like Mitsubishi Heavy Industries?

If you look at the press releases of the former government, of which members opposite were members—albeit strapped to the back of a car, sort of out of control—why would they do a deal with the commonwealth government to invest \$30 million into a hydrogen hub at Port Bonython if its merits are experimental? Why would they have done that? Could it be, perhaps, that they had seen the former government's, the Weatherill government's, hydrogen road map and thought, 'There's something in this'?

If we are using coking coal to beneficiate iron, and coal emits lots of carbon, and we have to decarbonise steel, and it's a hard to abate industry, and we have abundant amounts of renewable energy and abundant amounts of magnetite and a steelworks and a port and the best magnetite resources anywhere in Australia—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —do you reckon that the South Australian government, whether it be Labor or Liberal, might think about a green steel strategy? I reckon they might. Why would it be that the Japanese government, or any other government, might be worrying about green steel? Could it be that it wrecks their plans to maintain those industries in their own countries, and that it could mean they have to import HBI from somewhere else rather than beneficiate it in their own countries? Could it mean that they have to import steel from someone else? Could it mean that Menzies' legacy of selling pig iron to the Japanese while they were bombing us could have been a bad idea? Could it be, potentially, that this country might actually—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —want to beneficiate its own iron ore resources? Could it be? So yes, we are looking at it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We are looking at developing our own steel industries and making them larger.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey! Member for Hartley!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We are looking at beneficiating iron ore. We are looking at exporting green steel with green iron. Of course we are. Why wouldn't we? It's a good idea. Members opposite thought about it as well. They toyed with it. Why they did is because they were investing money in a hydrogen hub to export green hydrogen to Japan, Korea, China, Europe and the United States—and so are we. We think it's a good idea.

It's one of the programs members opposite had in place that we did not stop, we doubled down on, but, in fact, we made one particular change: whereas members opposite, when they were auctioning off land at Port Bonython, had no requirement that the land be auctioned off for the purposes of hydrogen, we have ensured that every bit of land that would be auctioned off is for the production and export of green hydrogen to our trading partners Japan, Korea, Germany, and anyone

else who wants to beneficiate their steel industry. We are not going to continue exporting our base products to the rest of the world; we are going to add complexity to our economy here in South Australia. We want those advanced manufacturing jobs here, not just in Japan.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Morphett, I recognise the presence in the gallery today of members and friends of RoZSI's Voice, guests of the member for Playford. Welcome to parliament.

Question Time

HYDROGEN POWER PLANT

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Will the government's hydrogen power plant lower electricity bills for South Australian households? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PATTERSON: The Australian Energy Regulator's recent state of the energy market report has confirmed that the wholesale cost of electricity in South Australia has risen by 69 per cent in the last 12 months, the highest in the nation by a significant amount.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:45): It is pretty fair to say that the electricity market faces some serious challenges—very serious challenges—because of a combination of bad decisions from the former Marshall government, a lost decade—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton! Member for Morphett!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —of policy indecision, no climate policy, no structural reform.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morphett!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Members opposite yell out and interject—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —that prices dropped under the previous Marshall government. They did, but they were still higher for each and every year bar one year, when they were cheaper by a dollar than the last year of the Liberal government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Still more expensive. The member referenced—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The member opposite references a report by the Australian Energy Regulator and AEMO.

Mr Patterson: Those pesky reports that show that prices are up!

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett is warned for a final time. You have asked the question; the minister is on his feet attempting to answer it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What he doesn't mention is that that report showed that wholesale prices decreased by 56 per cent in South Australia. What he doesn't say is that that was good news for South Australia; he just says, 'But it's higher than everyone else.' He doesn't mention the drop. He also failed to tell the public, when he put out his press release in Moseley Square, about how wholesale prices had actually dropped in South Australia. Nor did the opposition mention that South Australia's wholesale prices were lower than the other states in the preceding three quarters. He doesn't mention that either and he sits there with that smile on his face. While the two market bodies use—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —different methodology, one based on volume-weighted average, which is the AER report, and one on time-weighted average, which is the AEMO report, they came to the same conclusion. The conclusion is that prices have fallen considerably since the peaks of 2022, when the first shocks of the global fuel crisis were felt from the Russian invasion of Ukraine.

The important thing to remember here is that what South Australians are paying for is higher prices in the production of fuel for that gap that meets the demand. Renewable energy is cheap—it is cheaper than any other form of energy. What we are paying for is the people who are funding the gap, and the gap is being fuelled by coal and gas, and coal and gas are expensive. That is why prices are higher.

Gas-fired peakers, gas-fired turbines are being dispatched less and less into the grid, but they are needed to maintain reliability. Because those dispatches are happening less often, they seek to recover the same costs over a shorter period of time so their prices are higher. We are paying for the gap. What can bridge that gap? Storage—grid-scale storage like batteries, which they laugh at and mock. Grid-scale storage like hydrogen, which they laugh at and mock.

So, here we are again. When you try to actually fix the problem that is causing higher power prices, they call it experimental. When you say that the globe is heating up and warming and we want to decarbonise, they say that power prices are too high, burn more coal. When we attempt to try to replace coal, they attack it. Whatever we attempt to do, they oppose. Come up with your own plan.

NATIONAL ENERGY CRISIS TASKFORCE

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. What measures has the National Energy Crisis Taskforce developed in response to electricity price increases? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PATTERSON: The creation of the National Energy Crisis Taskforce, to be co-chaired by the Minister for Energy and Mining, was announced in parliament on 1 November 2022. Since then, we have heard nothing from this committee.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:50): I am seriously being asked why a cabinet committee is not being held in public. I am stunned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have news—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have news for the members opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Cabinet meetings are confidential, as are committee cabinets. They are confidential.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We meet regularly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I note members opposite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The shadow minister for energy will be holding all of his cabinet meetings—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —in the open, in public.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I look forward to the media, this new announcement by members opposite, that cabinet committees and cabinet—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morialta, under 134.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: the question was what measures has this task force developed? The minister is debating.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We are early in the minister's answer. I will listen carefully. However, I do emphasise to the minister the terms of standing order 98.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Premier and the cabinet decided that it was important that we zero in and focus on the issue at hand, and the issues, of course, were initially—

Mr Patterson: Just make it look like you're doing something.

The SPEAKER: Member for Morphett, you are on a final warning. The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We were focusing on a couple of things. The invasion of Ukraine by Russia created a shock internationally of commodity prices, especially of coal and gas. That lack of supply of gas into Europe created a lot of behaviour on the national spot market and the international spot market, which created the potential for shortages of gas, which almost saw the gas reliability trigger by the commonwealth government triggered for the first time in our nation's history. I think it was the first time, anyway; I will check.

What we were seeing as a consequence of that invasion was actually jurisdictions that were finding it difficult to meet their supply of electricity, which saw not only the wholesale prices go up, which had an immediate impact on upcoming retail prices, but also saw spot prices for commercial and industrial uses go up dramatically because of the cost of gas and indeed coal, because there were coal shortages as well.

What the task force, the national energy cabinet crisis committee, was about was making sure that South Australia, first and foremost, had adequate gas supplies. I am proud to report that South Australia has not suffered any gas shortages—none. Tick. We also made sure that the development—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Doing nothing? Just hanging around in a room talking, were we?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Ensuring that the commonwealth government had adequate policies in place to meet this challenge meant that we wanted to make sure that the commonwealth government, in conjunction with the South Australian government, did everything we could to make sure that grid-scale storage was incentivised and fast-tracked. Hence, there is now an auction process here in South Australia that the national energy cabinet crisis committee is, of course, tasked with looking at and making sure that South Australia has every opportunity to be competitive in that process—and we are.

The most recent announcement, by the commonwealth government, which is for multi-gigawatts of storage, not only variable renewable energy but of course dispatchable renewable energy, is a game changer. We want to be ready. What our cabinet committee is doing is focusing in to make sure that South Australia has the full benefit of that process.

Members opposite used to like always shouting out, when they were in office, that there was \$9 billion worth of renewable projects—\$9 billion of renewable projects—that had development approval, that were ready to go along the corridor between South Australia and New South Wales once Project EnergyConnect was energised for the New South Wales border. That will happen at the end of this year, years late, of course, than what they told us it will be done by, hundreds of millions of dollars over budget, more than they told us it would cost. I look forward to making sure that we hold them to account for what they promised as well.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENT LEVY

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science. Does the state government support an international student levy? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr WHETSTONE: International education is one of South Australia's leading export industries, contributing over \$2 billion to our state's economy. Despite already paying significantly higher fees than domestic students, the Albanese Labor government is proposing a sovereign wealth fund tax on international students.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (14:55): I am grateful for the question. No, South Australia does not support an international student levy. As the member has rightly pointed out, it is in fact our number one export in South Australia to have international students here as well as having a number of other benefits, including keeping the CBD lively, with people working, but also the relationships that we form across other countries. Whether people then choose to stay here and work or whether they go back to their country, those connections are extraordinarily important as a trading state. The reports

in the newspaper, however, are not sourced, and no federal government minister has made a statement that that is a policy position that they wish to adopt.

MOUNT GAMBIER DRUG AND ALCOHOL SERVICES

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister inform the community of Mount Gambier when the two drug and alcohol rehab beds will be delivered? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr BELL: It was announced in March 2022 that Mount Gambier and district hospital would receive two drug and alcohol rehabilitation beds. It's now almost the end of 2023 and building works have yet to commence.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:56): I thank the member for Mount Gambier for his question and his commitment to improving services in the Limestone Coast, particularly at the Mount Gambier hospital. The member is correct, absolutely: this government has committed to building two detox drug and alcohol beds at the Mount Gambier hospital. This is an important new component at the hospital, something that was called for by advocates in the Limestone Coast, particularly the substance abuse Limestone Coast network.

This has never happened before in terms of regional South Australia having access to detox beds. That's why we made it part of our commitment to the Limestone Coast in the previous election, and we are delivering on it in terms of our upgrades to Mount Gambier hospital more generally. This is part of a significant upgrade of the hospital. It includes upgrades to the emergency department in addition to mental health services at the hospital and also this drug and alcohol withdrawal unit.

We have committed \$4.6 million to construct these two beds as a dedicated inpatient unit as well as the other upgrades in terms of mental health and upgrading the emergency department. The drug and alcohol withdrawal unit will be an extension to the adjacent medical unit ward, which will establish new facilities, including a multipurpose activity room, communal living and kitchen space, a staff meeting room, medication room and an enclosed landscaped courtyard. There is a significant amount of works that are involved in doing that, and those projects are well advanced in the design stage and about to go out to tender early next year as a single suite of works to be constructed.

The drug and alcohol beds and the new mental health beds will start construction, expected in the middle of next year, to be delivered and built by the end of 2025, with the earliest part of those works being the emergency department upgrade works that will start as the first package of works there. I thank the member for his question. I thank the advocates in the local area who have advocated for these services.

Importantly, this is seeking to address an issue where people who are affected by drug and alcohol addiction in the Limestone Coast, to be able to get access to these detox facilities and services, have had to come to Adelaide. That has been a significant barrier in terms of not only the access issues for people to do that but also dissuading a number of people from getting that help and getting the help they need to address their addiction.

We are very excited about having this as the first in-country facilities in South Australia of this type. Of course, then we also made commitments in terms of additional residential rehabilitation services in the Limestone Coast and I can give an update in relation to those too. These are, of course, for people who have already been through detox to get additional support in the community, and they have already operated successfully in Mount Gambier for some time.

However, we have now tendered and gone through a process where we have signed a contract with Uniting Communities to extend the work that they are already doing in the region to deliver six extra beds to that region, so we will increase to 12 the additional residential rehab beds. The combination of these detox beds in the hospital and the additional residential rehabilitation beds in the community is really going to give a big boost in terms of the drug and alcohol support that people in the Limestone Coast will be able to receive.

SOVEREIGN WEALTH FUND

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:00): My question, again, is to the Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science. Has the minister sought assurances from the Prime Minister that the sovereign wealth fund will not go ahead? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr WHETSTONE: Research conducted by the Group of Eight estimate that a \$500 million levy could result in a national loss of 2,800 jobs and 27,800 international student enrolments.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (15:01): I repeat that there has been no comment made by a federal minister, or indeed the Prime Minister, and that the media commentary that has been drawn on is speculative.

It does have as its origin, of course, that the interim report of the accord raised the question about whether such a fund ought to exist not only in the context, first of all, of saying how important international students are to Australia but also in the context of how we best fund research in this country.

It is true that this country is, I think, unique if not very rare in choosing to raise research income by charging international students. That link is not usually made in other nations, if in any other, and so the report was highlighting the challenge of ensuring that as shocks occur, as happened with the relationship with China over a period of time, those shocks don't translate then into a challenge for how much money we can spend on research. That is a legitimate question to be asking.

I have been participating in ministerial council meetings and have discussed the interim report, and I will continue to be giving feedback to my ministerial colleagues in Canberra.

DRONE ACTIVITY

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Is the minister aware of any drone activity at the Adelaide 500 on Sunday and, if so, is he concerned by that? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I know that the Treasurer is a fan of Robbie Williams, so I will ask a question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I will start again. My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Is the minister aware of any drone activity at the Adelaide 500 on Sunday and, if so, is he concerned by that? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: *9news* has obtained footage of a drone flying dangerously close to an F-35 jet as it flew above the city during the Adelaide 500.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:03): No, I was not aware of that, other than what I saw in the media. Of course, anything that would risk the lives of our Defence Force would concern me, but I have not received any briefing that it did risk the life of anyone in our Defence Force. I have not received any information that could assist the member.

I was there on Sunday with my good friend the shadow minister. We both enjoyed the F-35. It was a great display, a great show. I know not all members of this house enjoy the F-35 flying over

the city of Adelaide. It is a great display of Australian patriotism and Australian hardware seeing our nation's defence in flight across our skies. What South Australian wouldn't be pleased to see our Royal Australian Air Force show its very best above our city and our skies. I can't imagine what type of person would be opposed to that.

STATE ECONOMY

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (15:04): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer update the house on the South Australian economy?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (15:04): I can, Mr Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to update the house on the most recent economic growth figures that were released last week. They showed that South Australia's economy was the fastest growing of all states in the nation in the most recent financial year, the 2022-23 financial year, the first full financial year under the Malinauskas Labor government—the fastest growing state in the nation. It is well above the national average: we grew at 3.8 per cent; the nation only grew at 3 per cent.

Remarkably, while the state did record some strong growth figures after the recession that the state suffered in the 2019-20 financial year, there were some strong growth figures in the following two years largely driven by record crop production and record government expenditure levels. Of course, the federal stimulus—

Mr Cowdrey: What would you have done differently, Stephen, over that period?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —particularly impacting the housing construction industry. The member for Colton says, 'What would I know?' Well, he should listen.

Mr Cowdrey: I didn't say that at all.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: He should listen and he might learn something.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order from the member for Colton.

Mr COWDREY: I ask that the member apologise and withdraw. I did not make that comment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The standard is a subjective one, highly subjective, and the Treasurer may choose to withdraw and apologise. I also—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Am I being asked to withdraw for mishearing an unparliamentary interjection, Mr Speaker?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Treasurer, you will direct your remarks through the Chair.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Treasurer, you will appreciate that it has long been held that the standard is subjective, and it may be that you would choose now, for practical reasons, to withdraw and apologise. I would, given the volume of interjections and the earlier preceding interjection, grant you an additional 20 seconds, contrary to the house.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, you guide me well. I withdraw and apologise. I recognise the delicate constitution of the member for Colton—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —and I withdraw wholeheartedly and apologise—

The SPEAKER: That is unnecessary.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —because I don't want to do him any offence.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Treasurer, it is sufficient to withdraw and apologise without additional remarks. The Treasurer has the call.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I withdraw and apologise to the member for Colton.

The SPEAKER: That is enough. The Treasurer has the call.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: If we are all okay, we will carry on because this is good news—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —3.8 per cent—

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is warned!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —the highest of all the states in the nation—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Flinders, member for Chaffey!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —and doesn't it drive them crazy, Mr Speaker?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey, order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Doesn't it drive them crazy to hear the good news?

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: For the benefit of those opposite—if they are not interjecting and getting sensitive about the repercussions of that—what was this latest figure driven by? Well, the fastest growing industry was accommodation and food services, 16.9 per cent, and then followed up with 15.8 per cent growth for household consumption in hotels—

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Colton is warned!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —cafes and restaurants. Do you know why?

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Colton, you are warned for a final time.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Because we have had the best year we have ever had for major events in this state—the best year. So, while those opposite celebrated the cancellation of the Adelaide 500—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —and they replaced it with Barossa Contemporary: Festival for the Curious that no-one was curious about—

Ms Savvas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Newland!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —when 25,000 people per day turn up for lift-off—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —when 260,000 people turn up at the Adelaide 500—

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —it means our economy is booming.

Ms Savvas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Newland!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Our economy is booming. There are record tourism figures and, for the benefit of the member for Chaffey, there is a huge boom in the number of international students coming to South Australia. So, unlike when those opposite were in government, when they drove the economic growth down—it was 2.2 per cent in 2017-18, they drove it down to 1.2 per cent, then they drove it down to 1 per cent, and then they drove it down into a recession—now our economy is performing strongly.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It is because we have a government that backs in this economy. We invest in the economy and the economy is doing well.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: We committed to no new taxes because we saw how damaging their unannounced—

Mr Whetstone: Line up another glass of chardonnay.

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —land tax increases were, and how much it punished the business community.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: We back business in this government. We support the state's economy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: We stand up for those and the results speak for themselves, member for Colton—the results speak for themselves.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Chaffey, the member for Colton and the member for Florey are on final warnings. The member for Hammond has entered the race, also on a final warning.

DRONE ACTIVITY

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley) (15:10): My question is again to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Is the minister aware of any drone activity above or in the vicinity of the Adelaide Airport that may be inconsistent with regulations issued by CASA? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: CASA regulations exclude flying drones within 5.5 kilometres of a controlled airport, flying drones at night, flying drones above people and flying over 120 metres above the ground.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:10): The first thing I would say is if the member has any evidence of that he should report it immediately to CASA. I know how diligent he is; I am sure he has done so already. He wouldn't have known about it and waited just to make a political point.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am not sure if there are any mandatory reporting requirements. I will check, but I am not aware of any. If there are any unauthorised drones operating in that vicinity they should be reported.

DRONE ACTIVITY

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley) (15:11): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Has the federal transport minister, Catherine King, discussed with the minister the matter of dangerous drone activities near Adelaide Airport? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Information provided to the opposition under freedom of information laws revealed that CASA has received complaints about dangerous drone activity near Adelaide Airport, identified through footage that may have been published on the minister's X account (formerly Twitter) on 14 April 2023.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:12): What my young friend is talking about is drone footage of Greek Easter. There was a Greek Easter procession around St George church.

The Hon. D.J. Speirs: No, he is talking about illegal behaviour.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, Christianity is not illegal behaviour.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The procession was around the church. There was drone footage made available. I don't know if it was legal or illegal. I was not responsible for organising the drone footage. If members opposite are trying to make such an insinuation, make it. I have no evidence that that drone footage is inappropriate or illegal. I don't know if that footage was taken at a time outside the operation of the curfew or within the operation of the curfew, or whether or not they had permission. I don't know, but what I will do now is ask my officers to check.

I will also inform the local community about the opposition's questions about this drone footage. They are run by volunteers. I am not even sure if the volunteers knew about the drone footage, but I will go about and find it. I am not sure who sent it to me. I thought it was quite interesting. Of course, if it was inappropriate or illegal that is a different question, but I have no evidence that it was. If my young friend does have evidence that it was inappropriate or illegal, I look forward to seeing that evidence here in the house and of course I will act on it.

SOCIAL HOUSING

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:13): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. How has the Malinauskas government supported social housing this year?

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (15:14): I thank the member for this question and also for her deep interest in making housing more safe, stable and affordable for those in need. This year marked a real turning point for social housing in South Australia, and indeed this month has marked another milestone in our commitment to grow public housing in this state.

Tenders for another 64 new public houses have been awarded or are currently being finalised. This work represents more than \$20 million for our building and construction sector, but even more importantly, it means another 64 people and their families will have modern safe and affordable housing in the near future. This tranche of homes is spread around the Adelaide metropolitan area, including Northfield, Campbelltown, Rostrevor, Modbury, Parafield Gardens, Taperoo, Osborne, North Haven, Ferryden Park, Blair Athol, Edwardstown, Dover Gardens, Cowandilla, Marion, Park Holme and Felixstow. It was very tempting to sing that but I didn't.

Even though new elements of the construction code don't come into force until October next year, the South Australian Housing Authority is helping industry to get ready for the upcoming changes. We are delivering homes at or above the silver standard of accessibility, which is also part of our vision around broadly making the market more accessible for people for their capacity to live in at different physical capabilities.

All new public housing since March last year has been built to the minimum silver level of Liveable Housing Australia design guidelines and therefore delivering better accessibility and adaptability. Our building industry has shown how it can innovate and adapt over the years but paying them to build homes to the new standard before it actually comes into force is a great way to build capacity in the sector. The silver standard means people can age in place more easily, manage disability or health conditions and, really importantly, have friends and family come to visit who may have mobility issues themselves.

At the election, we committed the \$177.5 million for new and upgraded public housing, and at the time we promised 400 new homes. This was boosted to 437 after the election and then increased again to 564 when we added an additional \$55.2 million in our first Mid-Year Budget Review, thanks to the work of the Treasurer.

As of today, 202 homes are complete, under construction or out for tender. We are looking to have another 235 homes tendered and under construction during 2024, and that is before we get to work on homes under the extra \$135.8 million we secured from the commonwealth for social housing in South Australia that needs to be committed prior to June 2025.

On Monday this week, applications closed for the tender where community housing providers have put forward their best proposals for extra federal funding. In September this year, federal Labor passed its legislation for the \$10 billion Housing Australia Future Fund legislation, despite the opposition from the Liberals who voted against it and delayed it for months.

I expect to stand here in 2024 and update the house on many great outcomes for South Australia that the Liberal Party tried to stop. The difference between each side of this house could not be greater. One party promised to grow public housing before the election and then more than doubled its investment in social housing after the election via more state and commonwealth commitments. In contrast, the other side of the house spent four years in government slashing the social housing sector and the public housing budget, and, also, what did they promise at the election? An 80-word policy to continue to do nothing.

AUTISM

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (15:18): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. Has the minister met with or spoken to the federal minister in relation to retaining funding for people with autism? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TELFER: It was reported that the federal government will introduce steeper requirements for children with autism to access the NDIS and it is currently unclear how this may impact South Australians with autism.

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (15:18): Thank you very much for the question. Broadly, we have attended many commonwealth/state meetings around disability reform. There has been, of course, the royal commission into the abuse and neglect of people with disability that has been handed down, which has hundreds of recommendations that we are working through. On top of that, there has been a very deep review into the NDIS itself, and I am now in receipt of a copy of that report to work with our Premier and our team in relation to how we will work with the government moving forward to improve, in fact, the NDIS for many years into the future. We have not seen or have not delivered on any of these particular announcements that you are alleging have been made. We have yet to see the outcomes of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. N.F. COOK: We are yet to see the outcomes of those discussions which will happen at national cabinet, so there are no decisions at this stage being made. What you might be discussing is just mere speculation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

AUTISM

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (15:19): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. Have any in-kind arrangements been extended into 2023-24 that are still to be resolved and, if so, what are they? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TELFER: The Auditor-General reported in the annual report that some aspects of transitioning to claiming for services provided under the NDIS were still being resolved and that the in-kind arrangements have been extended into 2023-24.

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (15:20): We certainly did commit to and have been extensively working with our teams in terms of the delivery of our state disability services and we did negotiate for a continuance of the in-kind arrangements so that we could make sure that our service was ready to be able to perform as an NDIS provider. That arrangement has now come to an end and we are now, as a state disability service provider, operating as an NDIS participant.

FOOTBALL AUSTRALIA

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley) (15:21): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Can the minister outline any discussions held with Football Australia to bring the Matildas and/or Socceroos to Adelaide in 2024? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: The Matildas have a home Olympic qualifier in February against Uzbekistan and the Socceroos have home World Cup qualifiers against Lebanon in March and Palestine in June, all without allocated venues since last checking.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (15:21): Thank you very much for the question. I think I can speak for all of us in this house about how exciting the FIFA Women's World Cup was here.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I will share with you the great joy I had when my son was playing FIFA on his Xbox—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: —and one day said, 'I'm Sam Kerr today on my Xbox.' I knew that had meant we had a change in how we view women's sport. But the reality is that this wouldn't have happened unless we had made the advocacy that we did—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Let's be honest here. Let's have a conversation about how close this came to not happening here in Adelaide.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: This is pretty exceptional that you go, 'You have got to have them here', 'Why are you doing this?', 'Why are you doing that?' But we could have missed out entirely. What we had were five games here. Let's not forget that the China versus England match had 53 million viewers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Hartley! Member for Elder! The exchange between the member for Elder and the member for Hartley will cease. Order, member for Reynell!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: standing order 98. The question was actually non-provocative and direct in relation to three games coming up and seeking advice as to whether the government was seeking them.

The SPEAKER: Very well. I will listen carefully. I will bring the minister to the question.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Well, certainly. I think that the question of women's sport and what we will have here is something that we look forward to time and time again. Our conversations with Football Australia continue. They were incredibly impressed with the role that we played during the FIFA Women's World Cup. And, of course, madam was very supportive, in her own words.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey is warned for a final time, and the member for Chaffey is very, very close to standing order 137A.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: We will continue to have those conversations with Football Australia, given the increased presence of South Australia and the knowledge of the major events that we deliver.

Mr Patterson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morphett, order!

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: What is more important—as much as we continue these conversations for additional games—is the legacy that comes from the FIFA Women's World Cup. Correct me if I am wrong, but is it \$18 million, minister, to dedicate ourselves to female sport here in South Australia? We know that \$10 million of that is going to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: —football in South Australia, and additional moneys to other sports as well. But what does this this do? This builds on a legacy of authenticity and commitment to

women's participation in sport. In my own electorate we have the women's change rooms at the Salisbury Football Club.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Order, members to my left and to my right, and I think I hear the member for Chaffey! The member for Morialta under 134.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Thank you, sir. Standing order 98: the question was specific and directly related to three upcoming games, and we are keen to know if the government is trying to get them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That may be, but it may also be that the minister has concluded her answer.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I will end by saying that I stand here proudly, part of a government that supports women's participation in sport, and we will continue to do so.

Grievance Debate

REGIONAL HEALTH CARE

Ms PRATT (Frome) (15:26): November is Rural Health Month, and, as the clock ticks down this parliamentary year, I take the opportunity to submit my report card on the Malinauskas government's priorities, or lack thereof, in regional health.

Members interjecting:

Ms PRATT: While members may laugh on the opposite side of the chamber, it will not surprise my colleagues that, in grading this paper, I give this government a big F for fail. The National Rural Health Alliance reports that seven million people live in rural and remote Australia, and they experience a triple health disadvantage when it comes to distance, lack of services and higher costs, despite their sizeable social, cultural and economic contribution.

Five minutes is certainly not enough to catalogue the many ways in which this government is failing to deliver life-saving and life-improving services to thousands of South Australians. The following is a list of issues that we want corrected and improved: quality of life, equity of access and a reduction in presentations and admissions to our city hospitals.

It is a fail for maternity patients across country SA, who should have no faith in the minister, who says he is doing everything possible to recruit more midwives to our regions. This year alone the five communities of Waikerie, Kangaroo Island, Kapunda, Gawler and Whyalla have lost midwifery services, and three remain in that situation. I am sure the member for Giles is watching it closely. I would say to the member: which town will be next?

It is a fail for rural mental health and unmet needs. When it comes to accessing psychiatric services in the regions we are worse off than Mongolia but, wait for it, better off than Uzbekistan. Reports released by the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist have identified that 19,000 South Australians have unmet needs in accessing psychosocial services, but Minister Picton has failed to properly engage with the state's peak advocacy body, the Mental Health Coalition, to resolve much-needed funding to relieve the suffering felt by so many. If only we had an advocate who was appointed by the Premier who could bring more attention to this very chamber on the plight of suicide rates in our state, the prevalence of mental distress in the regions and the shameful lack of funding in early intervention and prevention.

I note that the member for Elder has only delivered one speech on mental health in the last 12 months and has reminded us at least nine times of her title. So I ask her, as she walks out: where has her advocacy been in this chamber? Where is the government's voice and leadership on mental health and suicide prevention? Thank God for rural champions like Dr Kate Gunn, the genius behind ifarmwell; Alex Thomas, the founder of Plant a Seed for Safety; and Steph Schmidt, a psychologist, farmer and Agrifutures Rural Women's Award winner. We are in good hands with these fabulous

women and regional leaders. It is another fail for the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme, which we call PATS. The minister offers crumbs to a regional community that needs to see serious reform.

Mr Hughes: You were in government for four years.

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Giles!

Ms PRATT: The member for Giles, this is a fail. The member for Giles has also been on the record speaking about PATS—every country member does, Mr Speaker, as you well know. There are reports of inexcusable processing delays. Too many people are ineligible because they do not fit the current criteria. For those patients who require overnight stays in the city the rebate of \$40 is insulting, as the member for Mount Gambier said today, reminding us that it has not been increased since 2014. I am calling on the government to reverse this disadvantage urgently.

It is a fail on regional radiation therapy. South Australia remains the only state or territory in this country that does not provide radiation therapy services anywhere in regional South Australia, so the only option remaining to a patient who lives in the country with that diagnosis is to travel the long distance to this city or interstate.

If you live in regional South Australia, you are 1.3 times more likely to die from cancer—it is that simple—and so I give this government zero out of 10 when it comes to workforce planning, lack of incentives, threats of a GP payroll tax, failure to meet national standards for radiotherapy, embedding disadvantage and increased costs for our country patients and a general disregard for our wellbeing. We are out of sight and out of mind.

GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (15:31): I rise to speak in support of the 16 Days of Activism against Gender-Based Violence. This is a sensitive matter, and I give warning that some may prefer to avoid this topic. When I think of the many campaign events running across the planet, it is fitting that on day 5 we bring this message to the very same chamber that has previously shown the world how it can be better in improving the rights and conditions for women.

The message behind the campaign will be heard loudly and frequently around the world until 10 December, concluding on Human Rights Day. Sadly, this follows the week when we mourn the deaths of four women in South Australia, allegedly as a result of violence from a partner or former partner, reiterating that we still have much more work to do.

While we think we have it good in Australia, we have alarming statistics that tragically delineate that this is not the case for everyone. When I say 'everyone', I refer specifically to women and girls. To our shame, on average one woman a week is murdered by their current or former partner. In the year 2021-22, 5,606 women were hospitalised due to family and domestic violence and one in three has experienced physical violence since the age of 15.

I could go on with more alarming statistics, but it sickens me talking about these horrendous acts as numbers and inadvertently overlooking that we are actually talking about someone's mum, sister, grandmother, wife, cousin, neighbour or friend. Therein is the tragedy of these awful numbers: they become the bleak substitute for individuals with potential to be nothing short of amazing.

I am sure there are other ways to look at this tragedy, but hopefully I have illustrated that it cannot be and should never be seen as just a problem for women but, rather, a disaster we must all come to grips with. For every wonderful person who becomes a voiceless statistic, we all lose. This is where we men must step in and take ownership of what we are facing.

While there are always exceptions, we must because the numbers show that although we stand against gender-based violence of any kind, we know that overwhelmingly the perpetrators are men and that the victims and survivors are women. We therefore cannot escape that, regardless of how we think we behave, each male has a role in turning this catastrophe around.

To me, this begins through introspection, plenty of hard listening and a willingness to change. Along the way, there is an obligation to call things out and an overwhelming desire to stand with everyone capable of breathing to assert respect and zero tolerance for gender-based violence. As lawmakers, the onus is on us to go further.

We have the option shortly to support a bill on the criminalisation of coercive control, a form of domestic violence where an abuser seeks to control a victim's behaviour. If we do not, we will be turning our backs on a pattern of behaviour intended to cause apprehension, fear and/or a loss of self-worth. As I have said here many times before, there is so much work that needs to be done also on public housing. I apologise that the time limits me on the paths we must take, but needless to say there is no room for complacency.

I also want to recognise the work being done locally to raise awareness, not just for this campaign but for improving the conditions of women and girls on a broader scale. In the north, we have RoZSI's Voice, an acronym of the key initials of the Para District Zonta Club, Rotary Mawson Lakes and the Torrens Soroptimists. It is only day 5 and I have been proud to stand with them for the Walk for Respect last Saturday, and I look forward to hopefully attending the candlelight vigil in Mawson Lakes on 10 December.

In between, there will be information stalls at the Mawson Lakes market, birthing kit assembly at the Tea Tree Gully library and seminars at Innovation House, also in Mawson Lakes. It has been my pleasure to host local organisers and friends of the campaign, along with brave victim survivors of gender-based violence.

It is normal political style to drop as many names as possible into a parliamentary speech but, in heeding the advice of one member of RoZSI's Voice, these words are offered today for the victims and victim survivors, and I end by sadly pointing out that it would be impossible to name them all.

COLTON ELECTORATE

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:36): Today, on behalf of my community I tabled the first set of 500 signatures for my community petition calling on the government to take immediate action to rectify the access issues at Henley Beach and Henley Beach South and to outline and fund a long-term solution for sand management on our central beaches. Do not worry, Mr Speaker, there will be plenty more to come.

It is a shame that it has come to this, but the condition of our central beaches and coastline is an issue of immediate concern for my community, as well as for many others across the state. In particular, I talk about the stretch of beach from West Beach through Henley Beach South and into Henley. This issue has just got worse and spread further north for every year of inaction.

Infrastructure and beach access points at Henley South and Henley Beach have been compromised, and we need a solution to address sand management in the longer term. So far, all we have had from this government is spin and talk. No solutions have been found, no decisions have been taken and no money has been provided or allocated.

Meanwhile, our beaches continue to deteriorate. It has been nearly two years now and what do we have? Absolutely nothing. We have a surf lifesaving club soon to open at West Beach, funded in part by the former Liberal government, and what do we have again? A beach in front of it disappearing. This is a direct result of decisions taken by this government.

While on my feet today, I would also like to take the opportunity to pass on my very best wishes to my community for the Christmas season. We have so many great events happening in the western suburbs over this time of year. It is the time of year when all of a sudden the coastal suburbs come alive. We have Christmas in the Square happening this Sunday 3 December. I look forward to seeing many of my community down there, enjoying the singalong and the carols in the most picturesque of settings in the whole of South Australia, without a shadow of a doubt.

I would also like to take the opportunity to thank the many members of my local community who have volunteered over this year, whether that be through our local sporting and community clubs—we all know the adage that sporting and community clubs do not run without volunteers; that is an adage because it is 100 per cent true—or whether that be my friends at the local Meals on Wheels.

The Henley and Grange branch will be delivering meals across the week leading into Christmas, as they do every other week of the year, to those in our community who need their

assistance through not just a meal but also the ability to make contact with somebody. It is a very important role that they undertake and I thank them for their service. To the many other not-for-profit organisations and service delivery organisations that make the western suburbs of Adelaide one of the most amazing places to live, we say thank you.

To our surf lifesavers across the Grange, Henley and West Beach surf clubs, thank you for doing what you do over the summer period, keeping our beaches safe. We know that often we take for granted the water cover that is provided across our coastal beaches, not just obviously for those who live there but those more broadly who come and visit our fantastic part of the world over the summertime.

I would also like to point out that this year the December-January period is going to be one of the most pivotal for two of those clubs. With West Beach, we have the new surf lifesaving club opening in, hopefully, a matter of weeks, a club that was in part funded by the former Marshall Liberal government, an investment that I am very proud to have seen made that will be the gem of infrastructure projects in surf lifesaving clubs. I am sure there will be many clubs that are a little bit jealous about what is about to be opened down there, and we look forward to that happening.

Most importantly as well, the Henley surf club commenced a new venture, with chef Adam Swanson and his business partner Josh Harkin transforming the upper storey of the Henley Surf Life Saving Club into what will be the ocean bar and kitchen. We look forward to seeing that restaurant up and running and seeing the future of all of our surf clubs down the coast, particularly my stretch, a long and prosperous journey as we look forward to keeping our beaches safe. To my community, merry Christmas and enjoy the summer period. We look forward to another year of fun ahead.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH AND MEDICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (15:41): Happy 10th birthday to the cheese grater. You know you are from Adelaide when you know exactly what I am talking about when I mention the 'cheese grater', the iconic building in our West End, which is home to the renowned South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, otherwise known as SAHMRI. I want to take this opportunity to commend former state and federal Labor governments for establishing SAHMRI in the CBD's West End, driving the creation of Adelaide's BioMed city, one of the largest health and medical research precincts in the Southern Hemisphere.

The creation of SAHMRI was a powerful investment in the health and quality of life of people throughout South Australia and beyond, focusing on the four major research themes of Aboriginal health equity, lifelong health, precision cancer medicine, and women's and kids. As it celebrates its 10th anniversary today, this vibrant world-class biomedical hub now hosts thousands of staff across multiple universities and agencies, making global health breakthroughs. I congratulate each and every one of the staff at SAHMRI on the important work they do.

Professor Maria Makrides, the 2022 SA Scientist of the Year, was appointed Executive Director of SAHMRI this August. Professor Makrides and SAHMRI Board Chair, the Hon. Hieu Van Le AC, recently hosted me at SAHMRI to update me on their work ahead of today's significant milestone. I would like to thank Professor Makrides and the Hon. Hieu Van Le AC for their commitment to this incredible institution and congratulate them on today's anniversary. Professor Makrides was happy to share the secret of SAHMRI's success in a recent addition of *Cosmos*, and I quote:

It's about connections and when you make the most of these connections, you end up with great outcomes.

People know people. And SAHMRI is built on a partnership model. We have exposure to people that you otherwise wouldn't have.

It was also connections that sowed the very first seeds of SAHMRI. In the early 2000s, a delegation of SA academics approached then Labor health minister John Hill to raise the fragmented nature of medical research in South Australia. Hill shared this with Adelaide stockbroker Alan Young, who had some great ideas. The CEO of Health, Dr Tony Sherbon, suggested that Professor John Shine from the Garvan institute in Sydney connect with Mr Young, and together they produced the Shine-Young report, laying out a plan to link universities and individual research groups together within a flagship research institute. From there, the cheese grater was born, but the project needed funding.

Enter the global financial crisis and the then Rudd Labor government looking for shovel-ready projects to keep the economy moving. The South Australian government knew exactly what project was shovel-ready and, thanks to the investment of the Rudd and Rann Labor governments, the cheese grater became a reality. I would also like to acknowledge the institute's inaugural executive director, Professor Steve Wesselingh, on his stewardship of SAHMRI over the last 10 years. Together with his team, Professor Wesselingh has seen SAHMRI become home to a nationally significant Registry Centre, the Health Policy Centre, the Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, the Molecular Imaging and Therapeutic Research Unit, and Preclinical, Imaging and Research Laboratories.

In just 10 years the institute has made significant discoveries and impact across the broad spectrum of its research agenda. In just one example, over the past 10 years a team within SAHMRI's Hopwood Centre for Neurobiology has reinvented how to study the human brain by bioengineering tiny brain replicas from patient's stem cells. The brain organoids enable the screening of drugs without putting people at risk, and today the technology is in use seeking treatments for people with Parkinson's, brain cancer and children with dementia, offering new hope to those affected by such terrible conditions. I am merely scratching the surface of what researchers within SAHMRI have been able to achieve, and they are not done yet.

I also want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the federal Labor government for its significant investment in the Southern Hemisphere's first proton therapy unit currently being built adjacent to the SAHMRI. The Australian Bragg Centre for Proton Therapy and Research will deliver the most advanced cancer treatment available for children, young adults and people with tumours close to vulnerable organs.

To put it simply, the cheese grater is a life saver and will continue to save lives and improve the quality of life for so many South Australians and beyond for many years to come. Here's to 10 great years of the cheese grater. Congratulations again to Professor Makrides, Professor Wesselingh, SAHMRI researchers and staff and every single person who has played a role in the success of this iconic institution.

EYRE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (15:46): I want to speak today about one of the most important—indeed most fundamental—challenges for my region, Eyre Peninsula, and that is water. Indeed, it is something that those of us from Eyre Peninsula have all grown up knowing about, from the construction of the Tod Reservoir, which was opened in 1922, to the subsequent engineering feat of a gravity-fed water pipeline from there all the way west to Ceduna, some 400 kilometres away.

We know about the use and subsequent mismanagement of some of the underground basins and have ongoing concerns. We know of the now decades-long campaign by the community and their local MPs to get a desalination plant on Eyre Peninsula, with concerns about the longevity of the underground water aquifers that supply the peninsula. This campaign resulted in the previous Liberal government being the first to make any indication on advancing that project, with a \$99 million budget allocation during the previous term.

After community industry concerns about the way that SA Water proposed to locate the desalination plant at Billy Lights Point, in the bay area of Port Lincoln, the former minister put in place a site selection committee, made up of community leaders, fishing and aquaculture industries and the local government sector, tasked with putting together the work for an alternative location.

I must commend this committee for their work. They were thorough, they were thoughtful, evidence based, collaborative and consultative, and after much deliberation and evidence-gathering they made a recommendation of their preferred site at Sleaford West. They considered all different aspects: environmental, economic, cost and constructability. They got expert advice, scientific advice. They were thorough. Unfortunately, this has been ignored by this minister and SA Water, and now the community once again is faced with a project advancing at Billy Lights Point.

Port Lincoln is known as the seafood capital of the state, with fishing and aquaculture being a significant component of the local and state economy. Many of these aquaculture industries are based within this bay area of Port Lincoln, notably tuna, kingfish and mussels. With this in mind the

community and industries at the time came out strongly opposing SA Water's proposal, and in response to this the question still remains: what will be the impact on our fishing and aquaculture industries?

The minister has previously advised that she has a report which found that it can be built without negatively impacting the local marine environment, with ocean modelling showing that, once the plant is operational, long-term salinity levels in the bay will remain within natural background levels. But there is still no confidence in that perspective from my community, as the locals know the fine balance that existing industries must make with their interactions with the local marine environment, as they focus on this, and they rely on this, for their clean, green produce which they are renowned for.

The minister has also previously made a statement that:

...the final decision on the plant will be informed by a separate business case being prepared by Infrastructure SA into the Northern Water Supply project...

We know that subsequent to this statement, the Northern Water supply project team had announced that Cape Hardy is the recommended location, which is much closer to Port Lincoln than previous recommended locations, and only around 35 to 45 kilometres away from the main EP water line.

I know this is a significant project, it is a significant proposal—the Northern Water scheme—but I hope the government, the minister and her department and SA Water start to have a big picture perspective on water supply on Eyre Peninsula. If we are serious about getting an appropriate long-term solution for Eyre Peninsula water, we need to look at all the different factors because there continue to be concerns about all aspects of Eyre Peninsula water.

Currently, the upper and western parts of Eyre Peninsula are relying predominantly on River Murray water coming via the Iron Knob to Kimba pipeline. The people of Elliston and surrounds, which rely on the Bramfield Basin, have recently become aware of significant long-term sustainability issues regarding their own ongoing water supply. The town relies on water supply from the Bramfield Basin and is not connected to other water supplies available to the majority of Eyre Peninsula. This is happening in the shadow of the mismanagement previously of the nearby Polda Basin and the close-by Robinson Basin.

My community have multifaceted concerns about their sustainability, but water is obviously a vital aspect that is non-negotiable. This is why the government must invest in the big picture on water on the EP, not short-term budget savings by building a desal at Billy Lights Point. Build a desal in the right place and of the right size, invest in infrastructure that will enable industry growth and not put at risk existing productive industries.

Personal Explanation

FRANKFURT TRADE OFFICE

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan) (15:51): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It has been brought to my attention that we now have representation in Germany. This is a very good thing and, of course, updates my comments to the house yesterday.

The SPEAKER: Very well, as I understand it, that will also suffice to discharge the matter of privilege that has been raised with me.

Grievance Debate

EVANSTON PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:51): In the five minutes I have for this grievance, I would like to bring a couple of matters to the attention of the house. One is that today is a very special day in my local community. On 29 November 1963, there was the official opening of the former Evanston

primary school. The school now celebrates its 60th anniversary. Sadly, though, that school has since closed.

To mark that occasion, earlier this week the Mayor of the Town of Gawler, Karen Redman, myself and also a former teacher Mrs Anne Hausler—who was my year 6 teacher at primary school then—officially unveiled a storyboard on the site, because the school had not only been closed in 2012 but, also, it has since been demolished and built with houses. So there was no recognition of the school, the work of the teachers, the parents and the community that actually served the community for 50 years.

The school was officially opened on Friday 29 November 1963 by then Minister for Education, the Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson KBE, LLB, MP. The school opened its doors to students on Tuesday 6 February 1962—it took almost two years to officially open the school—and closed on Friday 7 December 2012. The inaugural headmaster of the school was Mr William H.B. Turner, who was supported by seven teachers, eight classrooms and 218 students. The school was opened during the population growth periods in those areas. At one stage, the school had up to about 450 students when I was a student there between 1964 and 1971.

The school reopened in 2013 as the primary years of the newly created Gawler and District College B-12 on the Gawler High School site and was also joined by the former Evanston preschool. As I said, I am an old scholar of Evanston Primary School and Gawler High School, while my sons attended the Evanston preschool. Like a lot of areas, as the suburb aged over time, enrolments at the school fell dramatically and that is one of the reasons the school closed after serving local families and thousands of students for 50 years.

The plaque or something similar for the site was first mooted by Mrs Anne Hausler, a former schoolteacher. After many years' absence, Mrs Hausler visited the school site during 2021 and was surprised to see no plaque on the site to mark the important history of this school. Mrs Hausler said that despite teaching at the school during the 1960s for a number of years, she would not have been able to find the site of the school as there were no signs or directions.

I am pleased to say that the storyboard has been funded and erected by the Town of Gawler. Gawler Mayor Karen Redman came to the official launch and said that Evanston Primary School provided quality education to the people of southern Gawler for many years. She went on to say that the school was staffed by fantastic teachers and she thought it appropriate to acknowledge the school and where it was as part of our history of the town.

The school actually came about as a chance discussion which took place between myself and a former teacher at Evanston Primary School—who was also a former teacher of mine when I was at high school—on a train on the way back from a tour of parliament. The discussion held was that the primary school students would walk across to the high school on a regular basis to do their science and other classes.

As a result of that, discussions were held between the three schools. At the time I was a member of the Gawler High School Governing Council. It was discussed to explore what would be better for the students in that area. The schools decided, after a public vote, to merge and that is what happened.

The school was named after the suburb in which it was located. Evanston was originally named Evans Town after Ann Taylor Evans, the wife of the land developer James Philcox, and became Evanston in 1854 when the land was transferred. At one stage it was proposed to name the suburb Tambelin, but this was rejected by the Geographical Names Board.

Private Members' Statements

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Ms PRATT (Frome) (15:56): Today, I had pleasure in tabling a petition signed by 308 residents of the Freeling community who are very keen to have a police officer returned to the Freeling station. I want to pay my regards and compliments to the tireless work of resident Lynn Craige, who sat at the local supermarket collecting as many signatures as she could. I understand

that around the time of COVID the resident police officer was redeployed and unfortunately has not returned.

Freeling is a growing community with subdivisions attracting new businesses. There has been an expansion of services like the new Foodland. We will see a medical clinic return, hopefully, and the chemist that was burnt down will be a recent addition. This is a growing community.

I note the member for MacKillop, in his heartfelt condolence motion yesterday, explained that the good people of Lucindale totalled 637 residents and still have their own police station, which is a building, he said, adjoining a house that is just a stone's throw from the local pub, post office and deli. With over 2,200 people living in the Freeling community, the Freeling station is similarly located. They are simply asking for the same service.

The residents of Freeling are keen to learn the future of this station and if there are any plans to return an officer to the station. Yesterday in the house we heard the heartbreaking tributes in honour of Brevet Sergeant Jason Doig, and I add my own contribution to his family and colleagues because we greatly value the service and protection afforded to us by those who choose to serve. The presence of police officers who live in our country towns makes an immeasurable difference to our safety.

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (15:58): I would like to use this time on International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People to say a few words. On Monday night, our six year old lay between us in our bed because the storm was scaring her. The bright lightning and loud thunder made her worried, but she was safe and, despite her tight cuddles, I think she knew she was safe. The same cannot be said for the children in Gaza. The bright lights of lightning and loud bangs of thunder are replaced with the bloodcurdling sounds of war.

The children of Gaza are not scared of lightning: they are scared of bombs. The children of Gaza are so desperate that even during a thunderstorm they stand out in the street with their mouths wide open, hoping to catch a drop of the only safe drinking water they have seen in days.

In Australia, we are rightly horrified when there is news of the death of one Australian child. When we hear of the death of thousands of children, it becomes almost unfathomable, impossible to comprehend, but we must try. At last night's vigil on the steps of this parliament, the names and photos of many of the children who have been killed were on display. These children were the nieces, nephews, brothers, sisters, cousins and grandchildren of their families, and their lives have been devastatingly cut short.

While violence, dispossession and suffering have been prevalent in Gaza for decades, conditions in this small region of occupied Palestine have deteriorated beyond belief in the past 16 years. The median age in Gaza is 18 years. Clean water is unavailable to 95 per cent of the population; 80 per cent of the population relies on aid for food. For those who do survive these brutal conditions, many are met with a bombing campaign described by some horrifyingly as 'mowing the grass'. Today, on International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People and every day, I stand in solidarity with you.

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (16:00): I rise briefly to speak about a gathering last night in the town of Goolwa. This was a gathering organised by some local members of the community in relation to a proposed code amendment occurring in relation to a development to the north of Goolwa. The Minister for Planning in May of this year announced that there would be 2,500 new allotments made available in Goolwa. This is the area that we are now looking at with the code amendment.

There is real concern by this community in relation to the infrastructure needed to make it possible for 2,500 dwellings to be built in Goolwa. This would put enormous pressure on the road networks coming into the community. It would put huge pressure on the great work the town has done to become a Cittaslow town, which means a slow town, a town that wants to do things in a sustainable way.

It is certainly something that is putting up a lot of challenges in the community's eyes. I very much support them. I very much hope the minister considers the views of the community when the code amendment comes before him, rather than just having prejudged this code amendment by making that announcement in May.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (16:02): As the parliamentary calendar draws to a close, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my hardworking staff, Abbey, Alex and Macey. It is quite something to be working with people who stand beside you and walk alongside you, always knowing that they are giving you absolute support. For all three of them, I am so proud that whenever someone calls or drops into our office, they show the utmost respect for the concerns and worries that constituents bring to us and for everything that they do in all of their power to help alleviate those concerns and bring about positive results for people in our community.

I would like to acknowledge Abbey, whose values she holds deeply but expresses quietly, who is thoughtful and diligent and works beyond whatever is asked of her but never seeks any praise; Alex, who is professional and polite and always quick to have a laugh; and Macey on the front counter, right on the frontline, who brings absolute empathy to everyone she speaks with, who is patient, who listens, who shows absolute respect for everyone who comes in and gives them the time they need to hear their worries. I thank them all and wish you all a very happy Christmas.

Bills

AYERS HOUSE BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (16:04): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to grant ongoing rights in relation to Ayers House to the National Trust of South Australia, to make related amendments to the National Trust of South Australia Act 1955, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (16:04): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, I introduce the Ayers House Bill 2023. One of this government's election commitments is to introduce legislation to grant ongoing rights in relation to Ayers House to the National Trust of South Australia, including its use for commercial operations to generate revenue for the National Trust.

The National Trust has worked tirelessly to protect and promote heritage in South Australia since 1955. The National Trust has over 1,000 registered volunteers and over 5,000 members. Over the years, the National Trust and its volunteers have contributed the equivalent of millions of dollars for work supporting heritage conservation and heritage education.

The National Trust was first asked to assist in managing Ayers House in 1971. In 1970, the then Premier, Don Dunstan, invited the National Trust to contribute to his plan to restore, furnish and present the house to the public as a museum, restaurant and function centre. This act expands upon the vision of the former Premier by granting Ayers House to the National Trust as a permanent home. The Ayers House Act will ensure that this location is safe from a future minister evicting the National Trust on a whim. It will:

- maintain the minister as the registered owner of Ayers House on the certificate of title;
- give the National Trust permanent care, control and management of Ayers House;
- allow the National Trust to generate income to support its operation through leases, licences and other activities within Ayers House;
- ensure public access to Ayers House;
- render the National Trust liable for all claims related to Ayers House;
- exempt Ayers House from council rates; and

- include transitional provisions to:
 - allow the National Trust to carry out its traditional activities without it being considered a change of use under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016; and
 - assign the National Trust lease and licences that until the passing of the act were held by the Crown.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

3—Interpretation

This clause defines terms used in the measure.

4—Objects

This clause sets out the objects of the measure.

5—Ayers House vested in Minister

Ayers House is vested in the Minister but the clause contains restrictions on the Minister's entitlement to grant rights of interests in the property.

6—Care, control and management vested in National Trust

Care, control and management of Ayers House vests in the National Trust subject to the rights of public access and any other requirements set out in notices under the provision.

7—Liability

The National Trust will bear the liability for any claims arising in respect of Ayers House or any use of Ayers House.

8—Exemption from council rates

No council rates are payable in respect of Ayers House.

9—Regulations

This clause is a regulation making power.

Schedule 1—Related amendments and transitional provisions

Part 1—Amendment of National Trust of South Australia Act 1955

1—Amendment of section 5—Objects of Trust

This clause makes a consequential amendment to the *National Trust of South Australia Act 1955*.

Part 2—Transitional provisions

2—No change in use of land

This clause clarifies that the resumed use of Ayers House by the National Trust will not constitute a change in use for the purposes of the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*.

3—Assignment of leases and licences to National Trust

Existing leases and licences with respect to Ayers House are to be assigned to the National Trust.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

*Parliamentary Procedure***STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION**

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (16:07): I move:

That standing and sessional orders be and remain so far suspended to enable Private Members Business, Other Motions, No. 130, set down on the *Notice Paper* for Wednesday 29 November to take precedence over government business forthwith.

The SPEAKER: An absolute majority not being present, ring the bells.

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

Motion carried.

*Motions***INTERNATIONAL DAY OF SOLIDARITY WITH THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE**

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (16:11): I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes that:
 - (i) the 29th of November is International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian people, as declared by the United Nations General Assembly in 1977;
 - (ii) the current conflict between Israel and Palestine continues to be unresolved, resulting in the loss of innocent lives; and
 - (iii) many South Australians are concerned by the ongoing conflict and humanitarian crisis in the region.
- (b) recognises that:
 - (i) Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations adopts the principle of equal rights and self-determination;
 - (ii) the ongoing occupation of Palestine is a significant barrier to finding a lasting peace in the Israel-Palestine conflict; and
 - (iii) international humanitarian law must be observed by all state and non-state actors in times of both conflict and peace.
- (c) acknowledges that:
 - (i) pro-Palestinian advocacy is based on humanitarian norms and not anti-Semitism; and
 - (ii) Islamophobia, anti-Palestinianism and anti-Semitism has no place in Australia.
- (d) reaffirms its:
 - (i) support for the rights of both the Israeli and the Palestinian people to live in equality and peace within internationally recognised borders.
- (e) calls on the federal government to:
 - (i) actively promote measures to end the conflict between Israel and Palestine on the basis of relevant UN resolutions and international law; and
 - (ii) continue working with humanitarian organisations to provide humanitarian assistance and support for civilians affected by the conflict.

It is with no great joy that I move this motion today, because it reflects the failure of world governments, and particularly Western nations, to resolve a conflict that started over 75 years ago. This conflict did not start on 7 October this year. To say so is both historically incorrect and offensive to those who have lost their lives and to those who mourn and grieve for both family and friends, in particular those children who will never experience the opportunity to go to school, to play sport, to play music, to enter into relationships or to have children of their own—all those things that are an expression of our humanity.

Most of the lives lost have been those of innocent civilians, both Israeli and Palestinian. Over those 75 years, many people have lost their lives. It is a senseless conflict, and we have to stop

pretending that, if we turn a blind eye or stay silent, the plight of the Palestinian people in this conflict will be resolved. When we stay silent, evil prevails.

Evil prevailed on 7 October, which resulted in the senseless death of 1,200 Israelis and another 240 abducted. The grief and anger of the Israeli people is understandable, and quite rightly those acts have been condemned. Since 7 October, 14,532 Palestinians, including 6,000 children, have died as a result of Israel's response to the horrific acts of 7 October. The indiscriminate killing of innocent Palestinian civilians, and particularly children, has caused enormous grief and pain in Palestine. It can quite rightly be called an evil act worthy of condemnation.

In my faith, we are all born equal and in the image of God. No child is less equal and no child's death should be referred to as collateral damage. There is no justification for killing innocent children, and to refer to them as collateral damage is an affront to our humanity. My faith teaches me about the power of love and peace, and the right of all of us to live in dignity and be treated with dignity. That includes the Palestinian people.

It is no accident that the General Assembly of the United Nations decided at their 91st plenary meeting, held on 2 December 1977, to commence an annual observance day on 29 November as the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People. This decision was based on a recommendation of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. That is what this motion seeks to do, namely, acknowledge the right of Palestinian people to self-determination, to live in peace, to prosper, and to live freely in a place called Palestine, as determined by international law and with internationally recognised boundaries.

This motion will not change the course of events in either Canberra or the Middle East. What this motion does do, hopefully, is send a message to the Palestinian community, of all faiths, Muslim and Arab people of all faiths in our community, that the grief and pain felt by them at the current conflict in Palestine is acknowledged by this parliament and every life lost deserves equal consideration and respect by all of us.

By acknowledging their grief and pain, we make a positive contribution to the process of healing. The process of healing will only truly progress when political leaders acknowledge the grief and pain of both communities and not preference one over the other. Our political leaders should not act as cheerleaders for one side or the other in this conflict but use language which respects both.

What is said is important, but what is not said is more important. Had the political commentary to date been reasonably balanced and respectful to all communities involved in the current conflict, there would be no need for this motion. The broader Palestinian communities have felt isolated and silenced by the lack of words which recognise their plight and their experience.

Article 1 of the Charter of United Nations adopts the principle of equal rights and self-determination. When we talk about international law and when we talk about rules-based behaviour, clearly we have to apply that to all nations and not selectively with some nations and not others.

At this point, I would like to acknowledge the steps made by the Albanese federal government and Minister Penny Wong, who actually acknowledged that international humanitarian law applies to this conflict. While I personally think the response by the federal government could have been more precise and clearer, I do not criticise them because, of all the political voices on this matter, theirs have been the most moderate and considered. Some of the political rhetoric has been hypocritical and harmful, as they call for social cohesion and use inflammatory language which creates division.

It is also important to note that earlier this year this chamber endorsed the principles 1 to 8 stated in the Sydney statement on anti-Palestinianism. Those principles make very clear the rights of Palestinian people and the rights of the Palestine nation under international law. There is nothing really controversial about this because what it says is that this is the international law, and this is what we should be upholding as a world community—and Australia is part of that community—and that these are the principles that we should be upholding, including the rights of Palestinian people to actually protest peacefully around the world in support of their plight and their right to statehood.

Sadly, we are in a position where often just criticising the Israeli government makes you antisemitic. I reject that position. It is important that we acknowledge that supporting the rights of

Palestinian people to statehood does not diminish the right of Jewish people to their own state of Israel.

On 15 May each year, the Palestinian people around the world commemorate Nakba, the day that 80 per cent of Palestinians leaving the land occupied by Israel were forced from their homes and country and made refugees. The remaining 20 per cent became internally displaced people. The partitioning of Palestine without the consent of the Palestinian people was a disastrous decision by the United Nations to appease the Zionist movement and cleanse the conscience of Europe for their failure to stop the barbarism and extreme political right against the Jewish people across the continent. The Palestinian people paid and continue to pay a heavy price for the sins of Western nations to address one injustice by only creating another.

Palestinian people continue to be victims of 19th century and 20th century colonialism. From 1947 to 1949, over 530 Palestinian towns and villages were completely destroyed by Zionist militia, with many of the depopulated towns taken over by Jewish settlers and renamed. Around 15,000 Palestinian people were killed during these forced takeovers of Palestinian land and almost 800,000 Palestinians were expelled from their homes in Galilee. Those who attempted to return were shot and killed.

Sadly, successive Israeli governments have introduced laws and enacted policies that have made the Palestinian people second-class citizens in their own country. The discrimination, hardship and indignities experienced by Palestinian people would not be tolerated in any First World nation in Western Europe, yet we continue to turn a blind eye to the plight of Palestinian people.

Many Palestinian people live scattered across the world, hoping that one day they will be able to return home, a right which all Australians expect and experience but one which is denied the Palestinian people. Today, six million Palestinian refugees reside outside historical Palestine and continue to be denied their right to return to their homeland, while the 3.5 million Palestinians who live on the West Bank are denied the right to vote for a government that continues to control every aspect of their lives.

Some 2.2 million Palestinians live in appalling conditions caused by the ongoing seizure of their lands by Israeli forces, while the 1.9 million Palestinians who continue to live within historic Palestine do not have the right to vote but are subject to different laws, which diminish their inherent humanity and dignity.

While many European powers have accepted the process of decolonisation across the world, Israel continues to be permitted to occupy the land and lives of the Palestinian people. It is right that we remember the Holocaust and other atrocities and acts of genocide committed during the 20th and 21st centuries, but in doing so we should not be allowed to justify aggression and violence against the Palestinian people, nor should we allow ourselves to be distracted from what is happening in Palestine today and be blind to the hardship and oppression experienced by Palestinian people.

As the foreign minister has quite rightly said, this conflict will not be resolved unless we work towards a plan to recognise the plight of Palestinians to achieve statehood with internationally recognised boundaries. The internationally recognised borders to this day—and by that I mean recognised by international law—are the 1967 boundaries, yet those boundaries continue to be breached by the state of Israel.

We also need to acknowledge that there is a power imbalance between the Palestinian people and the state of Israel. It is important to note that we as an Australian nation—and that is why this motion calls on the Australian government—acknowledge the right of Palestinian people to self-determination as provided by international law, acknowledge the Palestinians' right to statehood and also actively promote measures to end the conflict between Israel and Palestine on just grounds and on the basis of international negotiations. It is time for Palestine to be free and for the Palestinian people and Israeli people to live in peace. For this to happen, we need to not only stand by Israel but stand by the people of Palestine.

There being a disturbance in the gallery:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): I appreciate that this is a passionate issue, but I will remind the gallery to please be quiet during the debate.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:22): I rise to speak on this issue at short notice. The opposition will offer some amendments to endeavour to keep those parts of the member for Light's motion which I think many in the community, as do we, would passionately support. We are desperately in favour of peace. We are desperately saddened and troubled by the loss of an individual, especially a child, especially anybody who is described in any way as innocent, as are so many people in Palestine and as are so many people in Israel who have lost their lives. The trauma their families suffer is unbearable to think about for anyone.

We offer amendments because, while I believe the spirit of the member for Light's motion may be intended to capture and be a voice for those people in our South Australian community who feel that they have not heard their voices honoured over the very difficult seven weeks in the public discourse on this difficult issue, nevertheless, were this parliament to stand by a form of words as expressed in a motion, the Liberal Party believes that we should be consistent with the views and the considered motions that we have put in the past, and indeed with Australia's foreign policy, for which this house is not responsible but obviously the commonwealth government is.

I will detail the description of the amendments briefly for the benefit of the house. I believe that copies are being circulated for members' consideration. It would have been my intention to circulate these earlier, but it was only brought to my attention and the opposition's attention in the last half an hour that this motion would be completed this afternoon.

We had no notice of the motion's coming prior to the phone call that I got from the member for Light yesterday advising that, after question time today, he would seek to suspend standing orders in order to debate this motion. I sought information from the Government Whip as to whether the government would be seeking to complete the motion today and would we have to, as such, convene a joint party meeting to consider the amendments. The Government Whip advised yes, that it would be completed.

The leader of the house and I had a conversation this morning during which I suggested I might have amendments were there to be a requirement for it today. Several hours later, the leader of the house told me that the government had determined that they would be happy to adjourn debate after the member for Light's contribution, thus enabling the Liberal Party to take a bit longer to consider the potential amendments, to consult more broadly on those potential amendments and, indeed, for us to circulate such amendments to members of the government for their consideration and for this to be dealt with in a considered manner, hopefully a bipartisan manner.

The leader of the house apologised to me half an hour ago and suggested he was happy for me to record for the record the exchange. It is in that context that I do not complain about the rules of debate lightly and I certainly do not wish to interrupt the merits of the discussion, only to explain why the opposition proposes to have only one speaker on this motion and only to explain why I propose to go mostly through the technical detail of the amendments rather than a more deeply considered reflection on the broader issues. It is through having had only five minutes to print out the draft amendments and then 20 minutes to think about what I might say that I therefore offer this contribution.

Firstly, one of the concerns with the way the language is currently structured is the description of the conflict between Israel and Palestine. It is our view that it is a conflict between Israel and Hamas. I said in the motion on Israel and after the 7 October massacre that I did not believe that Hamas necessarily spoke for all the Palestinian people, and condemnation of the attacks should not reflect more broadly on the Palestinian people than on Hamas. The situation in Gaza is a tragedy for the Palestinian people and Palestinian families, many of whom seek nothing more than peace.

The motion, therefore, amends 'Palestine' to 'Hamas' in the description of the conflict. In the description in (a)(ii) of the resulting loss of innocent lives, it also suggests that it is important to note that at this time the continuing plight of Israeli hostages who remain in captivity should be added to the motion. I think that it is nothing more than a matter of record that the reason, the trigger, that has meant that this motion exists—why there is deep unhappiness, unsettlement and trauma in our community, let alone the global community—is that it has been triggered in the immediate sense by the attacks of Hamas on 7 October, the taking of hostages and the fact that the vast majority of the

hostages remain, presumably, in tunnels in Gaza, and I think it would be inappropriate for this motion to pass without noting that continues to be the issue.

The motion at (b)(ii) describes significant barriers to lasting peace. The amendment describes an additional alternative barrier to lasting peace, which is that the ongoing aim of Hamas is to, and I quote, 'obliterate' Israel, as expressed in its charter and demonstrated by its massacres in southern Israel on 7 October.

The amendment to paragraph (c) of the motion is where the member for Light has described that 'pro-Palestinian advocacy is based on humanitarian norms and not anti-Semitism'. Indeed, the member for Light, I am certain in his heart, has no level of offence ever meant against anyone of any faith or race background. I think there are examples where people have been described as antisemitic for calling out the government of Israel on occasion.

I agree that criticism of the government of Israel is not necessarily antisemitism, except in circumstances where one is criticising the government of Israel only for behaviour by that government and not by any other government doing similar activities in any other case; it is just that the government of Israel is the government of the only Jewish country in the world. Therefore I am suggesting an amendment to paragraph (c)(i) to confirm our belief that pro-Palestinian advocacy is based on humanitarian norms, but adding new words identifying:

...but when such advocacy also denies the right of the Jewish people to self-determination and calls for the elimination of Israel, it constitutes antisemitism;

At this point, for the benefit of the Clerks, I note that in the motion circulated by the whip 'antisemitism' did not appear with a hyphen. In the *Notice Paper*, it appears with a hyphen. There is a difference, sir. Antisemitism is a word. It is not the opposition to semitism. Antisemitism is in itself an approach best exemplified by Hitler, but antisemitism is the word and there should be no hyphen. It is not clear to me that that was a drafting intent. I think that might have been an error in the house, and I trust that the amendment makes clear that there should be no hyphen.

Importantly, paragraph (c)(ii) is a very important part of the member for Light's motion confirming that Islamophobia, anti-Palestinianism and antisemitism have no place in Australia, and I could not agree more. In relation to paragraph (d), it is just minor amendments. We are suggesting that it changes the words to:

- (d) reaffirms its:
 - (i) support for the rights of both Israelis and Palestinians to live in equality and peace in their own respective states with internationally recognised borders.

I think that is a statement of Australian government policy, of the policy of the two major parties. I do not think that the member for Light would have trouble with that change. We would recommend a change to paragraph (e)(i) to more simply present as:

- (e) calls on the federal government to:
 - (i) actively promote measures to support a lasting peace for the benefit of Israeli and Palestinian people;

On a motion such as this, we endeavour as leaders within our parties to capture a bipartisan spirit so that when we speak we can try to find a way of expressing the views of the South Australian people.

The member for Light, as I take it from his speech, suggests that the motion passed recently did not necessarily feel the support by everyone in the South Australian community. I am sorry if that is the case. I certainly believe that we want to express grief for any loss and express our unified desire for a just outcome and a lasting and sustainable outcome.

Certainly there is dispute over a range of matters in this area that are very difficult to resolve, but it is very difficult for us to allow the motion to pass without amendment given the difficulty in what would Israel's response to 7 October be without seeking to dismantle Hamas.

We can express support for that desire while at the same time bemoaning and expressing our sadness for the trauma and tragedy of every child loss, of every innocent loss, of every

Palestinian loss, but we must, I think, in context do it in the recognition that this motion responds to 7 October, and the Israeli losses must be present in the motion for it to have our support.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (16:33): First and foremost, I owe the opposition an apology, and I am prepared to say that, and also especially to the Co-Convenor of the Friends of Palestine. I do note that no member was able to support the suspension, but that is a matter that they are entitled to do. However, I did give my consent to an adjournment.

Just to explain to the house what would normally happen on a day like today, for an ordinary day a motion that you wanted to be debated you would seek a suspension of standing orders. The lead drafter or the lead speaker would make his or her contribution to the house and we would adjourn, but today, of course, is a significant day: it is the International Day of Palestine and it is recognised by the United Nations, and it was recognised so in 1977, hence the government now wishes to proceed with the motion and pass it. We have shown solidarity with Israel over the attacks by Hamas in October. We are now showing solidarity with the people of Palestine.

I have had a look at many of the amendments the deputy leader has proposed. Some have merit; there are some that the government cannot agree to. The official language of the Australian government is now that the ongoing occupation of Palestine is an inhibitor to a two-state solution, and we will of course, while we are in government, always support the nation's foreign policy.

However, what I think we can do is potentially adjourn the motion so we can have a discussion with the opposition to work out what is an acceptable amendment that we can agree on. The government would obviously like to have a bipartisan uniform approach to this because the Palestinian people deserve that. With that, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Bills

RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Minister, did you wish to speak to the amendments?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: Yes. These two amendments come from the Legislative Council, which we agree to in this place on this side.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Any further contributions?

Mr TEAGUE: I indicate we understand there have been amendments. I do not propose to hold up the house in terms of the passage on receipt of those. I indicate that that is understood what has occurred.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC HOLIDAYS BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (16:38): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, I introduce the Public Holidays Bill 2023. This bill modernises and streamlines South Australia's public holiday legislation, bringing our laws into the 21st century and rectifying longstanding issues that employers, workers and regulators have had dealing with the outdated and archaic Holidays Act 1910.

This bill follows commitments made by the government during the last state election, as well as consultation through a public survey conducted on the YourSAy website earlier this year. This bill delivers on our election commitment to ensure that Christmas Day is treated as a public holiday every year, regardless of which day of the week it falls. Currently, if Christmas Day falls on a Saturday, then the public holiday moves to the following Monday and Christmas is treated as a normal trading day. This means that workers miss out on penalty rates when rostered to work away from their families and friends on Christmas.

The former Liberal government had the opportunity to close this terrible loophole when it last occurred in 2021, but it refused to do so. In opposition, Labor was pleased to support a private member's bill to make Christmas Day a public holiday, and we are even more pleased to initiate this reform in government. With this reform we join every other state and territory in Australia that has now made this change, a reform supported by nearly 95 per cent of the respondents in the YourSAy survey.

The bill also brings South Australia into line with every other mainland state by declaring Easter Sunday a public holiday. This ensures that workers are appropriately remunerated when rostered to work on this day and was also strongly supported in the YourSAy survey. Easter is a special time of year for many, whether that is for religious reasons, family gatherings or just a time to refresh.

Declaring Easter Sunday to be a public holiday will allow many people to continue those traditions with the knowledge that our workplace relations laws provide certain rights when it comes to public holidays. The addition of the Easter Sunday public holiday is not expected to have a significant impact on trade, given that under the Shop Trading Hours Act 1977 most stores are closed on Easter Sunday in any event.

The bill also aligns with South Australia's rules for additional and substitute public holidays with the Eastern States. This means that most public holidays will occur on the same days across jurisdictions, reducing confusion and disruption to business and improving interstate tourism opportunities. It also includes a number of technical amendments, including removing outdated and archaic terminology, removing the proscription of all Sundays as a public holiday and permanently moving the public holiday on the third Monday in May to the second Monday in March, consistent with longstanding practice since 2006.

The bill includes consequential amendments to the Shop Trading Hours Act 1977 to ensure special trading arrangements applicable to additional public holidays are maintained under these new laws. The bill also amends the Shop Trading Hours Act 1977 so that in the case of a special public holiday being proclaimed, such as the Queen's memorial public holiday, the minister may simultaneously declare a shop trading exemption without needing to consult on the exemption.

The total impact of the bill will be an average of 1.1 additional public holidays each year over the next decade. This takes into account both the Easter Sunday public holiday and changes to additional and substitute holidays, which largely balance out evenly. If passed, the bill will come into effect from 1 January 2024. The only change in the 2024 calendar year would be the addition of the Easter Sunday public holiday. I commend the bill to the house and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

3—Days fixed as public holidays

This clause sets out the days that are public holidays in each year and provides for additional and substitute public holidays as follows:

- where 25 December or 1 January falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the following Monday will be an additional public holiday; and

- where 26 December falls on a Saturday, the following Monday will be an additional public holiday; and
- where 26 December falls on a Sunday or Monday, the following Tuesday will be an additional public holiday; and
- where 26 January falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the following Monday will be a public holiday instead of that day; and
- the Governor may, by proclamation, substitute another day to be a public holiday instead of a day appointed by this clause to be a public holiday.

4—Part-day public holidays

This clause provides that the part of the day from 7pm until 12 o'clock midnight on 24 December and 31 December are public holidays.

5—Additional special public holidays may be proclaimed

This clause allows the Governor to appoint a day to be an additional public holiday, or part of a day to be an additional part-day public holiday, by proclamation which may apply throughout the State or within a specified district or locality.

6—Public offices to be closed on public holidays

This clause provides that all offices of the Public Service will be closed on public holidays unless an office is specially required by law to be kept open on the public holiday and nothing in the measure prevents the responsible Minister in charge of an administrative unit from requiring the services of officers of the unit during a public holiday in case of an emergency.

7—Bank holidays

This clause provides that all Sundays and public holidays are taken to be bank holidays. It allows the Governor to substitute another day to be a bank holiday instead of a day appointed by this clause to be a bank holiday, appoint an additional bank holiday or appoint a part of a day to be a bank half holiday by proclamation which may apply throughout the State or within a specified district or locality.

All authorised deposit-taking institutions within the meaning of the *Banking Act 1959* of the Commonwealth (ADIs) must be closed on bank holidays and during a bank half holiday but the Governor may, by proclamation, authorise the opening of ADIs within a specified area on a bank holiday or bank half holiday.

8—Payments and other acts on public holidays etc

This clause provides that a person is not compellable to make a payment or do an act on a public holiday, bank holiday or Saturday that they would not be compellable to make or do on a Sunday before the commencement of this Act. It also provides that an obligation to make a payment or do an act on a public holiday, bank holiday or Saturday will apply to the next day that is not a public holiday, bank holiday or Saturday, unless the law specially requires the person to make the payment or do the act on the public holiday, bank holiday or Saturday. A reference in this clause to a public holiday does not include a part-day public holiday. This clause applies in relation to a day on which a bank half holiday occurs as if the whole day had been proclaimed a bank holiday.

Schedule 1—Related amendments, repeals and transitional provisions

Part 1—Amendment of *Adelaide Cemeteries Authority Act 2001*

1—Amendment of section 20—Plans of management for Authority cemeteries

Part 2—Amendment of *Bail Act 1985*

2—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

Part 3—Amendment of *Bills of Sale Act 1886*

3—Amendment of section 2—Interpretation

Part 4—Amendment of *Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium Act 1978*

4—Amendment of section 27—Regulations

Part 5—Amendment of *Building Work Contractors Act 1995*

5—Amendment of section 36—Right to terminate certain domestic building work contracts

Part 6—Amendment of *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*

6—Amendment of section 16—Interpretation

Part 7—Amendment of *Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) Act 1995*

7—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

Part 8—Amendment of *Fair Trading Act 1987*

8—Amendment of section 43—Unlawful actions and representations

Part 9—Amendment of *Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005*

9—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

Part 10—Amendment of *Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing) Act 1994*

10—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

Part 11—Amendment of *Legislation Interpretation Act 2021*

11—Amendment of section 4—Standard definitions

Part 12—Amendment of *Magistrates Act 1983*

12—Amendment of section 15—Recreation leave

Part 13—Amendment of *Marine Parks Act 2007*

13—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

Part 14—Amendment of *Mental Health Act 2009*

14—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

Part 15—Amendment of *Mining Act 1971*

15—Amendment of section 9AA—Waiver of exemption (including cooling-off)

Part 16—Amendment of *Parliament (Joint Services) Act 1985*

16—Amendment of section 18—Recreation leave

Part 17—Amendment of *Public Trustee Act 1995*

17—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

Part 18—Amendment of *Residential Parks Act 2007*

18—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

Part 19—Amendment of *Retail and Commercial Leases Act 1995*

19—Amendment of section 20E—Implementation of preferential right

Part 20—Amendment of *Second-hand Vehicle Dealers Act 1995*

20—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

Part 21—Amendment of *Shop Trading Hours Act 1977*

21—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause amends section 4 of the principal Act to delete the definition of public holiday which currently excludes Sundays.

22—Amendment of section 5—Exemptions

This clause amends section 5 of the principal Act to provide that certain subsections of that section (that set out matters the Minister may and must have regard to when deciding whether to grant or declare an exemption, circumstances in which the Minister must not grant or declare exemptions, consultation requirements and judicial review entitlements in relation to a proposed exemption) do not apply to an exemption granted or declared in relation to a day appointed as an additional public holiday by proclamation under section 5(1)(a) of the measure.

23—Amendment of section 13—Hours during which shops may be open

This clause makes amendments to section 13 of the principal Act consequential to the enactment of the measure and removes references to specific public holidays where referring to public holidays generally is appropriate.

Part 22—Amendment of *Stock Mortgages and Wool Liens Act 1924*

24—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

Parts 1 to 20 (inclusive) and Part 22 of this Schedule make related amendments to the Acts specified consequential to the enactment of the measure.

Part 23—Repeal of *Holidays Act 1910*

25—Repeal of Act

This clause repeals the *Holidays Act 1910*.

Part 24—Transitional provision

26—References to public holidays

This clause is a transitional provision that provides that a provision of an Act enacted, or instrument made, before the commencement of the measure refers to a public holiday within the meaning of the *Holidays Act 1910* and will be taken to include a Sunday unless the contrary intention appears.

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (16:42): Thank you for the opportunity to make a contribution on the bill before us today, that being the Public Holidays Bill 2023. I do so not really knowing where to start with this. I think the easiest place to begin this contribution is to look at the process that has been undertaken to get to the point that we are at now. I do indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition in doing so.

What we have here is something that I would say is not standard practice in terms of the consultation process around this bill. In fact, the Deputy Premier herself would say that it is not standard practice, because she said so yesterday. In the committee stage of the debate on another bill, the Deputy Premier put on record that it was standard practice on IR-related bills that affect business that there would be a consultation draft provided to business groups and businesses affected. Those were the very words of the Deputy Premier yesterday. Today, less than 24 hours later, it has come to the fore that there was zero consultation with the business community on this particular proposal.

What we have is the sham of a consultation process around what was the actual commitment by the Labor Party coming into the last election around the Christmas Day holiday. In fact, the minister himself provided some answers to me after the briefing, where we were able to ascertain a number of useful bits of information from his staff in regard to this bill, given that those whom we had talked to had not been provided with any information in regard to what was happening.

What we got was a time line and a procedure that involved going out to consultation nearly a year ago asking the following questions: firstly, 'Do you think Christmas Day should always be a public holiday regardless of which day it falls on?' That seems like a fairly straightforward question that I can understand there would be straightforward support or non-support of if it was distributed to businesses and other organisations affected alike.

The second question involved in that consultation was: 'Please let us know any other changes you feel should be made to the Holidays Act 1910 and why.' That was the extent of the consultation for the proposal to make Easter Sunday a public holiday. That is the level of detail that small and family businesses across the state were provided. It was not the actual proposal that Easter Sunday should be a public holiday.

Suffice to say, the government have proudly said that there was not much pushback about Easter Sunday. I wonder why. It would actually take the government to ask the question as to whether Easter Sunday should be a public holiday, if they were going to elicit a response from the business community.

Do you know why that was done? It was for the same reason that this bill is before the house today, in the very last week of parliament for the year. The government was hoping that this would slowly disappear out of the news cycle so that many small and family businesses would not pick up that the government was out to make this change. That is exactly why there was zero consultation with the small and family business community in regard to this change. It is insincere. The process that has been described around this change by the government has been misleading. Even this morning we had the minister on ABC radio saying:

It's always important to consult. We went out with an exceptionally thorough consultation from the end of last year well into this year. We've had hundreds of responses including from many of the main industry groups...

They did get responses, 11 of them in fact. I am not sure that I can call that number many. There were 11 responses from the industry groups and other providers but none of them about the question of Easter Sunday, because it was not the question that was asked.

Had the government bothered to entertain the proposal to perhaps take, as the Deputy Premier has advised is standard practice in IR-related changes, a discussion draft out to those organisations that represent small and family business, perhaps they would have learnt what we have in the last few days, the time that has been made available to us to talk to the community around what these changes may mean, the impacts they may have on the South Australian community.

What we have done is do the government's job for them. We have gone out and talked to those organisations that represent small and family business in South Australia. Why? Because they are the businesses that are going to be affected more than anybody else by these changes. They are the mum-and-dad cafes. They are the regional South Australian pubs. They are the small coffee shops in Henley Square. These are the people who are going to be affected by this change, and these are the people the government has proactively chosen not to talk to. Why? Because it knew this would not be popular with them.

In going out and talking to those organisations that represent small and family business across South Australia, what have we learnt? From comments provided to us, there is significant concern around NDIS providers because, under the commonwealth arrangements, as has been advised to me by these groups through those representations that have been made, the NDIS only provides an allocation of up to 10 public holidays a year.

Are the government keen to tell us at any point what they plan to do to help those NDIS providers that provide services to those living with a disability in our communities? Are they going to outline to us where they think that changes should be made? Perhaps if they had gone and talked to providers of aged care, one that has made representations to us through a representative body, that again through federal funding models there is only an allocation for a certain number of public holidays a year. Have the government considered that? Have the government talked to any of those businesses that provide aged-care services across South Australia? The answer is no.

Perhaps, if they had taken the time to talk to representatives from Ai Group, they may have learned of manufacturers who are not able to turn equipment off over a 24-hour period who have to operate no matter what to ensure that they are able to continue to employ their employees to ensure that they are able to continue their operations. Did the government talk to those businesses? Did the government talk to those families who are trying to make ends meet? No.

Did the government talk to anybody who runs a small cafe who may be opening over the Easter period, opening on Easter Sunday perhaps particularly, to ensure that they are able to reclaim some of the smaller margins that they make over the other days of the Easter period? Did the government go out and talk to any of those mums and dads who are sitting over the kitchen table looking at their balance sheets, trying to work out how they continue to operate in an environment where electricity costs are skyrocketing and in an environment where this government has gone out at every opportunity to increase costs of doing business in our state? No, they did not talk to one small business.

Did the government talk to the AHA? Did the government talk to them about what it means for the publican out in the country, running their pub, keeping youth in the country town employed? No. Did the government talk to any of the cafe owners around South Australia, any of the coffee shops, anybody running a small business about what impact this could have on their businesses, on their livelihoods, on their ability to employ South Australians, on their ability to keep their businesses running? No.

All we got from the minister, the Attorney-General, was a couple of phone calls to those organisations the night before he introduced the bill to let them know this was happening. That is all that was afforded to small and family business in this state over a major decision that was going to impact them. That is the standard that this government has set.

The question then moves on to what is the SDA's role in this—the shoppies union. We are well aware of the existing links between many members of this house and the shoppies union. Through the government briefing, we got to the bottom of who actually proposed this change, of the 11 submissions the government had, and funnily enough to the question that had nothing to do with Easter Sunday. The answer from the SDA was that Easter Sunday needed to be made a public

holiday as a matter of priority, essentially. So, no other submission: this idea has come from one party, one organisation, and that is the shoppies union. The shoppies union in South Australia is effectively dictating government policy, if we are to interpret the set of circumstances rightly.

Did the Premier talk, as we have already discussed, to any of the small and family businesses about the potential to make this change? We know the answer is no. The question then becomes: did the Premier walk into the SDA conference announcing that he had secured an extra public holiday for them? That is a question we would love to hear the answer to, from the government.

What this reminds me of, more than anything, is this sort of influence: I remember that a number of years ago Hendrik Gout for Channel 7 did an exposé on the SDA's influence on the Labor Party in South Australia. The exposé was called 'the pyramid of power', or something similar to that, and it showed the links of how the SDA officials had made their way into the Labor Party in South Australia—the tentacles of influence. It highlighted the role, during the Rann years, of the shoppies union boss of the time, who of course is the now Premier. From memory, he may have looked slightly different in that exposé; I believe he may not have had the active athletic career that he perhaps had in his time of running for higher office.

It is very clear that in South Australia at the moment we do not have tentacles of influence coming from the SDA into the Labor Party. It is clear that the Labor Party is a wholly owned subsidiary of the SDA. The shoppies union is in charge here. That much is clear without a shadow of a doubt. The SDA asks and the Premier says, 'How high do I need to jump?'

That is all well and good, but what about the poor teenager working on the check-out at their local shopping centre? Unbeknownst to them, the union stipend that they are paying—and they were probably shown helpful, informative videos as an encouragement to join the union—how many of them know where that money is really going, and that that money is used for political influence, for donations to the Labor Party, to influence government policy and to have the head of the shoppies union sitting here as Premier of this state?

Let's not muck around anymore. The Premier has well and truly nailed his colours to the mast here. There are no more jazz hands and there is no more saying one thing and doing another that does not actually help business: the union boss has had his day today. That is what is happening here. He may not be in the chamber, but the Premier's fingerprints are all over this.

For my next question, let's look at the make-up of the front bench. We have the Premier, the head of the shoppies, and we work our way down until we get to a minister on the side of the corner: the Minister for Small and Family Business. What is the point of having a Minister for Small and Family Business if they are not even willing to stand up for the small and family business community? If they think it is acceptable to not even discuss this change with the small and family business community, they are a minister in name only.

The reality of this situation is very clear. There may need to be a reshuffle at some stage over the summer so that perhaps that ministry can disappear and the minister for the shoppies union can take their rightful place on the front bench here in the state parliament. That is the level of power and influence this union has within the state Labor Party.

The Premier had a choice here. Peter Malinauskas had a clear choice. He could have made Easter Sunday a public holiday. In fact, the opposition actually thinks that making Easter Sunday a public holiday is a good idea. This is the day across that break when people are at home with their families, there are Easter egg hunts happening around the place and there are people attending church. For those workers who do have to or want to work on public holidays, they should be paid a fair and reasonable amount for that.

But what we do not agree with is a net increase in public holidays in South Australia, increasing the total number that, as it stands, is 11½ public holidays across the year, despite the best efforts of the government in their press release to ensure that they did not mention the part-day public holidays are already here—we conveniently just referred to the full-day public holidays.

In the minister's statements on radio this morning, when discussing Easter he completely failed to put into context that we have more public holidays across the calendar year than New South Wales, than WA, than Tasmania and than most of the states on the mainland. We do

support Easter Sunday being a public holiday; we do not support a net increase. If the Premier had bothered to speak to the small and family business community, he would know that too. He would know that they do not support this.

What they do support, funnily enough, was raised in the same consultation process by a number of the organisations. We failed to release some of that detail, of course, despite not being asked the question directly, particularly about Easter Sunday, but being open and alive to the fact that the government could be interested in increasing the numbers, there were submissions that included words to the effect of, 'We don't support any net increase in the number of public holidays in South Australia.'

So not only did we not specifically ask the question around Easter Sunday, not only did we present a one-sided picture of what the current situation is in terms of public holidays, of what the response was to this quasi-consultation that clearly had no interest in eliciting a response that had anything to do with the proposal that is before today, but the minister continued to make the assertion that the Liberals are trying to remove a public holiday when, in fact, we are putting forward a sensible and measured suggestion that, should the government wish to make Easter Sunday a public holiday, they should simply swap the Saturday public holiday that already exists to the Sunday.

We think that suggestion is sensible, and we are not the only ones. In fact, we have gone out and done the uncanny thing of talking to those who represent and participate in the small and family business community. Guess what? They think it is a good idea too. Business SA supports this change, the Australian Industry Group supports the proposal from the opposition, the Australian Hotels Association (SA Branch) supports the proposal, the Wine Industry Association supports the proposal, and the Motor Trade Association supports the proposal.

I would hazard a guess that there would be many others who would support the proposal should we have been given enough time to go out and properly do our job. We have done it to the best of our ability but, my goodness me, I would have an epic bet that there would be many more South Australian small and family businesses who would support the proposal made by the opposition on this bill.

Let's get back to the basics of what is being proposed here because I think it is important to again remember that we are having a net increase of Easter Sunday every year, again with this proposal not being put to anybody in the small or family business community. What does it actually mean broader than the impacts I have talked specifically about on individual potential businesses that are affected, whether that be cafes, NDIS providers, aged-care homes, coffee shops, pubs?

What does that mean is going to be inflicted on some of those businesses? Do they make the decision that it is all too hard across this period now, that they shut up shop across the Easter period in the middle of a cost-of-living crisis, in the middle of a crisis in terms of the cost of doing business in South Australia, with electricity prices continuing to go up? Nobody wins—nobody wins if these businesses are closed. The businesses are not running, the economy is not benefiting, those families who own these businesses are not benefiting and, importantly, workers do not have the opportunity to work, should they wish.

Again, I think we also need to highlight the change that was made in the shop trading hours laws that passed through this place, because nobody in that industry can be forced to work on public holidays. That was a change that passed this house with the support of both sides of the chamber. This fallacy that has continued to be put out there, that people can be forced to work on these days, is simply not true.

I could go further and talk about some of the arguments that were posed in terms of bringing South Australia into line with other jurisdictions. I wish it could be said that the Attorney-General had a similar view of bringing the state into line with other jurisdictions when it comes to shop trading hours, but apparently it is only on selective issues that the Attorney sees it as being a sensible idea to bring South Australia into line with other jurisdictions.

But let's not miss the fundamental point here: the Premier, Peter Malinauskas, had a choice. He could have made Easter Sunday a public holiday without inflicting pain on the small and family business community in South Australia, but he chose not to. He could have made Easter Sunday a

public holiday without punishing small and family business, but he chose instead to punish them. He chose to push up costs that threaten the viability of those businesses and threaten their ability to open on public holidays.

He chose to add an additional public holiday to the calendar, punishing small and family businesses at a time when we have a cost-of-living crisis, when the cost of doing business is skyrocketing, when his Labor government has already jacked up the return to work levy, government fees and charges, and electricity prices. We are still waiting to see the promised reduction in electricity prices from the Labor Party generally.

This is a move that is simply doing the bidding of the shoppies union, who have put the Premier in the seat he sits in today. That is the sphere of influence that we are talking about. That is the decision that this Premier has made, and it has been done to their detriment, without consultation, with no notice, with what can only be described as a desire to punish small and family businesses right across the state of South Australia.

Those on the opposite side of this chamber who purport to stand up for and to care for small and family businesses in South Australia, who say that they support small and family businesses in South Australia, who stand up when motions come before this house to acknowledge the difficulty, the sweat and the sacrifices that small and family businesses make each and every year to put food on the table, to make ends meet and to put their capital on the line, should hang their heads in shame if this bill passes this parliament.

The Liberal Party has been forced to stand up for them and call out this sham. Again, we support Easter Sunday as a public holiday but doing it in a way that does not punish small and family businesses right across the state of South Australia.

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (17:09): I rise to speak in support of the Public Holidays Bill. As someone who has worked in retail, this is a bill that I am very happy to support. It is also another policy that the then Labor opposition took the election and it becomes another promise that we are delivering on. When I look back on my seven years working at Stirling Foodland, which then became a Woolworths, I have a lot of very fond memories. Starting at the age of 14, back in 1994, this was my very first job, which took me through high school up until I completed my second degree, in 2001.

It was not until I finished and took what some would suggest to be a standard nine-to-five job that I worked out how much I missed this time. The camaraderie we had in the supermarket was second to none. Sadly, this fantastic shop attracted a lot of attention recently in the news as, unfortunately, it burnt to the ground just a few weeks ago. What took me by surprise was a discussion I had recently with Noah Beckman, the local organiser for the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees' Association (SDA). Noah was explaining to me how there was something unique about this shop when reflecting on the special bond the employees had for one another.

I am not sure if the origins of this started back in the old Foodland days and carried through subsequent generations of workers, but I can attest to the closeness we felt for each other that thrived back in the day. When I heard Noah's words, they reminded me about how, over 20 years ago, we all seemed to attend each other's 21st birthdays, made the weekly quiz in the *Saturday Advertiser* a lunchtime ritual and rallied around other workmates if times ever got challenging. We had something special, and it seems to me that over 20 years later nothing has changed.

I understand Noah's words and how hard it must be for the Stirling crew to be separated from other stores during the rebuild, and I wanted them to know, as a former employee, my thoughts are with them. Being pulled away from your friends, whom you call colleagues, is going to be tough, and I hope that the rebuild can happen quickly so we do not lose a drop of synergy that bounced around the staff and made it a cheery place since the Stone Age.

I hope that I have painted a positive picture of my time in retail. While I look back at it with fondness, I must remind myself that it is always easy to look back with rosy spectacles and forget some of the things that we were indifferent to. It has been over 20 years, and I accept that a lot of change has hit the sector since I moved on, but I cannot forget the relentlessness of the gruelling shifts. In the Foodland days, we stacked shelves at night until the job was done. As a high school student in the nineties, sometimes this would end at 11; other times, we would be pushing that until

three in the morning. Obviously, the later we went the harder it was to function at school the following day.

While the change to Woolworths was more regimental, the days could still be long, especially if you were working a double shift, quite often to cover a mate who may not have had time off if their shift could not be covered. Needless to say, a lot of goodwill came from the staff to ensure their friends could take a well-deserved break. Working on a check-out and standing on your feet for a long period, with just a rubber mat to soften the pain, was particularly gruelling. This intensified if the day was busy, usually around a public holiday, when it seemed you could not walk away just to get some movement in your legs, even if it was just for a split second.

Then, there were the special public holidays around Christmas. Although it did not affect me at the time, I remember having a private celebration when the previous Labor government introduced the half day holidays for those working late on Christmas or New Year's Eve. For those unfamiliar, coming from a Polish background the emphasis placed on Christmas Eve seems higher than my friends were used to. They would all flock to the pub for a drink, whereas I would stay home because the celebration meant the world to me and to my family.

It was always heartbreaking to finish up at the supermarket late on Christmas Eve, to come home exhausted and see the rest of my family having already started before me on all the food and celebrations. You could not blame them for tucking in and enjoying themselves, but I always felt I had been robbed of something big when the harsh routine of the system stated that it was just business as usual. So, it was great that a hard-fought win ensured there was some recompense for the sacrifice that retail workers, often young, would receive for missing out on something special. The advent of Saturday trading opened up a whole new can of worms with the potential to feel an even greater degree of loss for those working hard in retail.

I think we all know the inflexibility of what happens when Christmas Day falls on a Sunday. This was seen at its heartless best when the previous Marshall Liberal government refused to close this loophole when it last happened in 2021. For those unaware, and maybe some opposite who simply did not care, this led to workers not receiving public holiday penalty rates when rostered to work away from their friends and family on Christmas Day. For a party that often likes to bestow us with how they are the superior beings of the universe when preaching family values, this was a low.

This bill repeals the Holidays Act 1910 and replaces it with some straightforward rules to regulate public holidays. Importantly, it ensures that Christmas Day is treated as a public holiday regardless of the day that it falls on. It also declares Easter Sunday to be a public holiday, and brings us into line with every other mainland state.

As I mentioned earlier, there is a massive sense of loss when a worker is required to work on days that are special, and maybe even verge on sacred. It is therefore right that as compensation for the loss of this special time a worker receives the appropriate compensation of public holiday penalty rates when working on the day.

I focused on retail workers as it is a story I am familiar with, but there are those in sectors such as the emergency services, health care and hospitality I am sure will also welcome this change, and with this in mind I am sure that I am not alone in feeling that these people deserve their penalty rates.

I feel that many within the business community will also welcome these changes. Crucially, we will be able to align our public holidays with the bulk of the states, therefore the majority of Australians. This will be achieved by aligning South Australia's rules for when additional and substitute public holidays occur with Eastern States.

Most other states no longer discriminate based on whether a public holiday falls on a Saturday or a Sunday, instead during the Christmas period an additional Monday holiday occurs whenever a public holiday falls on a weekend. The positive outcome of this is that most public holidays in South Australia and the Eastern States will now fall on the same days. For those seeking certainty and simplicity, this change reduces disruption to business and, as a bonus, should promote tourism between states.

Taking into consideration the fluctuations that we have observed with our recent standard calendars, I do not feel that the changes that are before us are excessive or onerous on business. It should not be forgotten that most shops are not allowed to trade on Easter Sunday, so this change is not expected to have a significant effect on business trade.

When also considering the additional and substitute public holidays, it means that, on average, the cost to business will be an additional 1.1 public holidays each year over the next decade. It should be noted that many sectors would not operate on Easter Sunday and its addition as a public holiday will be the only change felt next year.

I have noticed that a school of thought is developing around the quality of hours worked versus overall quality. Businesses are beginning to be open to the thought of a four-day working week, and I have become aware of a number, particularly those in retail, moving to five weeks' annual leave. While the latter is a topic for another day, it is great that there is a realisation developing that employers will get more out of their workers if they have more time to rest up to have a life outside of their job.

What we achieve in this bill should align to this school of thought. While I doubt there will be much research conducted into the benefits of this change, I am sure that employers will see a positive change in their staff because of this welcomed reform. If I harken back to retail, given the exhausting effort put into the pre-Christmas period and the inevitability of what follows on Boxing Day, a bit of extra time off to recoup should also make great economic sense. You do not need to be a rocket scientist to realise that an exhausted worker is an unproductive one.

In finishing up, there are several people out there who need to be acknowledged: firstly, Josh Peak and the staff from the SDA who led the chorus for this welcome change. It is a terrible shame that the then Liberal government ignored the union's calls, and I am very sorry that workers missed out back in 2021.

I would also like to thank the Attorney-General and his team for their efforts and drive to convert an election commitment into something that is close to becoming a reality. While there is a Labor majority in the lower house, this is not the case in the Legislative Council. I would like to pass on my thanks to the members upstairs who supported the passage of this legislation.

Recognising that a great deal of work also goes on at officer level with the various departments and parliamentary counsel, I pass on my thanks to them for playing their role in delivering this win for workers. This is a positive step that will ensure that blatant mistakes of the past are not repeated and, with this in mind, I am happy to commend this bill to the house.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (17:19): I rise to oppose the bill. I have listened carefully to the debate so far and, in particular, the contribution of the member for Colton and just now the member for Playford, who has taken the opportunity to recount some happy days working as an employee of what until recent weeks was the Woolworths store at Stirling, which was destroyed by fire just some few weeks ago.

Actions were necessary to bring that blaze under control, and it was responded to in a very significant way by the local volunteer firefighters, including members of the Stirling CFS brigade, the Aldgate CFS brigade, Bridgewater and Upper Sturt, of which the member for Waite is a member, and the member for Waite and her son at different times over those ensuing hours I know were involved. It was an event that counted as, in the Stirling brigade's words, the most significant fire event the brigade has attended in its history, and that may be compared to those significant disasters, including the Ash Wednesday fires of decades ago—so an extraordinary event, indeed.

It is well to reflect on the camaraderie of those employees. The daughter of my office manager was one of those employees in fact present in the building as the fire commenced and one of those employees evacuating as the fire got going. In reflecting on those early hours, I found myself standing among the firefighters and those other members of the community who, in normal times, would be just coming and going in the supermarket, in the mall and in those shops that were destroyed along the way.

Among them was the owner of that property and, alongside him, those who were then and now every day needing to contemplate how they care for their tenants, how they care for their tenants'

employees, how they contemplate what is to be done step by step in terms of the necessary attention to demolition on the one hand and then the subsequent reinvestment in what might be replaced there at Stirling. There can be no doubt: it is an excellent example of the ecosystem of the community centre that such a place provides for employees, for customers, for tenants and for the business owners of those retail shops; and it is a sorely missed place of community gathering while it now sits behind high fences, monitored by security guards, blackened and inactive. It is well to reflect on that as an example of the comings and goings of people, and of the necessary inputs of the energy and resources of people to make sure that such places function and thrive.

It is not lost on anyone in my community that that shopping centre—that property, containing as it does many other tenancies besides the Woolworths supermarket—will require the cooperative energy of all those various stakeholders, including the community's embrace of what ought to follow. I wish all the strength to each of those tenants running the small businesses that they do. I wish all the strength to the owner of the property who is going to now consider the very large amount of reinvestment that is required—indeed, Woolworths and the negotiations and so on that are now going to necessarily follow. It is a clear indication of the real world in which businesses, employees and owners of property all need to function in terms of their interaction with community.

In the context of this debate—which, as the member for Colton has rightly identified, centres essentially on what would be the addition of another designated public holiday to the annual calendar in this state—we focus very much on questions of principle rather than be quick, as we have seen in this very brief public debate, to descend to the parading of, as it were, Labor credentials on the one hand and a readiness to engage in a kind of character assassination based on two opposing sides of an argument.

Let us be clear: the expressions that we have seen in the media over the course of the last day—including from the Attorney-General on radio this morning and as chimed in on by the current secretary of the Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees' Association, known as the SDA or affectionately, as I understand it, the shoppies—are a kind of ridiculing of the view that has been expressed on this side of the house and articulated by the member for Colton of the notion that, without more, it bears scrutiny to just come along and add an additional public holiday to the annual calendar in South Australia.

Of course it bears scrutiny. Of course, for all those different contributors to what made the Stirling shops such a thriving environment that the community enjoyed, one steps back and looks at that whole environment and says, 'Well, of course they all have an interest in the number of designated public holiday days in the year. We ought to be able to have a mature debate about that.' But instead we have heard in the media the member for Colton essentially being singled out for ridicule by at least those two individuals.

The Attorney-General of another place somehow sought to characterise all of this as some sort of debate centred on how one values Easter, or one's credentials in terms of recognising the significance of Easter—and I might say it was much the same from Josh Peak as well—where what has been proposed is really a sensible approach to the application of public holidays throughout the course of the year in South Australia. So let's at least talk in a mature way about where South Australia sits vis-a-vis the rest of the nation in terms of the number of public holidays we have in any given year.

We have all that before us. We can have that sensible debate. South Australia already—we have the evidence—is sitting there smack bang in the middle of where the nation sits. The different states and territories to varying degrees have their own unique public holidays and so, if one looks at the list in each of the states and territories, one will see a somewhat different list. We see a range of between 10 and 13 public holidays in the year depending on which state we are talking about.

Victoria, for example, is the only state or territory that makes Melbourne Cup Day a public holiday. South Australia, for what might be similarly obvious reasons, is the only state that recognises and makes Adelaide Cup a public holiday. There are reasons by dint of local history, of custom, of religious observance and so on that have led to those dates being recognised in different parts of the country.

The total from one state to the other and each territory is somewhat different but by small degree. Let's have the debate by all means in a mature way about how that has come to be, what that leads to in terms of the overall dynamic in the state and whether or not there is merit in reviewing it. Of course, there are the circumstances of how a public holiday is substituted when it falls on a particular day of the week and so on.

I am thoughtful in this regard, in terms of my appreciation of the proper role of unions in a positive way, of the legacy of Sir John Carrick, who was a towering figure of national politics in the 20th century. It was well known, with his keen interest in particular in education, that he would be quick to recognise the constructive role that unions can play.

But when we see the role of the union applied in such a transactional and, if I might say, in light of the evidence in the media this morning, belligerent way towards the delivery of an outcome, including by the use of highly superficial rhetoric, one is moved then to consider: where does this come from? The member for Colton has spelt it out very well.

A good example of this is spelt out in a piece in InDaily as recently as 24 August this year, where we see the SDA pedigree of the present government just spelt out. The centre of power in terms of the SDA and its deep connection and control over this government is there spelt out. It is just one illustration, but we see there a piece that is recognising the occasion of the commencement of Sonia Romeo in a senior role in the Premier's office.

The piece makes the observation that the Premier himself was a former secretary of that association. Now a former secretary has come to join his office and we have heard the advocacy of Secretary Peak. It is an association that is clearly at the core of power in this government. Given that is the case, it ought to be that there is all the more effort, all the more application and diligence applied by the leadership of that association towards an argument that is based on principle.

I heard the member for Playford refer to an election commitment. If that is the case, let's spell out the principal reason for that being applied because the evidence is, rather, that this is just a drawing on the levers of power and a transaction that is applied through the influence of the SDA. That is on display in terms of the short time that has been afforded to the opposition. I understand only as recently as 23 November, a briefing of substance was provided.

On that occasion, I understand it became clear that in the circumstances of this bill and its subject matter, a subject matter obviously of keen interest to industry, including to all the various component parts that make up, until recent weeks ago, that thriving ecosystem at the Stirling shops—of keen interest to them—but we understand sufficiently transactional was the application of power by the SDA in this case that they were not consulted or properly in terms of this additional public holiday being added to the South Australian calendar. Indeed, we were advised that the SDA, the association I have just been referring to, was the only group to submit a response in terms of any response from industry that was actually speaking up for the addition of this public holiday to the South Australian calendar.

It is in those circumstances, and coming from a point of view admittedly that the opposition is not convinced of the merits of adding an additional public holiday to the calendar, that the opposition says that if we want to be fair dinkum about recognising Easter Sunday, perhaps the most significant day in many South Australian's lives admittedly each year—and it has been said it is an important day of celebration and of gathering—if that is to be a proposal, do not use that to add an additional public holiday to the calendar under cover, as it were, of that Easter Sunday proposition and then go and demonise the likes of the shadow treasurer for articulating what might be done to keep the status quo to recognise Easter Sunday and to go about it in that way according to principle.

I understand that approach and that amendment is supported by the relevant key bodies—the AHA, Business SA, the MTA and the Ai Group. as the member for Colton has articulated. I urge the house that if we are to have a debate, an economic debate, about the merits of public holidays and their number in this state, let's do it according to principle and not by way of the application of belligerence or character assassination.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (17:39): I am glad to have the opportunity to speak on this important bill because, while I heed the warning of the member for Heysen that we

should not enter into this debate with belligerence—and the house would be aware that I am the last to engage in that sort of behaviour—what I would like to see is that we enter into this debate from a basis of fact and a basis of consistency.

The only real opposition to this notion that we hear articulated from those on the other side is that they are dissatisfied with the level of consultation that occurred. Their proposition is to try to take advantage of the opportunity of this bill to massively decrease wages to South Australian workers for the benefit of South Australian businesses. Most disingenuously, this is done, as the member for Colton says, in the interests of small business. Well, the member for Colton picks and chooses whether he sees fit to stand up for small business. It depends on which day of the week it is, it seems or, in particular, which bill is before the house.

If anyone has a record of failing to consistently stand up for small business, it is the member for Colton and those members opposite. Just remember, if you will, the position that the member for Colton, the member for Heysen and those others who are now on the opposition benches took in the very late stages of the parliamentary year in 2021, when they refused to consider, and then refused to support, a bill that the then Labor opposition sought to ensure that workers who were working on Christmas Day—Christmas Day—got paid penalty rates.

They refused workers the opportunity to be paid penalty rates for working on Christmas Day. That is the view of those opposite. It is not about fairness and it is not about standing up for small business; it is about adherence to core Liberal ideology.

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: If you are going to interject, do it from your place.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order!

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Do not wander in here late, to your own debate—

Mr Cowdrey: This is my place, Stephen.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —and call out—

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: If you are going to interject, do it properly.

Mr Cowdrey: I was in my place.

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: No, you weren't; you were walking in the door. You can't even be in here for your own bill.

Mr Cowdrey: Excuse me? It's your bill. You're the one inflicting pain on—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: You are the one handling it on behalf of the opposition, and you are not even here. You are not even here.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order!

Mr Cowdrey: You are the one inflicting pain on the South Australian businesses. You can do it whichever way you want.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Why on earth are you in this place?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order! The minister will be heard in silence, and the minister will keep his remarks to the bill.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. The insertion of facts and consistency would be of great benefit to the member for Colton. Let's look at the position that the member for Colton and his colleagues took on shop trading hours. Let's try to strike an arrangement, let's try to—

Mr Cowdrey: You just told us we should be in line with other jurisdictions.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order! The member for Colton is warned. This is your bill.

Mr Cowdrey: It's not my bill; it's—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Are you not the lead speaker for the opposition?

Mr Cowdrey: It's not my bill.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): You indicated to this house that you are in charge of this bill. Were you not correct?

Mr COWDREY: I am the lead speaker for the opposition. It is the government's bill.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Right. Sit quietly and listen to the minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you very much, Mr Acting Speaker, for your protection. Those opposite took a shop trading hours deregulation position: more Coles and Woolworths, fewer independent retailers. Which retailers employ more South Australians per dollar spent on their shelves? It is South Australian independent small retailers, not Coles and Woolies. What do they seek to do? They seek to give a free kick to Coles.

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Member for Colton, you are warned for the second time.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: They seek to give a free kick to the big end of town, as always. It is Liberal Party writ large: a free kick to the big end of town.

Do you know what this proposition does? This proposition recognises the longstanding and widely held practice of Easter Sunday being an actual legislated public holiday, if not a public holiday in practice, because the truth is the vast majority of small businesses are closed on Easter Sunday as it stands. The vast majority of businesses that choose to trade on weekends are open on Easter Saturday and are paying penalty rates.

What they would like to see is those penalty rates removed from workers who are working on Easter Saturday, and they say, 'Don't worry, they will be getting them on Easter Sunday.' They know, as it stands, the vast majority of businesses do not trade on Easter Sunday. You have been called out for what the Liberal Party inherently believes in and that is minimising workers' wages for the benefit of the big end of town—once again, caught out.

You got called out on land tax, you got called out on shop trading hours and you are being called out now on this. While the vast majority of workers, particularly in retail, are working on Easter Saturday and being paid penalty rates, the member for Colton wants those penalty rates removed from those workers, and he pretends that they will be working on Easter Sunday, and the vast majority of them will not be because the vast majority of outlets are not open on Easter Sunday.

That is what the member for Colton's proposition is all about and he dresses it up with some 'failure to consult', that we should have been out there talking to all those people who are open on Easter Sunday, who are open on Easter Saturday. But that, of course, is just a smoke screen for what the real intention of the member for Colton's proposition is. It is his proposition here to remove the penalty rates from the many, many thousands of workers who are working on Easter Saturday now and pretend that they will be reimbursed if they work on Easter Sunday when, of course, the vast majority of them will not be working on Easter Sunday.

Then we have the contribution, 'But there are all these small independent retailers that are open on Easter Saturday, that are open on Easter Sunday,' whether that is in Rundle Mall, for

example, or whether that is in regional areas, where there have been longstanding exceptions for those retailers to be open over the Easter long weekend. Well, where was the support for them when it came to the Shop Trading Hours Bill? Where was the support for them, because what they wanted to see, of course, for example in my electorate, was for Westfield to be open. They wanted Coles and Woolies and David Jones to be open, to the detriment of those small retailers, because that is their proposition: always for the big end of town.

As for this, 'It's all an SDA conspiracy,' well, I can speak with some authority on this because I am not a member of the SDA, but I am proudly a member of the union movement. I am actually a member of the Finance Sector Union. Remember that union, the union representing bank workers? Where do they line up for bank workers? Where are the banks on this? Of course, they trade throughout Easter don't they? They are so generous to their account holders to make themselves unflinchingly available. No, of course, they are closed. They open at 9 o'clock on a normal day—no. Open until five—no. A big friend of the Liberal Party is the banking sector because remember how much the Liberal Party federally tried to protect the banking sector for some overdue scrutiny.

That is what I bring to this debate: proud unionism and a member of a union whose workers have been decimated by the behaviour of overextended market power by a small group of dominant players. That is essentially the proposition that those opposite seek to bring to debates in this place, for example when it comes to shop trading hours. It is minimising the benefits for workers and focusing the benefits on the big end of town. That is what they are focused on. So, please, spare me the crocodile tears about small business, because you, member for Colton, have consistently failed to stand up for them in this place when it has counted.

Your only complaint about this is that we did not consult properly. Well, you have been called out for your proposition. You have been called out to remove the extraordinary amount of penalty rates that would be paid to those workers working on Easter Saturday. You have been called out. We know exactly what you stand for in this place. You are tucked comfortably into the pockets of big business when it comes to these sorts of debates, and to say that you stand up—

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order, the member for Flinders! The Treasurer has the call.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: My job in this place is to represent the interests of working families and working people. That is exactly what I do and my record bears it out. You must be confused about what you think the Australian Labor Party stands for. It stands for the interests of those people whose only economic asset is to sell their labour into the market. We stand up for them, and when we see a group of people that comes along—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —and wants to rip away their penalty rates on Easter Saturday, we call it out, because that is exactly what you want to do. All those thousands of retail workers, all those thousands of hospital workers and all those other low-paid workers who work in all your constituencies are the ones at risk from your proposition.

Mr Telfer: Base politics.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: No, it is not base politics. It is basic principles about what we stand for. Do you stand up for working people? Do you stand up for people who are forced to work on public holidays? Do you stand up for people who deserve penalty rates, or do you not? The proposition here is you do not—you do not stand up for them. You stand up for the interests of big business and you want to see those interests grow in this state to the detriment of small business and to the detriment of workers.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That is the difference between people like us on this side who are proud of our record—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —and people who flip-flop.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order! The Treasurer has the call.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That is the difference between people on our side who are very clear and very consistent with what we stand up for and people like all of you on that side who pick and choose what you might say on a bill which may or may not impact small businesses or large businesses to different impacts. As long as it aligns with Liberal Party ideology to do your absolute best for the big end of town, that is where you will be.

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order, the member for Flinders! You come into the chamber and immediately start heckling the Treasurer.

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): You will keep order, please.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I think the proposition is absolutely simple and, of course, eminently supportable. Why would you not support a public holiday on Easter Sunday? Why would you not support Christmas Day being a public holiday? Why would you insist on those two very basic propositions being purchased at the expense of a huge amount of penalty rates that gets paid to workers who often need it the most on Easter Saturday?

The member for Colton smiles incredulously at this argument, almost as if the penny has only finally dropped—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order, Treasurer! There is a point of order from the member for Colton.

Mr COWDREY: Point of order: I take offence to the comment by the Treasurer. I ask that he apologise.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): The member for Colton has asked that you withdraw and apologise for a reference to him smirking, I believe, Treasurer.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I said smiling; I did not say smirking.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Smiling; I am sorry.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Nonetheless, Mr Acting Speaker, I more so than most today am aware of the need to stay within standing orders and the conventions of this place. I wholeheartedly withdraw and apologise to the member for Colton.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Thank you.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It is my last wish that he be offended at all in the course of this debate. I know that—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): You have withdrawn and apologised. Please continue with your remarks on the bill.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you. I know that it is important that we maintain our focus here on exactly what the behaviour of the member for Colton and those opposite would wreak on South Australian workers, and that is a massive reduction in take-home wages, particularly over the week or fortnight involving for them the Easter long weekend.

Let it stand on the record what the member for Colton is seeking to do. He pretends that there is an equivalence of Easter Sunday and Easter Saturday, which, of course, there is not—there is not. While most people, for the purposes of this debate—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: While most people are already working on Easter Saturday and being paid penalty rates, the member for Colton wants those penalty rates gone, and he pretends that they will be returned to them in the following 24 hours on Easter Sunday when the vast majority of outlets will be closed. How bogus, how bogus and transparent, and transparently motivated the member for Colton's proposition is.

I support the bill. We stand very proud to protect the interests of working South Australians, including those people who are employees and, of course, our record of standing up for those people who employ. We have protected small businesses, or tried to, against the worst ravages of the member for Colton and his land tax reforms, not that we could fully debate them because he supported a gillotine motion so that we could not debate it.

We tried to protect small businesses against the worst ravages of the land tax changes and also their proposition for deregulation of shop trading hours. The member for Colton loves walking both sides of the street. He picks and chooses when he might stand up for small business or not. We know what we stand for, and that is looking after the interests of South Australians.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (17:56): I am pleased that the Treasurer raised transparency because I am going to raise some transparency in talking about some history. In 2004, Christmas was on a Saturday, and Labor was in government, and it was not a public holiday. In 2010, Christmas was on a Saturday, and it was not a public holiday, and Labor was in government. They had 11 years to prepare for the Saturday Christmas Day in 2021. It works in a pattern: it is a six-five, six-11 pattern, so every six years-five years, six years-11 years Christmas Day falls on a Saturday. For the eight years—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Order! The member for Unley has the call.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —that the Treasurer was either a staff member or a member of the previous Labor government, nothing—nothing to fix that. There he goes, leaving the chamber.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): It is disorderly to remark on people leaving or entering the chamber. Please continue your remarks.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Thank you for reminding me, sir. You can see, Mr Acting Speaker, that there is a need for clarity on this. When did they raise it? From opposition, not at the beginning of 2021, when no hospitality businesses had started taking bookings for their Christmas dinners based on the costing mechanism that they had relied on, based on Saturdays not being a public holiday on a Christmas Day for the 16 years of the previous Labor government and, as a matter of fact, for the entire time that we have had Labor governments and other governments in South Australia. Never before was it raised. It was raised in the final weeks of debate in this chamber in the lead-up to the election after many hotels had already taken bookings for Christmas. That was the argument that we put to not support that at that time as a government.

The fact was that it was purely for political purposes, and we know what those political purposes were. They were so it could help political Labor formulate a populist election policy in the lead-up to the election. It was happening not at the beginning of the year, not at the beginning of 2021, when people would forget in the lead-up to the election. It may very well have fixed the problem, but they would not have had an issue to take to the people of South Australia.

We saw pure politics at that time waiver for 16 years the ability to fix this issue that they are claiming they are fixing today. They wanted the election promise. They wanted to go out there and say to people, 'Who wants an extra public holiday?' Of course, everyone would say yes. Then, after asking the same group of people, 'Who wants to pay for it?' nobody would put their hand up, but that

was not their target audience. Their target audience was people who were led to believe that this was some newly established, unjust matter that had just occurred that they were going to fix if they were elected to office.

Sitting suspended from 18:00 to 19:30.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I will continue my remarks on the Christmas Public Holidays Bill that we are debating. There were certainly some very fiery remarks from the Treasurer prior to my commencing my contribution before dinner about how profitable the banks are. I am not quite sure how that was relevant, but the last time I did some research on where bank profits go it is interesting that, if you look at industry super funds, the hold on average—about 15 per cent of their stocks—are bank shares. So profit-making banks deliver better superannuation outcomes for many of the workers who are members of those industry super funds.

It always amazes me when I hear people who represent the left of politics complain about profits that companies, who their own super funds invest in, deliver that extra retirement income, that extra security in retirement. Then, of course, there were comments made about the Liberal Party being the party of big business. We are the party of business and, of course, small business is very much a part of our party, but who is the party who does deals with big business? The party who does deals with big business is the Labor Party, the political arm of the trade union movement.

You only need to look at the deals that are done with the shoppies union and Coles, for example. Coles is a big business, and I know industry super funds have shares in Coles. Certainly, the profits that the shoppies union makes from their membership fees do not go into supporting members' super funds; they go into the ALP election campaigns.

We have Sunday penalty rates in the Fair Work Act. If you are employed under the award, you pay a 150 per cent loading for Sunday ordinary award rates but, if you are employed by Coles under an enterprise bargaining agreement that has been signed off by the shoppies union—and do not forget that was a major role of the Premier as the person who would sign off on many of these shoppies union enterprise bargaining agreements—the loading is 95 per cent. The award, 150 per cent, but get the union involved, negotiating for you, and all of a sudden it is down to 95 per cent. So who is it that wants lower wages? It is not the Liberal Party that wants lower wages; it is the Labor Party that wants lower wages.

Why does the Labor Party want lower wages? Because what the modern labour movement is offering to everyday workers is not very appealing, so they have to find somebody else—partners—to sign up their members, and so, of course, they do a deal with Coles and Woolworths and others, whether it is KFC, McDonald's or Hungry Jack's. They all have an extraordinarily large number of young people who are members.

How do they become members? How do they know about the union? Because a deal has been done on the induction nights when the unions get access to 15 year olds and 16 year olds on their first night at work when they are paid that three hours on induction. What happens? They get half an hour when they must sit in front of a union delegate who warns them about the perils of big employers and how they are just a single twig, but if you hold a whole lot of trees together they become a strong branch and they are much harder to break, so that is why you should join a union. I know that experience from my own son. Many, many years ago when he got his first part-time job, he felt he had no choice but to join a union.

Here we have a union that sends many people into this chamber, and the federal chamber and state chambers around Australia, that intimidates 15 year olds into signing an agreement to have union fees deducted from their salaries. Union fees are not quite as important and so there is a threshold you need to earn before you start paying union fees, but you are still a member.

The important thing about being a member of the shoppies union is you actually give those shoppies union delegates—those people who are at the top of that pyramid of power of the shoppies union—more power on the floor of the Labor Party convention. The more members you have, the more votes you direct because there is no individual voting for those members. They are very kind, the shoppies union, as they vote on other people's behalf. The more members you have, the more

influence you have in the Labor Party, the more of your mates you get preselected to be members of parliament.

Not only do we see that the shoppies union enterprise bargaining agreement deals pay less than the award, particularly on penalty rates on Sundays but we also saw at least two occasions when the Fair Work Commission has ruled shoppies union enterprise bargaining agreements as unlawful because they reduced the pay to their members. On 30 April 2016, *The Age* reported on an appeal to the Fair Work Commission that had significant implications for supermarkets and their employees:

It's the greatest mismatch since Darryl Kerrigan in *The Castle* took on city hall to keep the family home...and won.

The story goes on to say:

This time, a Brisbane trolley collector and a data-crunching unionist have taken on one of Australia's most powerful employers and influential unions in a landmark legal case. Already, the challenge to the Coles workplace deal has won significant concessions, including higher penalty rates for tens of thousands of casual workers and higher junior pay rates.

What was that union? The shoppies union, the SDA, the very union whose president or secretary (I am not quite sure of the term they use to describe their highest member of office, other than 'comrade') was angry at these so-called employers who were trying to reduce the wages of hardworking South Australians. However, here not only do we have evidence in the Fair Work Act of a difference between an award salary and that of a so-called negotiated rate by the enterprise bargaining agreement that was pulled together by the shoppies union but we also see that there have been challenges to those agreements.

They have been found to have substance and the Fair Work Commission has ruled that they were, in fact, illegal. I just wonder how many of those illegal deals Peter Malinauskas was involved in when he was the head of the shoppies union here in South Australia. Do not forget, these are deals that are national, so they affect every shop worker in those areas.

I just get a little bit sick of the violin playing by those opposite who claim ground in who they support and the reasons why, when we know that that is not the case. The outcome is not higher wages for workers, it is actually lower wages for workers, particularly when it comes to penalty rates. It is not just Sundays when the penalty rates are much lower, on Saturdays they are much lower as well. On Saturday, the penalty rate all day is 125 per cent in the award. On a Saturday, for the shoppies union it is a 25 per cent penalty—a massive difference in those hourly rates.

Of course, the workers who tend to work on those Saturdays and Sundays tend to be the younger casual staff. It is purely exploitation and the only winners are those on the top of the pyramid in the shoppies union who have the power to push their friends and associates up the pointy end of that pyramid into a seat in parliament or some other cushy job that is handed out by a Labor government or a union within the system.

Consequently, our opposition to the way in which the bill was consulted, particularly when it comes to the additional public holiday, that being argued by the Labor Party, we think there should be an exchange rather than an additional public holiday is ripping off workers is a hollow claim because I have presented you with the evidence here that it is the Labor Party and it has reduced the wages through enterprise bargaining agreements, particularly penalty rates, for workers right across the country.

Another thing I found interesting in this particular bill was the language used to describe certain days. Apparently, there is a public holiday on 1 January. I wonder what 1 January is? It is New Year's Day. Why do we not call it New Year's Day? Why is there a public holiday on 26 January? I do not even remember. It is 26 January Day today, it is a public holiday. No, it is Australia Day. Why do we not call it Australia Day? The second Monday in March? Is that not the Adelaide Cup? It goes on to 25 April. That is ANZAC Day. Fancy not using the name ANZAC Day. The second Monday in June. I think that is the monarch's birthday?

You have the first Monday in October. This is a Labor favourite—Labour Day—the first Monday in October. It is not described as Labour Day. Surely that is a celebration of the old union

movement, the union movement that used to help people rather than rip them off. Now something happened on 25 December. That is right, Christmas Day, and Boxing Day on 26 December. The date is here, 26 December, it does not say Boxing Day, but it refers to Good Friday, Easter Saturday, Easter Sunday and Easter Monday.

I am trying to work out why they did not make a reference to the Gregorian calendar and insert a mathematical equation so we could work out when Easter was so you did not have to say 'Easter' on those particular days. It is an extraordinary piece of legislation. Of course, as Australia Day changes, we will be back in here again amending the act because it does not talk about Australia Day, it actually talks about 26 January.

As to when claims were made about other states having a public holiday on Easter Sunday, I do not know if anyone has ever been in Canberra over Easter and has wanted to go out on Easter Sunday for a meal, but you would be pretty lucky to find anything open. They are certainly not open on that day. They might have penalty rates on that particular day, but we certainly do not see businesses open, certainly not in the area of the hospitality sector.

The AHA was right in their concerns about the lack of consultation on this. It is all very well for the shoppies union to say, 'They can charge a surcharge to their customers,' but we are in the middle of a cost-of-living crisis. It just shows you how out of touch some members are who participate in this economy, who think that charging a surcharge is a good idea. I do not think charging a surcharge is a good idea.

As a matter of fact, I am sure I have heard people in unions representing workers complaining about surcharges being charged for credit card transactions, or surcharges being charged for other banking transactions, but all of a sudden we have the union and obviously this government advocating that surcharges be added to restaurant and fast-food transactions on public holidays and on Easter, which, under this bill, adds an additional public holiday here in South Australia.

This is on top of the new public holidays that have been added—the half-day public holidays from 7pm to midnight on New Year's Eve and on Christmas Eve—which is another significant cost to patrons and small businesses in South Australia.

A lot of people enjoy working on those days as part of their social life. I know that a lot of people who work in the evenings in the hospitality industry do so because it is a way of earning money while having a good time. I did that when I started my business, and when I was doing my apprenticeship I worked in hotels at night-time, and it was great to have a social life and an additional pay packet as well. If businesses are not opening because of the additional cost of providing those services, then that is an opportunity that is being missed by people who would be keen to work those extra hours and expand their social life. Thank you very much, Acting Speaker, for allowing me to continue my remarks.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis.

Motions

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF SOLIDARITY WITH THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. A. Piccolo (resumed on motion).

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (19:48): As I was saying in closing my remarks, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and I were having discussions about what potential amendments could be moved. I have circulated an amendment to be moved in my name, as follows. I move:

In paragraph (a)(ii) delete the word 'current'; and

In paragraph (c)(i) delete the word 'is' and insert the word 'when', and delete the word 'and' and insert the word 'is'; and

In paragraph (c)(ii) delete the word 'has' and insert the word 'have'.

I want to restate to the house that the government's position on Israel is unchanged. The events of 7 October that were perpetrated by Hamas are condemned. Hamas does not represent the Palestinian people.

What we are doing here today is what the United Nations in 1977 declared would be an International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, and we are celebrating that day. The government's view is that that day needs to be commemorated. Members have made remarks; those remarks are their own and they are heartfelt. The government does not wish and is not attempting to combine the two events.

This is a standalone motion regarding the 1977 declaration by the United Nations on Palestine and Palestinian people. I do not want people to confuse what we are saying today. Palestinian people deserve recognition, they deserve support, they deserve their time to be recognised. I stand in solidarity with the Palestinian people, as declared by the United Nations in 1977, and I commend the amendments to the house.

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (19:50): There are a number of amendments that have come through on this motion and all I would say is that the original motion that the Hon. Tony Piccolo has put down first and then some more amendments from the member for West Torrens that I have just heard are all valid. I am not here to pick winners and I am not here to choose which one we should be following.

All I will say is that I have been privileged enough to have been given a speech that has been heard outside this chamber that sits in the ownership of the Hon. Connie Bonaros. I am going to read it out word for word and, as I do, apparently the words I use are 'and I quote' when I start and obviously the quote is finished.

It is a good speech. I like the speech. I have read it two or three times and I think it is very valid and crosses all prescriptions. What is important here in my limited knowledge of the Israeli-Palestinian land ownership of a home, a destination of a country and peoples is that if there is no harmony there will be no life there for anyone. That has certainly been proven the case over decades now and particularly just recently when this conflict started in an abhorrent way where there has been massive death. The Hon. Connie Bonaros stated, and I quote:

It has been 53 days since the Hamas attack in Israel.

Sadly, it is civilians—from both sides—who have paid the price.

1,200 Israelis who were massacred on 7 October have paid with their lives, as have almost 15,000 Palestinians, including 6,150 innocent children and over 4,000 women.

As we here today know only too well, Palestinian people, innocent children, have paid with their lives for [more than] 75 years.

On 24 September, the Israeli Prime Minister displayed a map to the General Assembly titled 'the new Middle East' in which Palestine was erased and replaced entirely with Israel.

It is clear the world is witnessing a new, horrific chapter in the ongoing Nakba that the Palestinians have been suffering since 1948.

I have seen it referred to—in many [famous] forums—as a 'conflict'.

Let us be very clear—the Israeli occupation of Palestine is not a conflict or war.

It is not a conflict—it is an occupation.

And that is why context matters.

Language matters.

What plagues many of us most about it is—what we are actually doing in response here in South Australia and Australia?

Because it seems to me the political response does not represent what Australians are really feeling.

A recent Roy Morgan poll revealed a significant disconnect between politicians and public sentiment.

Only 32.6% of Australians surveyed supported the continued presence of Israel's army in Gaza.

A mere 24.7% aligned with the Australian government's stance on a ceasefire.

A substantial 56.1% of Australians advocate for an immediate ceasefire.

These numbers should deeply concern each and every politician who has been sitting on the sidelines.

Perhaps most notably, 84.6% of surveyed Australian's expressed their profound concern about civilian casualties in Gaza.

While doctors in Gaza are operating on children, on injured men and women in open air, without medical care, without food, water, electricity, cutting into their bodies without anaesthetics, pleading for a pause knowing only too well more bodies will need to be sewn back together tomorrow, we here are tying ourselves in political knots over carefully crafted motions that are ultimately approved by those higher up and well beyond South Australian borders introduced into parliament so as not to offend.

Our first instinct as a state and as a nation was to light up the city in the Israeli colours and ask for forgiveness from our Palestinian brothers and sisters later.

Behind closed doors we make pledges of moving another motion to level the playing field that is less contentious.

We say we know they aren't to blame for the atrocities of Hamas—a declared terrorist organisation—but we continue to resist calls to light up the city in Palestinian colours to acknowledge the decimation of their lands, their people and their race.

The phone calls from Canberra—that is what we worry about while innocent children are killed.

Why? We know why, we're just afraid to voice it.

I don't want to be one of those politicians.

I just want to finish by acknowledging that criticism of Israeli human rights violations is not anti-Semitic, just as criticism of Saudi violations is not Islamophobic, criticism of Myanmar violations is not anti-Buddhist, criticism of Indian violations is not anti-Hindu.

The many demonstrations all over the world have made it clear the Jewish people are not represented by Israel.

Jewish protestors have stood alongside their Muslim and Christian brothers and sisters calling for a ceasefire and the immediate delivery of humanitarian aid.

People of all faiths and nationalities are standing up to speak for the Palestinian people in calling for equal rights for all.

The life of a Palestinian child carries equal weight to the life of an Israeli child.

I am here today to assure you I will always use the privileged platform to fight for human rights for all but above all to ensure your voice is heard in that fight.

I have the privilege of saying a few words in the sense that obviously peace is the ultimate outcome. The civilisations of the two living in harmony would be an outcome that has not been seen for probably getting close to 80-odd years. As these atrocities continue to play out and the lands are occupied by one or the other, until there is a collaborative approach, where both the civilisations—the Palestinians and the Israelis—find a way to live in peace, we will be talking about this in years to come.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (19:57): I would like to thank both the member for West Torrens and the member for MacKillop for their words. In conclusion, I would like to reaffirm what the member for West Torrens has said, that this motion is not necessarily about the current conflict. It is very clear: this motion is about what the United Nations said in 1977 and why it said that, why that committee was set up, why the recommendations came there. If you like, in my understanding what the member for Morialta talked about we actually did deal with five or six weeks ago in this chamber. We did that. All of us did that. I was in this chamber and I stood up with every other member and supported that motion.

It was not easy for me to do that, given some of the language of that motion, but I thought, 'I am not going to play politics. I will do the right thing.' That motion was about that particular incident on 7 October, and today I have reaffirmed that that was a horrific time for the Israeli people. I have acknowledged that in my speech today.

What today is about, though, is the greater context, the history of Palestine and the Palestinian people, and what the Palestinian people and the Muslim people and other people in this community are feeling: as if that history has been erased. That history has not been erased for them. They still experience it. There are two things I have read recently in some papers locally that made me think about this.

One was a story about a woman who is now in Gaza going through the horrors of what is happening in Gaza today. She was in Palestine when she was three years old, when Israel was created, and her family were pushed out of Israel. She is reliving the Nakba for the second time in her life. She has been in a refugee camp for 70 something years. She has raised a family in the refugee camp and now she has been displaced again. She and her family have been displaced again, twice in a lifetime. That is what this motion is about: to acknowledge the experience of the Palestinian people for that time.

The other story I heard really did move me. I do not have anybody in Palestine, any family member, so I am not directly involved, but one story that I say almost traumatised me is when I heard that families in Palestine today, in Gaza in particular, were writing their children's names on their limbs in case they were killed, so that they could be identified. My God, what sort of world do we live in when parents are forced to write their children's names on their limbs in case they get bombed and killed, so that they can be identified? I am sorry, that is not a fate which I support.

This is not a war between Islam and a war between Judaism. Palestinians are a multifaith group: there are Christians, there are orthodox, there are a whole range of different people. That is why this motion needs to stand as it is because it provides that context and that understanding. In doing so, I do not in any way diminish the pain and the grief of the Israeli people on 7 October, nor the grief they are still experiencing today because their family members are abducted. That is inhumanity in its worst example.

But, I am sorry, I cannot accept that you can bomb refugee camps, you can bomb schools and you can bomb hospitals where women are giving birth to children and say that is okay. I am sorry, I cannot accept that, and there is no justification. My plea to this chamber is that, in the same way that we stood together, five or six weeks ago—and I was one of them, doing it together for that motion as we do today—and bring some healing to this community by doing that.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): The question before the Chair is that the amendment moved by the member for Morialta be agreed to.

The house divided on the amendment:

Ayes11
 Noes.....23
 Majority12

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.
 Ellis, F.J.
 Pederick, A.S.
 Telfer, S.J.

Batty, J.A.
 Gardner, J.A.W. (teller)
 Pisoni, D.G.
 Whetstone, T.J.

Cowdrey, M.J.
 Hurn, A.M.
 Pratt, P.K.

NOES

Andrews, S.E.
 Boyer, B.I.
 Close, S.E.
 Hildyard, K.A.
 Hutchesson, C.L.
 Michaels, A.
 Pearce, R.K.
 Savvas, O.M.

Bettison, Z.L.
 Champion, N.D.
 Cook, N.F.
 Hood, L.P.
 Koutsantonis, A.
 Mullighan, S.C.
 Piccolo, A. (teller)
 Wortley, D.J.

Bignell, L.W.K.
 Clancy, N.P.
 Fulbrook, J.P.
 Hughes, E.J.
 McBride, P.N.
 Odenwalder, L.K.
 Picton, C.J.

PAIRS

Marshall, S.S.
 Stinson, J.M.
 Teague, J.B.

Malinauskas, P.B.
 Patterson, S.J.R.
 Brock, G.G.

Speirs, D.J.
 Szakacs, J.K.
 Tarzia, V.A.

Thompson, E.L.

Amendment thus negatived.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): The question before the Chair is that the amendment moved by the member for West Torrens be agreed to.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

Bills

PUBLIC HOLIDAYS BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (20:07): I am proud today and every day to wake up in the morning and know that I commit my life to defending the rights of working people. At 14, I had my first job at Para Vista Pizza Hut, a place I loved working. I very much got my independence at Pizza Hut. I came from a family without a lot of money, and I remember all too well taking my first pay cheque to Tea Tree Plaza and spending an entire pay cheque on clothes for the first and probably not the last time, I must admit—I know, a surprise to everyone in the chamber.

I know what that independence meant for me. In the final months when I was working at Pizza Hut, unfortunately I was not getting paid correctly, but I was a member of my union. I did not know then just how significant that union would be to me in my life or the role that I would come to understand that it would play in the lives of retail, fast-food, and warehousing workers around this country. But I do know that before I was a member of the Labor Party, at a young age, I was a member of my union: the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees' Association, a group that has defended the rights of working people in this state for decades.

I did hear from members across the floor about this bill being an SDA conspiracy—I believe they referred to it as such when the Treasurer was speaking. I am very proud to say that I am not just a member of the SDA but a member of the FSU and the ASU as well. I am a proud union member of multiple unions. Of course, any conspiracy that may be occurring on behalf of a union is not just for members of a particular union, and I am very, very proud to be a member of three.

It was, of course, the union movement and my union, the SDA, that bothered to stand up for small businesses in this state when their trading hours were under attack, when the economy in this state was under attack, when farmers and independent grocers were under attack, because we have the balance right in South Australia. We have the balance right with trading hours in our state, and our state only, because here independent grocers have the ability to exceed in the market.

Our unique trading hours model in SA is one of the reasons we have the most competitive supermarket sectors in the country, and it gives small businesses like the independent grocers here in SA the opportunity to compete against Woolworths and Coles. The proposal to deregulate trading hours in this state put that at risk, and we saw that when independent grocers, farmers, small businesses and retail workers all campaigned against those changes and against Rob Lucas's decision and, of course, ended up voting him out.

I think it is important that we correct the record just generally in terms of enterprise bargaining in this state. There were a few comments made by the union buster himself, the member for Unley, a moment ago about enterprise bargaining in this country. He clearly does not have a clear understanding of the way that enterprise bargaining works here in Australia, and his statement that there is a massive difference between SDA enterprise agreements between a 150 per cent penalty rate and a 50 per cent loading rate is, of course, not true because they are in fact exactly the same thing. A 50 per cent loading rate on top of a regular rate is exactly the same thing as a 150 per cent penalty rate.

Of course, the SDA and all unions in this country are bound by decisions like the BOOT decision and the Coles decision, which means that all workers in an enterprise agreement must be better off under the enterprise agreement that that union puts up—everyone, every single person.

As a former SDA official, I know for a fact that the SDA do not have a single EBA with Sunday rates below the award—not one. It is important context.

It was alongside the SDA that I fought against the Marshall government's cruel, out of touch decision to refuse to close the loophole in 2021 when Christmas fell on a Saturday. I, too, have been a low-paid worker. I have worked my fair share of weekends. I have worked in hospitality and fast food, and relied on my penalty rates to get by. I have also at times been raised by low-paid workers, workers who rely on penalty rates, workers who have to give up time with their families on occasions when others—higher paid workers—are at home.

Our government are here with this bill not only to close that loophole but to ensure that Christmas Day is a time that is valued. On this side of the house we know how much individuals value Christmases and Easters at home with their families. Christmas is a time to be with family, and if you are working on that day I truly believe that you do deserve penalty rates. I value those people who work on holidays; I really value them. I heard it on the doors, I heard it at Tea Tree Plaza, I heard it in local pubs and at local shops, and I heard from workers in 2021, when Christmas Day was not considered a public holiday, that they did not feel valued by the former Marshall Liberal government. Despite that, we are here again.

In the last few weeks, we announced another decision to support working people, a decision that working people and the SDA (apparently a conspiracy theory) have been calling for: to bring South Australia into line with the other states and territories on the mainland and make Easter Sunday a public holiday. It is another day when low-paid workers—generally retail workers, hospitality workers and cleaners, as well as our emergency services workers, of course, who we all value highly in this place—are often working overtime to support our community. I am proud of that because I value working people. They matter to me, and they matter to us on this side of the house.

The Liberal Party responded to that commitment, despite the absolutely enormous outcry during their 10 seconds in government in response to their Christmas Day decision, by trying to remove Easter Saturday as a public holiday. It is another day over a long weekend when they can be with family and friends that many give up so they can go to work. Easter Saturday has been a public holiday here in South Australia for over 100 years. For 100 years it has been recognised by governments of all persuasions that people should not get just one day but, in reality, a whole long weekend to spend with their families at Easter time—and the Liberals have again decided, not surprisingly, that they do not value working people.

I am sure that many members on the other side and perhaps their supporters are spending their long weekends away at river shacks or in Robe or equivalent during the long weekend, but most of my relatives and friends will be working. I believe that work should be valued, I really do, just like I did when I worked at Tea Tree Plaza on Easter Saturday for many years. I not only commend the bill today but I really want to condemn the Liberal Party for their blatant attack on working people, and make no mistake, this is what that is. They have not learned a lesson from Christmas Day and are acting true to form as always.

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (20:15): I rise to congratulate the member for Newland on her comments and reiterate my support for the Public Holidays Bill before the house. Like the member for Newland, I have worked in low-paid jobs. I got my first job at 14, working as a waitress—I should say 'paid job' given I grew up on a farm and you pretty much start working as soon as you can walk. I got my first paid job at 14, working as a waitress. I took on another job working after school, scrubbing pots and pans at a local restaurant. I have managed a pub, working weekends when I would also love to be spending time with my family.

I think it is absolutely disgraceful that the opposition has chosen to attack workers. They have gone after Christmas, and now they are going after Easter. They are going after the long weekend, which many workers deserve to have off. If they are required to work, then they should be remunerated accordingly, because if you are working on a public holiday, you are entitled to penalty rates.

However, under the current rules, when Christmas Day falls on a Saturday, then it is not treated as a public holiday, which means Christmas Day workers miss out. Likewise, Easter Sunday is also not considered a public holiday, which means penalty rates do not apply. This bill will repeal

the Holidays Act 1910 and replace it with an extremely simple set of rules for the regulation of public holidays. As the current legislation stands, Christmas Day is not treated as a public holiday unless it lands on a weekday. This bill changes that.

I would like to applaud the SDA union and their campaign to make these reforms a reality. I am a proud SDA member, and I heartily acknowledge the dedication and hard work of branch secretary Josh Peak and assistant branch secretary Jordan Mumford as well as the tireless efforts of organisers, reps, delegates and workers on the road, on the shop floor and in our warehouses. The efforts of our mighty union movement again are resulting in better outcomes for South Australians.

In comparison, the opposition are attacking workers and seeking to rip hundreds of dollars out of the pockets of hardworking South Australians during a cost-of-living crisis. It is shameful. By simplifying the legislation regulating public holidays, this framework will bring us into line with other states in the country. Let's be clear: Easter Sunday is a public holiday in every mainland state except South Australia. By declaring Easter Sunday a public holiday, we are following every other mainland state, ensuring workers receive their well-earned public holiday rates when required to work that day.

Further, the bill will ensure SA joins the Eastern States when considering additional and substitute public holidays. The current legislation outlines that if a public holiday falls on a Saturday, then a substitute day off will occur on the following Monday. This means that Saturday is treated as any other Saturday. This is in contrast to when a public holiday falls on a Sunday, when the Sunday and the following Monday are both considered public holidays, creating an additional day off.

This proposed legislation will simplify these rules so it will not matter whether the public holiday falls on a Saturday or a Sunday. Instead, if a public holiday falls on the weekend during the Christmas period, that day will be a public holiday, and an additional public holiday on the Monday will also apply. While this might not mean much to an average Monday to Friday, nine to five worker as the weekend is already considered their days off, this will assist our shift workers and those with less conventional rosters who work off-peak hours to receive the wages they deserve, wages that reflect the sacrifice of working on a day that most South Australians have off.

They are working on a day when they could be spending time with their loved ones, working when everyone is taking time off, to ensure that this state keeps running, business as usual. We saw during COVID just how essential these workers are, our nurses, aged-care workers, disability workers, those at the check-out, on the shop floor, driving our buses. They are working weekends, they are working late nights, early mornings and on public holidays, because the work has to be done.

These reforms will simplify and unify our rules around public holidays and give a fair wage to those who desperately need it during a cost-of-living crisis. These legislative changes will result in yet another election commitment being fulfilled, and again I am proud to be part of a Malinauskas Labor government which makes good on its promises. I look forward to the passing of this bill and for these reforms to come into effect next year. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (20:20): I rise to raise a few concerns I have in this space. As someone who had family involved in dairy farming for 183 years—until recently, when we sold the farm—there are people out there, business owners, dairy farmers and others, who operate businesses 365 days a year. Those people often employ staff to help them with their business. The consequences of putting more public holidays in place are actually likely to lead to those farmers themselves working those public holidays.

I was just thinking back over my time working on the dairy farm, which is about 35 years; I had two Christmas days off in those 35 years. My staff generally got Christmas Day off unless there was a particular issue. Occasionally, they would volunteer to work Christmas morning so I could be with my young kids. So there are people out there who this is really going to hurt.

Likewise, in my community I am seeing a bit of a change. Victor Harbor, Goolwa and the south coast generally have very much deregulated shop trading hours. Shops can open when they like, as a holiday zone down there. We see many of the shops now choosing to not open on public holidays. In recent times, the Chicken Run in Port Elliott, a chicken shop, has made the decision not

to open on public holidays more often than not. This is causing the dilemma of people coming down to the tourist region and wanting to have a chicken down on the beach but not being able to do so because they are not open.

So there are consequences to this as we move forward. We must understand these sorts of changes that are being made—what they do to these sorts of businesses, the pressures they put on them. These businesses are small businesses that are trying to do what they can to survive, and they are having to make hard decisions and make those decisions that they cannot operate on these days. With those few words, I cannot support this increase in public holidays going forward.

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (20:23): It has been really interesting sitting back and listening to the debates from both sides of the chamber. One side of the chamber says it is all about employees, cost of living, looking after members and union rights and union members, quality of life and everything that life at the moment is bringing in this unusual world that we are living in after COVID.

There are a couple of things that no-one talks about, which I find quite fascinating. One is that when the Australian women's soccer side got very close to winning the grand final there were suggestions out there—and it was put to the Premier—that we could have a public holiday on the success of the women's soccer. I had about 10 phone calls from businesses in my region saying, 'Over our dead bodies would we think that's a good idea.'

One of the reasons—and it was actually stated in the local media—was that if a public holiday was declared in South Australia or even across Australia it would cost around \$60 million just in aged care. No-one talks about these sums and what they mean. The last speaker, the member for Finnis, was talking about businesses that operate 365 days of the year. These are businesses like hospitals, aged-care facilities, factories for milk production and food production with workers who are having to work on a Sunday so there is work on a Monday ready for the working chain to actually begin, fuel transporters, anything that operates 24 hours—airports, hotels, all the employees where things never shut down.

When you start rolling out three public holidays, no-one here has considered at all what it does to inflation. I have not heard anyone talk about the health bill, which might have imposed on it three more public holidays in South Australia, and what it will cost our health portfolio as a whole—is it \$1 million, is it \$100 million? Are you now \$100 million short on your side of the chamber? No-one has told me anything about what it will cost for the 5,000 or 10,000 employees in the health sector. It is fascinating that no-one comes up with it.

I can tell you right now that the Limestone Coast would love \$100 million to service the health needs of my constituents. We do not have hospitals that are modern, all the services are not there, there are not enough GPs in the hospitals, not enough nurses in the hospitals and not enough specialists down there—but we are really quick to change the rules that actually add to our problem. Then we talk about inflation, which is running at 5, 6, 7 per cent. Does anyone consider what that will be when you roll out these sorts of expenses into payroll?

What is really fascinating about this is that the argument I heard from this side is not wrong either, because if employees are working on Christmas Day why are they not valued at double? Why should they not be remunerated well? Now I am an Independent, I can take the middle road, and I am going to take the middle road. There is either side of the coin, and there is a right and a wrong, and there are both sides there.

What I would say is that I think Christmas is really obvious. It is a special day. It is the one big one of the year, unless you are totally non-religious of any type—almost like me—then with Christmas it can be any day of the year, if you want to make it that way, but we do try to celebrate it and we do try to do it well. The majority of people do see Christmas as one of those special big days of the year and an event. Any of those sectors I have talked about—health, aged care, running a hotel or motel, airports, anything that is going 24/7, 365 days a year—are always going to need staff in those facilities, and they do need to be recompensed really well and, obviously, remunerated well.

The other thing that never gets brought into this context is how this place—government as a whole, opposition and/or government—thinks that they have to rule by a line and a sentence and

legislation, and they cannot leave it up to employers to remunerate over and above by themselves. Where there is an award, it is a base, and no-one talks about being paid more than the base. It is a line in the sand and you must not go below it, otherwise you will see yourself before the courts that look after employees to make sure they are remunerated fairly and appropriately.

One of the things that I find fascinating is that the major supermarkets, Coles and Woolworths, have a wage agreement with their staff but talk about a five, six or seven-day week, depending on what the employee is looking for, that will cover the spectrum of public holidays, leave loadings, time-and-a-half or double-time periods when the employees might find themselves working, that will cover the 365 days of the year. They are agreements between a worker and a boss, and this is what has been lost again in this discussion.

I would have loved to hear in this discussion, perhaps, when we talked about where we wanted to mandate and make sure those really important workers—as we heard from the member for King about how they sacrifice and give up that special day to serve others, those workers who sit inside the government circles—we could have talked about them separately from the outside industries and sectors in the greater wider world of the private sector in the South Australian economy.

Those sectors like health, aged care and any other public service that operates 365 days a year, seven days a week, 24 hours a day, they do need government to be legislating, mandating and calling it out for what it is, because no-one else is going in to bat for them.

In other words, the bosses, the bureaucracy, it is a black-and-white line, it is what it is and they have to roll it out, but everyone else can be subject to a private agreement, private enterprise, and they can talk and negotiate between their private employers, no matter how big they are. That goes from a massive company like BHP right down to a small supermarket chain, be it an IGA or a Foodland, where an owner is involved. They can have negotiations, so long as they do not fall below the award and the structures that are there; that is all that needs to be met.

A great opportunity would have been to able to distinguish and work out—and I have not heard any figures from the government side about what adding these three days might cost to the public sector, which will come back and hit the government purse and the government coffers (no doubt it will be in the millions of dollars, but I just do not know the extent of it)—whether there was an opportunity to work with the lowest base award employees and whether they were all being remunerated well enough if they did have to work these public holidays.

Normally, these lowest paid workers do not have to work public holidays because the employer cannot afford it, straight out cannot afford it. The product they are trying to produce and the work they are trying to do is why they are on the bottom and are the lowest paid—because if you are not in that area and that spectrum it just does not exist.

The other fascinating thing that no-one has mentioned is that, when you start adding to the costs of employing people, it becomes marginal and you start making more rules, making it harder for employers to pay employees, and you actually work against creating more jobs. In fact, it goes the other way and you perhaps take away jobs. It is not proven or an exact science, but the government has a really strong argument to say, 'Well, there are a lot more jobs out there nearly than workers, so what does it matter? We've got a really low unemployment rate, so if some of the sectors didn't employ so many people it would free up a workforce.'

I can tell you right now that in this current game it is really hard to find employees out there, skilled employees. If this breaks some shackles on some employees and some businesses slow down, do not employ as many, or do not employ them to do those days when it now will be double time or greater—2.25 I see some hospitality penalty rates are for a public holiday—then maybe these other workers will be freer to do other work where workers cannot be found at all. Maybe that is a motivation here that might be a great consequence of the government's move. I can tell you that from an employer's perspective there are ramifications in this bill getting through.

There used to be a lot of banter in my family when we saw award wages going up by an exponential amount and, if there was not productivity in the workforce to pay for it, we only added to inflation. We start paying our employees more, but they are worse off because everything costs more.

One of the things I find really fascinating and an interesting statistic relates to the meat processing game. Right now, we are going through a real glut, where the abattoirs in Australia cannot find workers and they can only operate the one shift. Protein out the other end is not much cheaper for consumers, and I think you have seen around a 6 per cent reduction in some meat products, maybe a bit more, but producers have seen a 50 to 70 per cent correction and you have seen a 6 to 10 per cent correction on the supermarket shelf.

One thing I would like this place to know is that, way back about 15 years ago, I heard that in Brazil it cost \$50 to break down a beast, a cow, a steer—cattle; it was \$100 to break it down and kill it in America; it was \$150 to kill it in New Zealand; and it was \$200 to kill it in Australia—15 years ago. I can tell you that those figures are irrelevant, but the ratios are still the same.

We suddenly say, 'We just must be paying all our employees too much. Australian abattoir workers are all just getting way too big wages.' That is a nonsense. That is not the case at all. They are not like that. It is everything else surrounding it: the energy costs, the inspections, the transport costs. Now we are going to have drivers driving cattle, sheep and lambs into the abattoirs on a Sunday on a public holiday, who will need to have some sort of remuneration for working public holidays. All this has to be taken into account.

Then we add the diesel costs, we add the fuel tax and then we put in the wear and tear on our roads, which barely keep up with it as well, so the trucks are more expensive to operate on the roads. Then, when you take the product away from the abattoir, that is also more expensive. Our whole chain around processing meat is more expensive than anywhere else in the world. It is not just the wages that are a problem; in fact, wages might be a portion, but they certainly may not be a majority. There may be a number of other things in there.

These are the consequences of what we are rolling out and I am seeing today. They do have consequences down the line and so in the end, when you try to buy your hamburger or your sausage—let's say you are a lower socio-economic wage earner and that is a lot of your staple diet—they are not going to be any cheaper by these sorts of processes. I can also probably say that the wage earner, because they will not get the opportunity to work on a public holiday, will not get the benefit of what those over that side have just been arguing about, that all wage earners are going to get this double time. This person does not get to work on public holidays, but his food and his cost of living are going to go up, so they are no better off.

You have gone in to bat for workers to be better off by receiving these benefits, but the problem is there are consequences, and they are not widespread. They are not all benefits; sometimes they are hits to the hip pocket. I can say to you to you honestly that perhaps the poor get poorer with the rolling out of these types of works because they are not receiving your bonuses, your three public holidays and your double pay that you think everyone is going to get when you roll it out—because they do not have jobs on Christmas Day or on public holidays during Easter. They may not have a job at all. I wonder whether you are then going to lift the social payments and Jobseeker as well to keep up with inflation at the rate we probably need to.

These are the sorts of things that I think both sides of this chamber—in other words, the government and the opposition—need to be fully cognisant of. There are wider ramifications than just saying, 'We look after workers, and we are going to be the great person for all the workers who have to work these days.' On this side, it is all about small businesses, and I heard about the Stirling butcher shop or supermarket, and I heard about the pizza bar and so forth. Yes, they are there. They will either put it into their cost structure or they will not open. They will keep the doors closed and it will not matter. The jobs are not there. They do not make the losses, and you do not get your pizzas, you do not go to the butcher shop, the supermarkets remain closed and no-one really wins. These are the sorts of ramifications of this sort of legislation.

I will agree and happily support that any Christmas that does not represent a public holiday is a missed opportunity, and I am with you on that. I think even this side recognise that. They found it really hard to argue against you, I can tell you that. Their arguments were not that strong, and rightly so.

In summing up, this is perhaps a two-pronged approach in its consequences for workers and for businesses. I think that in the end it is not worth the fight. The government will get this through.

Employers will have to work to the way this will function and operate. The Labor Party will look like it is looking after its workers, it will look like it will have its Easter public holidays, it will look like it will have Christmas Day and all Christmas Days will turn out to be a public holiday—tick, tick, tick—and there will be some financial losses, costs and problems with that as well.

How do you define that—how it actually is recognised when the budgets do not match up in the health sector or in the aged-care facilities and they are finding it hard to make the sums stack up today. Some of the workers in the aged-care sector are some of the lowest paid workers in the economy. We have to bring in overseas workers to fill these positions as it is because Australians do not want to do them. All I am going to say is good luck to everyone. I hope we enjoy the fact that we get a Christmas Day and that every day is going to be a public holiday on a Christmas Day. It will be interesting to see how Easter looks, how many businesses are open and how many function during Easter Saturday and Easter Sunday. May all businesses be fruitful and successful with this.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the Deputy Premier who would if she speaks close debate, I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of the Gawler Central football league, guests of the member for Light and the Deputy Speaker. Welcome to parliament tonight; it is an absolute pleasure to have you with us.

Bills

PUBLIC HOLIDAYS BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (20:39): Thank you, Mr Speaker, and, notwithstanding your very reasonable acknowledgement of those in the gallery, I think the concluding tone of the member for MacKillop was one of Christmas cheer, which I very much appreciate in what we think might be the last sitting week for the year. I will simply close by thanking all those who have contributed to the second reading debate: a particularly powerfully put case by my colleagues on this side of the chamber—no need for me to repeat—and I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

Mr COWDREY: I move en bloc amendments Nos 1 through to 15:

Amendment No 1 [Cowdrey-1]—

Page 4, line 5 [clause 3(1)(a)]—After '1 January' insert:

(New Year's Day)

Amendment No 2 [Cowdrey-1]—

Page 4, line 6 [clause 3(1)(b)]—After '26 January' insert:

(Australia Day)

Amendment No 3 [Cowdrey-1]—

Page 4, line 7 [clause 3(1)(c)]—After 'March' insert:

(Adelaide Cup Day)

Amendment No 4 [Cowdrey-1]—

Page 4, line 9 [clause 3(1)(e)]—Delete paragraph (e)

Amendment No 5 [Cowdrey–1]—

Page 4, line 12 [clause 3(1)(h)]—After '25 April' insert:

(ANZAC Day)

Amendment No 6 [Cowdrey–1]—

Page 4, line 13 [clause 3(1)(i)]—After 'June' insert:

(the Sovereign's Birthday)

Amendment No 7 [Cowdrey–1]—

Page 4, line 14 [clause 3(1)(j)]—After 'October' insert:

(Labour Day)

Amendment No 8 [Cowdrey–1]—

Page 4, line 15 [clause 3(1)(k)]—After '25 December' insert:

(Christmas Day)

Amendment No 9 [Cowdrey–1]—

Page 4, line 16 [clause 3(1)(l)]—After '26 December' insert:

(Proclamation Day)

Amendment No 10 [Cowdrey–1]—

Page 4, line 17 [clause 3(2)]—Delete '25 December' and substitute:

Christmas Day

Amendment No 11 [Cowdrey–1]—

Page 4, line 17 [clause 3(2)]—Delete '1 January' and substitute:

New Year's Day

Amendment No 12 [Cowdrey–1]—

Page 4, line 19 [clause 3(3)]—Delete '26 December' and substitute:

Proclamation Day

Amendment No 13 [Cowdrey–1]—

Page 4, line 24 [clause 3(4)]—Delete '26 January' and substitute:

Australia Day

Amendment No 14 [Cowdrey–1]—

Page 4, line 26 [clause 3(5)]—Delete 'The' and substitute:

Subject to subsection (6), the

Amendment No 15 [Cowdrey–1]—

Page 4, after line 29—After subclause (5) insert:

(6) A proclamation cannot be made under subsection (5) to declare some other day to be a public holiday in a year instead of Australia Day except in pursuance of a resolution passed by both Houses of Parliament.

(7) Notice of a motion for a resolution under subsection (6) must be given at least 14 sitting days before the motion is passed.

I take the opportunity to speak to the amendments. A number of those were what we deemed off the bat to be administrative errors where to this point I still have not heard a rational argument from the government in the other place, and I suspect I will not hear one in the coming couple of minutes, in regard to why certain public holidays within the bill were referenced by the name of the day and why the government chose to put dates against the others.

To that end, the opposition is moving a series of amendments to essentially give rise to the name of the particular public holiday with the date of the public holiday. It is in line with the official public holidays calendar that SafeWork SA provide each and every year. Funnily enough, the part-day public holidays are listed on this particular calendar. The government, as we said, must have missed those when they put out their press release; I am sure it had nothing to do with putting forward a political message that was not necessarily accurate, and some would even go as far as saying it was misleading.

The other amendments are despite the claims of those opposite, despite the claims of the Labor Party and despite the claims of the SDA, SA Unions and a range of others. What is being proposed here by the government is a substantial hit to South Australian small and family businesses. That is what we are discussing: a hit to those businesses, with not an ounce of consultation undertaken.

I am not going to waste the committee's time to ask what work the government have done to ascertain the impact. I think the member for MacKillop—in part of his contribution to the house, at least—outlined the fact that he and I have the same belief that the government have not done any work to ascertain what the impact actually is for private industry or for the government sector.

It is very clear that for the long list of particular businesses that I referenced earlier—whether that be small cafes, coffee shops, NDIS providers, the aged-care sector more generally, wineries, cellar doors, businesses that operate in regional areas, pubs or the like—the government have not talked to a single small or family business on this change, nor do they understand what the impact will be for those businesses. I am not going to waste the committee's time in making that point again.

What I will say is that it is very clear from those particular organisations that represent small and family business in their firm view—and I talk here again about the AHA, about Business SA, about the MTA, about the Australian Industry Group and the Wine Industry Association of Australia, and I am sure there are many other organisations that represent small and family businesses across the state—that they are going to be impacted the most by these changes, despite the outrageous claims from the government that this is something to do with some nefarious idea that the opposition is tied to big business. We represent small and family businesses on this side of the house. Those are the businesses that are going to be most devastatingly affected by this change.

What we are proposing, on behalf of those groups that represent those small and family businesses across the state, is their agreed position is not to have a net increase in public holidays. Therefore, the most logical move to negate that being the case is simply to swap the Saturday and the Sunday. Nobody is removing anything; those things that are provided to employees on the Saturday would simply shift to the Sunday. There is no change in arrangement but for a direct swap, a direct swap in those arrangements so that those small and family businesses are not worse off. The Premier had a choice and the government had a choice as to whether they wanted to do this in a way that inflicted pain on small and family businesses and they chose to do that.

The last number of amendments deals with providing a safeguard to a potential future government that may or may not wish to change the date of Australia Day at a future point in time. Quite simply, all this does is ensure that it would need to come to this parliament and pass both chambers of this very parliament. There is nothing to fear for those on the other side, unless they have a plan to change the date for Australia Day. That is the only reason that you would vote against this amendment to provide a safeguard to any potential change into the future.

They are the amendments that the opposition are moving en bloc tonight. I look forward to having a discussion around those, should the committee wish, or am happy to put them for a vote.

The ACTING CHAIR (Ms Savvas): Member for Colton, you have just mentioned an amendment put forward by the opposition with respect to amendment No. 15, but originally you stated you were only moving amendments Nos 1 through 14 en bloc. Can I clarify that you are only moving amendments Nos 1 through 14, and not 15 with respect to Australia Day?

Mr COWDREY: Pardon me. Amendments Nos 1 through 16, the full set. My apologies.

The ACTING CHAIR (Ms Savvas): You will not be able to move amendment No. 16; you will only be able to move amendments Nos 1 through 15.

Mr COWDREY: Amendments Nos 1 through 15.

The ACTING CHAIR (Ms Savvas): Thank you. I turn to the Deputy Premier.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Amendments Nos 1 to 3 and 5 to 13 are about giving the colloquial names for each of these public holidays. Somehow, South Australia has survived for 110 years with the Holidays Act without including these names. Somehow we have managed to work out that we have those holidays on those days.

The bill has been drafted to use the names of public holidays only when they move from year to year because they are following a different calendar and we are using the fixed dates for all the other public holidays. Which is the one that is not being moved en bloc?

The ACTING CHAIR (Ms Savvas): That is amendment No. 16.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Not No. 4 then?

The ACTING CHAIR (Ms Savvas): He is moving amendments Nos 1 through 15, not 16.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: In our understanding, Nos 4 and 16 are linked because they are about removing Easter Saturday as a holiday. I will speak to that and we can resolve that through voting. I just indicate that, although 16 is not being moved but No. 4 is, Easter Saturday has of course been a public holiday for 110 years.

I will not repeat the speech that was given so powerfully, particularly by the Treasurer earlier but, as to the idea that you could interchange the Saturday and the Sunday of Easter, I have no god, I am not a religious person, but even I understand that Easter Saturday and Easter Sunday have different resonances and the fact that Easter Sunday is a day when nearly everything is shut. This is not something I am presuming that the opposition is proposing to overturn and yet they are pretending that Saturday and Sunday in Easter are interchangeable.

Further, amendments Nos 15 and 16 are seeking to prevent the public holiday on Australia Day being moved. It is late, it is after dinner, I am not indulging in culture wars. We have 26 January. It is the day that New South Wales was founded by the British. It is the day we have chosen as Australia Day. It is in here. I am not interested in getting into this ridiculous dog whistle of having a different debate within this. This is about worker entitlements.

The committee divided on the amendments:

Ayes12
Noes.....22
Majority10

AYES

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

Batty, J.A.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Pederick, A.S.
Telfer, S.J.

Cowdrey, M.J.
Hurn, A.M.
Pisoni, D.G.
Whetstone, T.J.

NOES

Andrews, S.E.
Boyer, B.I.
Clancy, N.P.
Fulbrook, J.P.
Hughes, E.J.
Michaels, A.
Pearce, R.K.
Wortley, D.J.

Bettison, Z.L.
Brown, M.E.
Close, S.E.
Hildyard, K.A.
Hutchesson, C.L.
Mullighan, S.C.
Piccolo, A.

Bignell, L.W.K.
Champion, N.D.
Cook, N.F.
Hood, L.P.
Koutsantonis, A.
Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)
Picton, C.J.

PAIRS

Speirs, D.J.
Stinson, J.M.
Tarzia, V.A.
Thompson, E.L.

Malinauskas, P.B.
Teague, J.B.
Brock, G.G.

Marshall, S.S.
Szakacs, J.K.
Patterson, S.J.R.

Amendments thus negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 8), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (20:58): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 20:59 the house adjourned until Thursday 30 November 2023 at 11:00.