

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 7 March 2024

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

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

The SPEAKER read prayers.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: TILLEY RECREATION PARK REDEVELOPMENT

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:02): I move:

That the 54th report of the committee, entitled Tilley Recreation Park Redevelopment, be noted.

The Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing has administered funding to assist in the redevelopment of the Tilley Recreation Park, which is located in Surrey Downs and owned by the City of Tea Tree Gully. The scope of the proposed works will incorporate the construction of a new sporting clubroom and amenities, upgraded sporting fields, athletics and tennis facilities, a dog park and new community amenities and surrounding landscaping.

The Tilley Recreation Park serves as an important community sporting asset and public open space. It is one of Tea Tree Gully's most utilised parks and features two grassed areas which are predominantly used for soccer and athletics, three community buildings, nine tennis courts, a playground and picnic and barbecue areas. The park and facilities are regularly used by several local sporting clubs and community groups, including the Golden Grove Tennis Club, the Tea Tree Players Theatre group, Tea Tree Gully City Soccer Club, Golden Grove Little Athletics, the Roadrunners Softball Club and the Golden Grove Boxing Gym.

The predominant users of the park are over 450 members who play soccer weekly throughout the northern suburbs. The grounds do not provide adequate clubroom facilities. Currently, these players use a community building not specifically designed for use as a clubroom, and there is no dedicated undercover area for spectator viewing of soccer matches on the adjacent pitches. As well as the sporting and community groups mentioned, there are regular and casual hirers, and many council-run programs in the buildings within the reserve.

Due to growing demand from the community to improve the sporting and community infrastructure as well as the ageing community assets within the park, the Tea Tree Gully council developed a master plan in 2021. This master plan aimed to futureproof the site for the community and capture the needs of users over the coming years, not only making it a specific place for clubs but also opening the park to the rest of the community for more informal recreation, with an ultimate aim to promote and support opportunities for the community to enhance their health and wellbeing through physical and social activities.

The redevelopment aims to provide users with facilities that meet current and future needs, in line with relevant building regulations and sporting facility standards. It will address safety and security concerns in conjunction with protecting and celebrating the heritage and vegetation of the locale through developing and maintaining community infrastructure to address the needs of the Tea Tree Gully community.

The capital cost of the development is \$9.5 million, and construction has commenced, with practical completion expected at the end of this year. Once complete, the new Tilley Recreation Park will include the following buildings, sporting fields and amenities:

- a new clubroom with change rooms, umpires' rooms, a kiosk and a training and weights room. It will include a bar and function room with a supporting kitchen, as well as a balcony area with seating overlooking the oval;
- a realigned soccer pitch with new lighting and drainage;
- Little Athletics improvements, including new discus cages and shot-put circles;
- improved car parking;
- improved vehicle and pedestrian access across the site;
- new toilet amenities;
- softball club storage;
- upgrades to the entrance to the theatre;
- a new dog park; and
- improvements to tennis facilities.

The introduction of the dog park and improvements to pathways and signage aim to increase the use of the reserve for informal recreational activities, such as dog walking and exercise. The submitted plans also include additional tree planting to assist in increasing the reserve's tree canopy for the long term.

The Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing has confirmed that project management will be managed by the City of Tea Tree Gully's project management office and will follow best-practice processes. The project has adopted key sustainable development strategies to achieve sustainable objectives, which includes ensuring that the community and environment of the reserve are well protected and cared for.

Reduction of the carbon footprint will occur through the collective efforts of the community and council, and the consumption of natural resources will be minimised through reducing, re-using and recycling products and materials and using renewable resources. The clubroom will also incorporate active design strategies to ensure the sustainable development objectives are reached. Extensive consultation has been undertaken to advise on the new clubroom's location and design, with community engagement ongoing throughout the life cycle of the project.

After consultation with the Attorney-General's Department Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Unit, it was determined that there are no registered or reported Aboriginal sites, objects or ancestral remains within the project area. An assessment of the risk of encountering previously unknown and unrecorded Aboriginal heritage sites has been undertaken and has established that, because the land is within 200 metres of a watercourse, there may be a possibility of encountering Aboriginal sites and objects.

It has been noted that discovery protocols will be utilised should an inadvertent discovery be made during construction. There are no state, local or contributory non-Aboriginal heritage-listed places expected to be directly impacted by the project. The theatre building on site is listed as a local heritage site; however, there are no works proposed for the heritage-listed sections.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Tilley Recreation Park redevelopment. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Ryan McMahon, Chief Executive Officer, City of Tea Tree Gully; Justin Robbins, General Manager, Strategy and Finance, City of Tea Tree Gully; Greg Salmon, Manager, Project Management Office, City of Tea Tree Gully; Erica Vidinis, Strategic Project and Stakeholder Manager, City of Tea Tree Gully; and Tim Nicholas, Director, Corporate Strategy and Investment, Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing. I thank the witnesses for their time. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the member for King for expressing her support for the project.

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

Mrs PEARCE (King) (11:08): I rise to reflect the support from my local community for this very important upgrade. It is certainly something that I have heard at the many sporting clubs that utilise that space and also from local residents who take great pride in this park through all the many uses that they utilise it for. It is a big part of why this upgrade was a commitment that I made to our local community to ensure that it continues to service our community for generations to come.

Tilley Recreation Park is home to Golden Grove Little Athletics; the Golden Grove Tennis Club; the Golden Grove Boxing Gym; the Tea Tree Players, a fantastic theatre group that we have out in the north-east; and the Road Runners Softball Club, and it supports a wide range of social groups and organisations through the Tea Tree Gully council.

One of those, in fact, is the upcoming Talk Out Loud quiz night, raising important funds for mental health support in the north-eastern suburbs. But of course, most famously it is known for being the home of the Tea Tree Gully City Soccer Club. This is a club that consists of about 450 members who attend the facility on a weekly basis. It is a heavily engaged local community club that does a lot of work with local families in the area but also with our support services and volunteers. The club is famously known for hosting the amazing CFS Shield each year with another amazing local soccer club in my local community, the One Tree Hill Soccer Club.

What they do is raise important funds for two of our local CFS stations, the Salisbury station and the Tea Tree Gully station, to ensure that they can continue to do the vital work that they do, but also to give them an opportunity to thank them for everything they do in our community, particularly coming to the end of a very busy bushfire season. That event is actually coming up in a couple of weeks. I am looking forward to being there again with the member for Newland and the member for Wright, providing some support and some additional shelter for the activities of the day ahead.

As I said earlier, these upgrades will help to meet the community's needs for generations to come. It will help to ensure that they remain inclusive for the diverse range of uses at this park and also that they continue to remain fit for purpose. This desire from my local community to see this happen does go beyond the sporting clubs. It is also benefiting the general members of our community who like to come to the recreation park to walk around, to keep active and all the various activities that they can do there.

One of the most exciting features of the upgrade that benefits them that I have heard strongly about is the introduction of a dog park at this facility. Currently, we might see people walking around the facilities but our closest park is some while away, so this is an excellent way to get people out and active with their pets and also engaging with one another. With those very quick remarks, I would like to echo that this community strongly supports the upgrade of this facility.

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:12): I would like to again thank the member for King not only for her contribution to this debate and her support for this project but also for her contribution to the deliberations of the committee. However, it would be remiss of me not to mention the other members of the committee—the member for Elder, the member for Hartley and the member for Schubert—and again to thank them for their contributions to the consideration of this particular matter. I again commend this report to the house.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PRODUCE MARKETS POST-HARVEST BIOSECURITY PRECINCT PROJECT

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:12): I move:

That the 55th report of the committee, entitled 'South Australian produce markets post-harvest biosecurity precinct project', be noted.

The Department of Primary Industries and Regions, in collaboration with South Australian Produce Market Limited, proposes to construct a post-harvest biosecurity precinct for the South Australian Produce Market located in my electorate of Florey. The project is a major milestone project for South Australia that will transform the horticultural industry and has received strong support from industry and state and commonwealth governments.

A fumigation service with pressure cooling and an X-ray sterilisation technology service will be established to deliver a treatment service to growers that will enable export of all South Australian produce to overseas destinations. The precinct will also potentially benefit South Australian businesses across the food, health, medical and agriculture sectors.

The South Australian horticulture industry is valued at \$1.4 billion at the farm gate and represents over one million tonnes of produce. The industry employs 13,500 direct staff and 24,000 seasonal workers and provides fresh fruit, vegetables and nuts to the South Australian community daily. South Australian Produce Market Limited facilitates the exchange of produce between growers, wholesalers, retailers and consumers. It is expected that this project will enable growth of the horticulture sector revenue from \$3.5 billion to \$5 billion by 2030.

The capital cost of the development is \$49 million and will be funded through a mix of state and commonwealth funding as well as commercial and private investors. Currently, the project is in the tendering process, and I can say that it cannot come soon enough.

The Post-Harvest Biosecurity Precinct will be located on the site of the South Australian Produce Market in Pooraka. This initiative will minimise fruit fly impacts in South Australia and other pest diseases, grow and protect the sector, take a leadership position in biosecurity and provide export efficiency. Addressing biosecurity issues takes many forms and a significant fruit fly outbreak can cause the market and consequently the state to face critical food availability and contamination issues that need to be managed.

The South Australian Produce Market has stated that, as of November 2023, there had been 45 outbreaks of Queensland fruit fly, known as Qfly, in the Riverland, causing considerable stress for growers. A Mediterranean fruit fly outbreak occurred in South Australia in 2020, which cost the market \$1 million as there was no facility of this kind located here, therefore a fumigation and separate X-ray sterilisation technology service will serve as critical infrastructure to address these biosecurity issues.

The biosecurity precinct will provide benefits to the SA horticultural industry and include minimising supply chain disruptions, ensuring environmental stability and safeguarding the continuity of supply and market access for overseas and interstate markets, as well as the ability to manage significant outbreaks of fruit fly.

The technology utilised at the precinct will address demands in the sector, be accessible in all regions of South Australia and be used in multiple industries to ensure the products are verified and quality assured from start to finish. This will reduce the economic impact and maintain South Australia's status as the only fruit fly-free mainland state.

A fumigation service will address the needs of South Australian industry as:

- certain produce and other product categories are required to be treated before being transported interstate or overseas;
- fumigation is suited to low-cost produce;
- X-ray sterilisation technology is not accepted in all export countries;
- it enables produce to be treated at a central location and can be mobile into the regions; and
- fumigation has been used in SA on a small scale with two commercial operators based in the state.

The X-ray sterilisation technology processing service will address the needs of South Australian industry as:

- SA companies across food, health, medical and agriculture are incurring significant additional costs by needing to transport the produce interstate for treatment prior to export or for internal domestic use;
- it is an effective, more sustainable alternative to chemical treatments;

- growth in key industries identified by the state government, such as health, medical, defence and space, where SA has growing capabilities, seeks to attract local companies; and
- having an X-ray sterilisation technology processing service in our state will increase the state's value proposition for international companies to view South Australia as a place to have a presence, be that from a manufacturing sense or significant operations perspective, to service industry and customers in the broader Asia-Pacific region.

Sustainable development strategies have been incorporated into the fumigation and X-ray sterilisation technology systems to ensure they are cleaner and greener than other infrastructure currently used. This includes incorporating an efficient solar-powered electricity grid, which creates a 30 per cent reduction in carbon dioxide and enables the precinct to be completely self-sufficient in its energy supply, removing any threat of power outages. These sustainable strategies will ensure there is a healthy and sustainable future for the environment and horticulture sector to benefit future generations.

Extensive consultation and engagement have occurred with the relevant stakeholders, including the commonwealth, state and local governments. Additionally, preliminary discussions have occurred between the project team and the City of Salisbury in relation to consultation on the various planning, building and engineering divisions within the council.

After consultation with the Attorney-General's Department's Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation unit, it was determined that there are no registered or reported Aboriginal sites, objects or ancestral remains within the project area. There are no state, local or contributory non-Aboriginal heritage-listed places expected to be directly impacted by the project.

The committee examines written and oral evidence in relation to the South Australian Produce Markets Post-Harvest Biosecurity Precinct Project. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were: Professor Peter Appleford, Executive Director, Major Programs and Regions, Department for Primary Industries and Regions; Angelo Demasi, Chief Executive Officer, South Australian Produce Market; Paul Blandis, Commercial Financial Controller, South Australian Produce Market; and Peter Nicolaci, Senior Strategist, TSM Consulting. I thank the witnesses for their time.

I also take the opportunity to put on record my support as the local member for this particular project. Based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:19): I rise to support this committee report into the South Australian Produce Market's biosecurity actions that they are taking to protect this multibillion dollar industry that runs in many corners of the state. Angelo Demasi and his team do a magnificent job. This is a huge project which goes to making sure we keep fruit fly at bay. We note that many, many tens of millions—it is probably running into the hundred of millions of dollars in recent times—have been invested to control fruit fly throughout the state, whether it is the outbreaks that occur in the Riverland or in the city of Adelaide and other places. It is vital that this work continues at whatever level.

I note the sterile insect project that has been ongoing for several years now. We went to the launch of that quite a few years ago now.

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

Mr PEDERICK: You did. That is a great project so that we can keep up our status for exporting around the world. This project is vital because it will see the growth of the sector go from \$3.5 billion to \$5 billion by 2030. The estimated cost is just short of \$50 million, and it is funded through state and commonwealth funding and also through the South Australian Produce Market Limited and commercial and private investor contributions.

Obviously, as I said, it is about building facilities at the Produce Market site for the control of fruit fly, and that is absolutely needed. This is a major facility that has been open for quite a while

now as the new market area for South Australia, not just Adelaide, for those interstate exports, I guess you call them, that we send of our magnificent produce from this state.

As we know, horticulture has gone ahead in leaps and bounds, when you see broadacre horticulture practices applied here or interstate. When you think of it, years ago, decades ago, it was very small scale; it might be several acres. Now we are talking up to 1,000 acres of one crop. For instance, I will never forget seeing—and I know it is not in this state—1,000 acres of tomatoes grown in raised beds near Deniliquin. That is serious. The Italian family running it had their own packing shed, and that was quite a novel experience going through that as well. They were doing it from paddock to plate, essentially, the whole produce.

Very similar things happen here and right across the state. We have produce that has been grown in many areas around the north, in Virginia and Angle Vale, the Pedericks' old stomping ground. In many areas we see a lot of new technology, like we see in the Virginia area and up at Port Augusta, with trellised tomatoes and other crops that really boost production. Then we see the more broadacre practices that happen out at places like Parilla potatoes, Zerella Fresh.

Also, throughout my electorate I have many growers involved in the broadacre production of potatoes, onions, carrots and other vegetables right across the board. This has essentially brought bulk practices to a game—and it is a very serious game—to something that 40 years ago would not have even been envisaged on this scale of mass production to keep up with the demands of an ever-growing economy, not just here but overseas, because a lot of this stuff can be exported and is. I take my hat off to the people who have been prepared to spend tens of millions of dollars of their own money in developing projects so that they can produce this food.

I look at Zerella Fresh, for instance, in the Mallee: to accommodate workers they build homes in both Pinnaroo and Lameroo, which is a boost to the regional economy, to make sure we can house workers. It is one of those sectors, a bit like the food processing sector, where we absolutely rely on migrant workers to come in. We saw that during COVID, where we got Pacific Islanders in for various food processing sectors. But right across the board we are absolutely reliant on migrants coming in on various visas to make sure that we can have this production right across the board.

At the other end of it, obviously, are the produce markets, and they are so well set up. I have been around a couple of days. I can remember the East End produce markets; not everyone in here would. That was a magnificent place. It is totally different now down there. You are more likely to be able to go down for a beer than buy a carrot. It was quite a novel place back in the day. If you look at it compared to what we have got set up out of the markets there at Pooraka, it was quite niche.

In fact, a friend of mine, Paul Simmons, who is now the Mayor of Coorong: his family had a—I will call it a chocolate shop. They sold a whole range of bulk sweets. I think it was pretty handy that he had that shop for a while. They did quite well with a whole range of things—really more niche things like chocolates and other confectionery but other things as well: they sold a lot of seeds and that sort of thing. But, obviously, that disappeared with the market moving out to Pooraka.

So Pooraka will service this state and this country for many more years to come, as it does service the growers. More and more it is getting to I guess in a way what happens in farming: you get fewer growers at times, because it becomes more of a bulk commodity. But they do, as I have emphasised, have to employ many people just to get the process done. While there are robots and other machines in the packing sheds, it still needs people to do the preparation of ground, the sowing, the caring for products as they are grown in the soil, and then the harvest and the packing.

Then it gets through to the packing sheds and to the end result of the produce markets, which are truly top class. I applaud them for putting this technology in place with all the other partners. The more we can do to protect our valuable horticulture sector the better.

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (11:27): I, likewise, rise to wholeheartedly support this project that is happening out at the South Australian Produce Market. It is a wonderful facility. I was privileged in my time as Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development to spend time out at that facility to see what they do.

The work that is being done in this area in relation to biosecurity is so important. The management of fruit fly in this state is something I think we should be proud of as a state in the way

we have been able to manage it. We are sitting between the two varieties of fly, and being attacked from both sides, with Western Australia having Mediterranean fruit fly and the Eastern States having Queensland fruit fly. We are certainly having to hold that off here in South Australia.

Unfortunately, we do get outbreaks, and we have had a long-term outbreak in the Riverland. I am really pleased that the current government is continuing the good work to try to get on top of that. I must thank the staff at PIRSA. The work they do in this space is amazing, and the efforts they go to to try to get on top of this for the industry are so important; the efforts of the general public likewise.

Probably one of the things I was most proud of as minister was to see us get on top of the fruit fly outbreaks in the Adelaide areas that occurred during my time as minister. It was great to get on top of those. Unfortunately, we were not able to get on top of the Riverland ones. Interestingly, in the process, we were literally one week away from being on top of those outbreaks and we had one detection in the last week that kept it going, and sadly it has maintained that detections regime going forward.

It is such an important thing. It is something very important to our state. It gives us great access to sell our fruit worldwide. This will give the assurance that when we do have these difficulties of outbreaks of fruit fly we are still able to maintain market access. The ultimate is to get back to that freedom status in the Riverland so that we can sell those products fruit fly free. It is such a bonus to be able to do so.

As another aside, interestingly I have only ever seen fruit fly in two pieces of fruit in my lifetime. They were both while I was minister. One was a strawberry from Queensland and one was a piece of stone fruit from Victoria. Both had dead fruit fly larvae in them and both were from commercial facilities I was at: a supermarket and a restaurant that were serving these up. It is disappointing when they are there; we do not want them there. I really am pleased that we are supporting the industry by putting this facility there to maintain its access.

I implore the government to continue all efforts to get on top of the fruit fly outbreaks. It is very disappointing to hear that we have had a recent outbreak in the metropolitan area, and hopefully we can get on top of that relatively quickly. I implore the public to do the right thing. These outbreaks do not happen accidentally. It is that someone has brought something into a region they should not have and that has led to an outbreak. Please, members of the public, do what is right in managing fruit fly and looking after the wonderful growers in this state.

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:31): I would like to take the opportunity to thank those who have contributed to the debate on this motion: the member for Finnis and also the member for Hammond.

I also wanted to place on record how pleasing it was that I was able to spend some time with the member for Hammond and the member for Chaffey late last year at the Pooraka markets. It is always a pleasure to welcome people of any particular political persuasion to my electorate, but it was particularly good to be able to spend some time with the member for Chaffey and the member for Hammond under those particular circumstances.

The Pooraka markets are a fantastic facility, and I would encourage all members to pay a visit there to see a part of the industry of this state that perhaps we are not always exposed to. I would like to indicate to the house that I had a conversation with Mr Angelo Demasi yesterday, when he informed me that this particular facility is progressing well, which is good, because it is certainly needed at this particular time. Again, I take this opportunity to recommend this report to the house.

Motion carried.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: INNAMINCKA AND MOOMBA FACT-FINDING VISIT

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (11:33): I move:

That the fourth report of the committee for the Fifty-Fifth Parliament, entitled Innamincka and Moomba Fact-Finding Visit, be noted.

From 20 to 22 September last year, the Natural Resources Committee conducted a fact-finding visit to Innamincka and Moomba. This is the committee's report of that visit, and I encourage members and the public to read this report.

The purpose of the trip was to learn about the carbon capture and storage project of Santos at Moomba, which is a terrific investment on behalf of Santos. They are really trying to take a lead in carbon capture and storage. To go up there and witness it firsthand was terrific.

While we were there, we saw something that future generations will probably not see, which was a piece of kit made in Italy, flown out here, and it was not allowed to be opened until the Italian engineers were here to do it. Once that was put in place a few weeks later, then that was encased by the rest of the plant. It was a historic moment for us all to be up there.

I want to thank the management and staff of Santos, who were so welcoming and took us through a very detailed briefing about the procedures and then proceeded to take us on a tour of the site so that members of the committee could see it for themselves.

We also visited the settlement of Innamincka, a very important part of South Australia's history. It is a place that I have been fortunate enough to be going to since I was 14 years old, when we went on a school camp up the Birdsville Track and down the Strzelecki Track. For those South Australians who have not been to our outback, it is one of the most spectacular places in the world, and it is right on our doorstep and is not that far away.

Check the road conditions but, by and large, it is pretty easy to get around. You can get all the way up to Marree on the bitumen these days. The Strzelecki Track is being surfaced, and we were told by the local residents that that will bring with it some more challenges as it opens up that part of the world to people with caravans and not so high-end four-wheel drives, so there will be more visitors, and that is great thing for people to see. However, we need to make sure that there is an investment there in resources to be able to meet the demand of all these extra tourists.

I do not think too many politicians make it to Innamincka. We invited the eight local residents to come and have dinner with us and discuss any issues they had. It was not contained to things regarding natural resources, I might let the parliament know. There were aspects about health, aspects about development, about water and many other subjects that were covered. It was terrific for the five of us who were there—I do not reckon Innamincka would have seen five politicians at the same time. I am sure the local member and various ministers have been up there from time to time, but it was a really good opportunity for those of us who represent remote locations. I include in that Kangaroo Island. Because of the water, it is hard to get on and off the island, a lot harder than it is if you just have to drive somewhere without getting on a boat or a plane.

I want to thank the member for Gibson, the member for Waite, the Hon. Frank Pangallo and the Hon. Russell Wortley, who went on that trip to Innamincka and to Moomba, and Alison Meeks, the parliamentary officer, and Jennefer Bagaporo, the research officer. I would also like to thank them for all the work they put into planning the trip, taking all the notes and putting together the report. I am sure members and members of the public will find it interesting.

I want to thank the National Parks and Wildlife staff as well, who are so passionate and proud of the very special 1.3 million-hectare park that they look after at Innamincka. Their knowledge is extraordinary. It was great to spend time with them, not just out in the park but along the Cooper Creek and also sitting around and talking to them about what they see as the challenges with more people coming up to the area and things like that.

There are challenges but also opportunities. We should make sure that we stay ahead of the curve on that, and make sure that we do everything we can to create opportunities for people, not let them down if they get there and make sure that we have the resources there for them to have a good time.

I would really like to thank traditional owner, Robert Singleton, as well. He is also director of the Yandruwandha Yawarrawarrka Traditional Land Owners (Aboriginal Corporation). Robert's insights and knowledge were unbelievable. Every single member of the committee really enjoyed Robert's insights and the knowledge that he so graciously shared with us. He told us some amazing stories. He told us also about the great cooperation that is happening with Santos.

He said that back in the early days they would go and do stuff and then maybe think, 'Gee, that went a bit wrong,' but now everything that is done is done in consultation with the traditional owners. He said it is a very good relationship at the moment. He also spoke about the opportunities

and risks associated with sealing the Strzelecki Track and what that might bring in a few years' time. It was really good for us all to hear from Robert about his view.

I commend the members of the committee for their time and work on this visit and acknowledge the important work that the committee staff has done in pulling the report together. I commend the report to the house.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:40): I rise to speak to the Innamincka and Moomba fact-finding visit. Apart from having a longstanding interest in that area, I worked there 40 years ago and have made multiple trips since. It is a fantastic part of the world. There is oil drilling and exploration, and obviously gas in the Cooper Basin through to Queensland and the Northern Territory.

I really salute Santos for going to great lengths to get this carbon capture and storage process in place. The beauty of it is that they will use depleted wells. A lot of these depleted wells are close to Moomba, fields like Moomba itself, Moomba South, and Big Lake where we did a lot of work on various wells then. Back in the day, there were 11 drill rigs operating and one workover rig, so there were a lot of holes getting drilled. These rigs would each drill a hole 10,000 feet in a month in the old days, so they had to have sites built. When I was earthmoving, we were doing that work.

What we see with this carbon capture and storage are those depleted wells, which, more likely than not, were fractured wells. From March 1983 to March 1984, I was a junior hand working on wireline teams and we did conventional fracturing of gas wells. That certainly opens up the reserves underground, the reservoir. The beauty of that is that those reservoirs, which are now depleted, can be used for this carbon capture and storage project, which helps offset not just carbon emissions but potentially emissions from elsewhere.

It is interesting to note that there is a lot of disinformation around fracturing gas and oil wells. I have been on a trip to America to look at it. Standing here today, there is probably a well either being conventionally fractured or unconventionally fractured to get those vital assets. The state will need gas for at least 30 years, I believe, as we transition to other forms of energy.

I note that the member for Mawson mentioned the Strzelecki Track. We instigated that \$215 million project to seal the 472 kilometres of the Strzelecki Track. Yes, there will be some new, interesting times when people can basically drive up there in a mini because now you have the challenge of at least being organised. I always take a satellite phone so if anything goes wrong I can talk to people.

There is a road directly east of Moomba, the Della Road, which was like a highway 40 years ago. Now it is just rutted. It is a main arterial route heading from Moomba to Della, Dullingari, Toolachee and other fields and heads out to Dillons Crossing, where you head north again to Innamincka. That road needs major work. It got to the stage, for safety reasons, when I was there, that they pulled the speed limit back on basin roads to 80 km/h. They are now at 60 km/h. Tourists can chug past at 80 ks and you feel like you are almost speeding going past a road train that is literally rattling along, shaking to bits, at 60 km/h.

It does not do much for productivity and there are many, many hundreds of kilometres to traverse. In the old days of going up there, they used to joke that the pallets of food and even the beer cans had their labels rattled off and they had disappeared by the time they got to the Moomba camp.

The resealing is a project that not only will assist this state well into the future, and not just the oil and gas industry, but it will be another link right through to Brisbane. It will also assist our pastoral industry, to get that stock down south to the processing works or to get stock up there when they are in times of plenty of feed and plenty of rain.

I am disappointed in how the contract has been running out for the Strzelecki Track build. I am very proud that we started that when in government. It is a very stop-start operation, which concerns me greatly. Only 40 per cent is complete. There is a section of Dillons and a section further south near the Strzelecki Creek, south of Moomba, that need a bit more engineering to get up to speed. Both sections are about 20 kilometres. Obviously, you want to get it right before the paving goes in because it will be hit with a heap of traffic: road trains, tourists and others. You need that

right because otherwise it will just fall apart. So I am disappointed it is taking so long. It seems to be such a stop-start process.

It is not handy for contractors who have contracting camps that cost \$50,000 to move whenever they have to move them. They just leave them up there in the Cooper Basin, and it is just not on. They really should just get on with it and get it done. We cannot have the excuse that has come out that we have had 94 days of wet weather when there have been over a thousand days of dry weather when the project could go on. There are things happening now with the road as it is.

On one trip coming home, I had what was probably the funniest couple of nights of my whole life. I was up there with my 16-year-old son at the time, Angus. We were at Innamincka and parked near the Cooper Creek. We had a great week up there. It started to rain a bit as we packed up and, because you are packing up a camper trailer and all the gear, that takes quite a while. We got to the shop and they said, 'You won't get home because it will be wet at Murdi,' which is about 60 kilometres south of Moomba. I said, 'We're going to give it a crack.' Well, we got down there, and there were about nine road trains pulled up—there is a stretch of bitumen there—and they said, 'You're not going anywhere.' Once they saw us pull the barbecue out of the back of the camper, we ended up being the caterers and had quite an entertaining time for a couple of nights, because no-one was going anywhere.

That is the issue with the Strzelecki Track: it takes nothing to get it too wet in a lot of spots; and there is a lot of freight that needs to go up and down that road and not just for the oil and gas industry. The issue for me is that a lot of that freight is now coming in from the Queensland side. It is bitumenised through Adventure Way from the Queensland border through to Innamincka—a 30-kilometre stretch that has been done for a few years now. I have not seen all the piece that has been bitumenised down towards Dillons Crossing near to Della Road but it certainly will change the face of the basin, and we need people to be alert to outback driving conditions when they go up there and also to respect that it is a working area.

It goes to show how low impact the oil and gas industry is. Once the oil wells go in, there are basically underground lines through to a satellite station and then straight into Moomba. A lot of the time you have to look really hard to even find a gas well. I showed a photo to some young lads one day. I said, 'Well, there's gas.' They could just see a gas well that was protected by about four strands of barbed wire to keep the cattle off, and that was it. The site had been rehabilitated when the hole had been drilled and all the other activities were done to get that production online.

Certainly, in regard to carbon capture and storage and the work Santos has been doing up there for probably close to 60 years or more now, it has brought a lot of wealth into this state and they are looking at what they can do to not only offset the carbon, as I indicated earlier, but get it stored underground.

I wish them all the best with that project and I urge anyone who has never been up there—it is only 1,000 kilometres—to just go for a drive. You have bitumen for 40 per cent of the Strez, past Lyndhurst, and you have bitumen to Lyndhurst, just the other side of Leigh Creek. It is well worth a look. I commend the motion and wish Santos and its partners all the very best with the carbon capture and storage project.

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (11:50): I rise in support of this fourth report of the Natural Resources Committee, a committee of which I am a member. The report is about our trip to Innamincka and Moomba. It was an incredible trip. I have never been so far north before. There is almost nothing there, but when you look at it from above it is like Aboriginal paintings. It is so incredible to see all of the natural resources, all of the rivers, lakes—all of it. It was just amazing.

I echo the sentiments of the Chair in thanking everybody who helped us get there, including Alison in our chamber. We had a wonderful time. It was interesting to meet with the locals to talk about their challenges, not only in the work they do every day but also in the isolation they sometimes feel up there. I had a really great conversation with Tegan, one of the owners of the Innamincka Station. She talked about how hard it is to even talk with other women in the area, especially when you have young children and have those children trying to socialise with other children. Not only do we get to go on these trips and look at things the committee is interested in, but we also get to engage with local residents, which is lovely seeing what it is like for them.

I would like to thank Rob Singleton, who is an Yandruwandha Yawarrawarrka man. He took us on an incredible journey through Innamincka, all the way through to the Cullyamurra petroglyphs, which are rock carvings at least 4,000 years old, although he will say older. It was such a magical place to be to see that history, to think about what happened there and what those petroglyphs meant. It was a very special place for men and boys, he told us, so we were very fortunate to be able to go there. I congratulate him on his nomination for the South Australian Voice as well.

We were very lucky to be taken around by National Parks and Wildlife Service: Paul McKinnon from National Parks in the area and Penny from Dig Tree, a Dig Tree ranger. Tony Magor, who was the manager of that area but is now the manager of Mount Lofty Ranges and looks after my area, is always very helpful and knowledgeable—him and Stuart Paul, the district regional operations manager. They took us around. We had wonderful conversations about how they manage the national parks up there and how the integration between the national parks and the pastoralist areas and the animals that flow between the two occur.

We were very lucky to go there; I will definitely put it on my list to go back. All the people at the Innamincka pub were lovely and looked after us with great hospitality, and it was such a great opportunity to see something completely different and to see what was happening up there. We visited Moomba as well, and it was fascinating to see the transition towards a sustainable future, taking their emissions, compressing them and putting them into the disused gas wells. It is an incredible opportunity for them to become almost carbon negative, which is exciting, and to see their work in electrifying some of the areas and what opportunities exist further for areas like that.

I thank everybody involved—all the staff who took us there, all the committee members and the Chair for his leadership—and I commend the report to the house.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:53): I thank the committee for making the journey up into the Cooper Basin. It is a great part of our state. On reflection, I spent some of my younger days up in the Cooper Basin, working out of Moomba Central. Back in those days we spent a lot of time on the roads. Whether on the Innamincka or the Strzelecki Track, it was always an adventure. As I think the member for Hammond said, back in those days it was not much more than a goat track that used to wreck vehicles on a regular basis. It was good to see that members of the Natural Resources Committee could get up there and have a look not only at the natural environment but also at one of the great natural resources in this nation and, importantly, in South Australia.

My tenure up there was in the early to mid or late eighties. I went up there as a maintenance fitter, and it was a great experience to work in Moomba Central itself. Moomba town has a population of about four people, but Moomba Central has a transient population, fly-in fly-out. What it presented not only to the state's economy but also the training and the skills that people went up there with and came away with really was an eye opener, and it was for me.

As I said, I worked in the maintenance department within the processing plant for about 12 months. I was ever looking for opportunity, and along the way I went out as a private contractor working for Supervision Engineering Services. It was a great contracting company to work for, and I was able to claw my way up as a project manager up there for pipe construction.

That is basically what Moomba Central is about: it is a conglomeration of pipes and vessels. We piped gas into what we called 'the trains', and I hope the committee did get into Moomba Central to have a look at what the trains represent. Essentially, raw gas is pumped to the bottom of these train sets and solution is pumped to the top of it. That is what cleans the gas and turns raw gas into natural gas.

Over time, while I was up there we saw construction of the LRP, the liquid recovery plant. That is where the precious gases are extracted out of the natural form of gas, and that is where the value add was developed, I guess.

The history is that Delhi was the founding business in about 1966 or 1968. It went on and morphed into a partnership with Santos while I was there. What we saw was a formation of the MAPS system. The MAPS system is all about the pipeline, the distribution of the gases and condensate, remembering that Moomba Central is a processing plant but the Cooper Basin is a huge network of

wells, from which they extracted a lot of natural gas but also a lot of condensate and a lot of raw, sour water.

Delhi-Santos was a very productive partnership, if you like, and then later we saw the formation of Beach with a partnership with Santos. That has seen highs and lows, and while I was up there we saw the lowest price return for natural gas and condensate in 1985. Of course, we also went on to see the highs in about 2005.

While I was up there we were following some of the exploration wells, and some of those exploration wells they would explore and find deposits or reservoirs of the natural resource. Some of it had some orifices put in so they could continue that gas or condensate coming up to the surface to be pumped into the production facility. It was done at a very, very small and slow pace at that time because the prices were very low. Everything is driven by commodity price.

Without too much further ado, it was a great opportunity to experience the Cooper Basin, the Strzelecki Track and Innamincka. As my time runs out I will sit down and I guess rejoice on some of the great memories I had up in the Cooper Basin.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (11:59): I want to thank the member for Chaffey and the member for Hammond for taking us on those wonderful trips down memory lane or the Strzelecki Track, and also my fellow committee member, the member for Waite. Once again, I would like to thank everyone who was involved in this report and I commend it to the house.

Motion carried.

Bills

INTERVENTION ORDERS (PREVENTION OF ABUSE) (SECTION 31 OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (11:59): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Following its passage through the Legislative Council, we now consider in this place the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) (Section 31 Offences) Amendment Bill 2024. We know that intervention orders are a really important part of the ecosystem of action on domestic violence across the four domains of prevention, early intervention, response, and recovery and healing. We know that intervention orders are absolutely vital in helping to prevent a recurrence of domestic violence and that crucially they help those experiencing the horror of domestic violence to feel and to be safer.

I am really proud of our work in the lead-up to 2009 to introduce the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act itself, and of our work from opposition to significantly strengthen penalties for those who breach intervention orders. I am also proud of our extensive and enduring work to help prevent and to tackle domestic violence and its underlying cause, gender inequality.

Since coming to government, we have progressed legislation to include the experience of domestic violence as a ground for discrimination in the Equal Opportunity Act, for the first time giving those who experience discrimination as a result of their experience of domestic violence, whether that be at work or in seeking housing, an avenue to make a complaint about that discrimination and an avenue for recourse via the equal opportunity commissioner.

We have also legislated to ensure that those who are employed pursuant to the state industrial relations system, the state Fair Work Act, can now access 15 days' paid domestic violence leave. Amongst many other initiatives, we have funded southern and northern metropolitan domestic violence prevention and recovery hubs and restored funding to the Domestic Violence Court Assistance Service and to Catherine House, to name just a few aspects of our program of extensive reform. And this week, we have announced the Royal Commission into Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence, its terms of reference and that it will be led by eminent South Australian and tireless advocate for change at a state, national and, indeed, global level, Natasha Stott Despoja AO.

This bill amends the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009 to address a historical charging error in relation to offences under section 31 of that act. Section 31 contains offences for breaches of intervention orders under the act. Section 31(1) is considered a less serious offence of contravening a term of an intervention order which requires participation by the defendant in an intervention program. This offence carries a maximum penalty of a \$2,000 fine or imprisonment for two years, with an expiation fee of \$315. Section 31(2) is considered a more serious offence of contravening any other term of an intervention order. This offence carries a maximum penalty of three years' imprisonment for a basic offence and five years for an aggravated offence.

In September last year, the Attorney-General was informed that it had been identified that defendants had been charged with and found guilty of a less serious section 31(1) offence, where they should instead have been charged with and found guilty of an offence of breaching section 31(2) of the act. I am advised that this incorrect charging came about as a result of an error in a form used by SAPOL prosecutors to lay charges. I am also advised that nearly all of these prosecutions were resolved by way of a guilty plea and that the defendant was sentenced by the court on the basis of their admitted uncontested or proven conduct as if the prosecution were indeed for the more serious section 31(2) offence.

It is important to note that this error has not exposed any person to a greater penalty than they would have been liable for had they been found guilty of the offence of breaching section 31(2) of the act. Nonetheless, review proceedings may be available to those persons. The advice to government is that this issue arose after the commencement of the act in 2011 and continued until an error in South Australia Police's charging system was finally remedied in May 2019.

In practice, this was an error in SAPOL's charging system, which produces the required documents to lay a complaint or information before a court. The advice is that a full audit of all matters has identified 771 files, with 700 individual defendants to whom this error applies. This bill represents the government's legislative response to this historical charging error. It provides a pathway for fresh prosecutions to be brought and for the safety of the community, particularly survivors of domestic violence, to be rightfully maintained.

This bill would enact a scheme to apply to any review proceedings initiated by defendants that may be permitted by the court to be commenced out of time. Specifically, the bill will establish a process whereby fresh prosecutions for a section 31(2) offence could be brought out of time and be heard and determined in the same review court that is dealing with any appeal or review by a defendant for section 31(2) proceedings.

If these section 31(2) proceedings are contested, the review court has a discretion to remit the matter to a court of summary jurisdiction for trial, to deal with in the ordinary way. It provides that any agreed or undisputed facts received in the original sentencing proceedings for the offence against section 31(1) are, unless excluded in the court's discretion, admissible as evidence of the conduct in fact engaged in on the occasion alleged, for the purposes of the section 31(2) proceedings.

It provides for the offsetting of the previously imposed penalty, including costs and a levy imposed under the Victims of Crime Act 2001, against any sentence imposed in the fresh section 31(2) proceedings, including removing any liability to repay to the defendant any fine or compensation paid by the defendant. It amends section 31(2ab) of the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act to permit a person's section 31(1) conviction to be taken into account for the purposes of a second or subsequent contravention offence in subsection 31(2aa) of that act.

The bill also provides that no liability attaches to the Crown for false imprisonment or any other act or omission relating to proceedings involving these incorrect charges. As stated earlier, this error has not exposed any person to a greater penalty than they would have been liable for, had they been charged and found guilty of the correct offence.

Advice was, rightly, sought on the time line of events in this matter. The advice is that this error began in December 2011 upon the commencement of the act. In June 2017, the issue was identified and a warning was put in place in the SAPOL system to prevent the error from recurring. However, I am advised that a change in SAPOL database systems in 2018 led to this warning being

lost and the error recurring. This continued until May 2019, when the issue was finally addressed in SAPOL systems and no further incorrect charges were laid.

I am advised that in November 2019 former Attorney-General the Hon. Vickie Chapman and former Minister for Police the Hon. Corey Wingard were briefed on this issue. The current Attorney-General was advised of this issue in September 2023. In the months that followed, the Attorney-General received a significant and comprehensive body of advice from the Solicitor-General, the Crown Solicitor and the Attorney-General's Department on how this issue could best be addressed. Those efforts have led to the government now introducing this bill. It is worth noting that the former government did not take legislative action to address this issue. It is unclear to the government why ministers in the former Liberal government did not appear to have taken action.

This bill is overdue. Its passage is absolutely critical in maintaining community confidence in the justice system and protecting the courageous survivors of domestic and family violence. It is utterly regrettable that mistakes over the previous decade have necessitated this bill, but the government believes that it is incumbent on this government and this parliament to address these historical errors. 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

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009*

3—Amendment of section 31—Contravention of intervention order

These amendments allow a *deemed subsection (1) offence* (which is defined) to be taken into account in determining whether a contravention of an intervention order is a second or subsequent contravention for the purposes of section 31(2aa).

4—Insertion of section 31A

This amendment inserts new section 31A:

31A—Special provisions applying to review or appeal in relation to certain offences against section 31

If applicable review proceedings are instituted in a court (whether before or after the commencement of the provision) in relation to a person's conviction or sentence for an offence charged against section 31(1) of the Act, provision is made for—

- those review proceedings to be heard by the Supreme Court constituted by a single Judge; and
- the person to be prosecuted (in the same proceedings) for an offence against section 31(2) (defined as *section 31(2) proceedings*) in respect of the conduct to which the conviction for the offence charged against section 31(1) relates.

Provision is also made in relation to the time within which the section 31(2) proceedings may be commenced, the admissibility of certain evidence in such proceedings, considerations relating to sentencing a person for an offence against section 31(2) and other relevant matters.

Certain other matters are provided for, including a provision relating to liability of the Crown in relation to acts and omissions in respect of offences charged against section 31(1).

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (12:12): I rise to indicate the opposition's support for the bill and that I am the lead speaker in this place. I will make some contribution in terms of the change that is to be effected by this bill and the context in which it arises. The minister has walked through what is now a fairly lengthy historical context of a systematic error that was applied, as the minister has indicated and as I am advised also, as a result of part of the process that SAPOL uses to generate information—a drop-down list, I think—and that it somehow had been the practice during that period

from 2011 for many years and had been spotted and rectified, and then somehow managed to slip itself back into use.

The result of that was the two alternative offences for contravention of an intervention order that are available: one is the general contravention and the other is the section 31(1) contravention, being the contravention of a term that requires attendance at a course. So section 31(1) deals specifically with the terms of an intervention order that are the subject of section 13 of the primary act, which deals with the intervention programs. Section 13 provides:

An intervention order may require the defendant to undergo an assessment by the intervention program manager to determine...a form of intervention program—

and the defendant would then be required to participate in that program. That is quite thoroughly particularised at section 13. The section 31(1) offence is supposed to be concerned with the contravention of a term that is specifically connected to any of those aspects under section 13.

Broadly, it might be described as participation in an intervention program, but it might include any of the range of things, as I understand it, that are set out in section 13, including enabling the assessment of suitability for a program, the establishment of the appropriate program, and so on and so forth. Suffice to say that it is a particular form of contravention, and, for perhaps obvious reasons, the maximum penalty is somewhat lower than the maximum penalty that attaches to the general contravention provision in section 31(2).

A section 31(1) contravention attracts a maximum term of imprisonment of two years and, to illustrate its more discrete nature, there is also a money penalty that is available to the court, as well as an expiation fee. So it is clearly contemplated, on the face of the legislation, that section 31(1) is capable of being dealt with not only summarily but, in appropriate cases, by expiation; whereas the section 31(2) offence is about establishing the offence of contravention of any of the other terms of the intervention order, which, put plainly, include the substantive and direct protection terms that will be contained in the intervention order.

The contravention of any of those attracts, in the case of a basic offence, a maximum penalty of imprisonment for three years, which is marginally more than the maximum penalty available under section 31(1), and, in respect of an aggravated offence under that provision, imprisonment for up to five years.

So it is clear that the legislative intent sets a level of seriousness at a higher level in terms of the contravention of any of those terms of an intervention order, other than those discrete contraventions that might occur by reference to the section 13 intervention program requirements. That is the context of the section 31 contravention of intervention order provisions. We have heard about what has occurred in practice.

I indicate, as I think I have been able to do more or less universally in this space, my appreciation for the provision of a timely and thoroughgoing briefing from the Attorney-General's office and department. In these sorts of circumstances, that is of particular helpfulness. These are matters that are best determined with the benefit of advice and best determined upon the consideration by government with the benefit of those resources. The minister has referred to, I think, a further round of consideration that occurred, including advice, I think the minister has referred to, provided to the Attorney-General sometime last year in 2023.

It is clearly a matter that has occurred in not one but two episodes. It is something that has been managed and considered on a number of occasions, particularly over the last few years. While I do not have access to the advice that was provided to government last year—and I make no complaint about that; that is ordinarily appropriate—I understand that the advice is that it is appropriate to move now in this way. Hence, we see the bill that has been introduced to amend the act to deal with the possibility that there are individuals who might be affected, looking to deal with the matter and otherwise to regularise the circumstances of those matters in which there has been prosecution and sentencing erroneously under section 31(1) where section 31(2) ought to have been properly the context.

As we understand it, these are circumstances in which the evidence of, in relevant cases, the section 31(2) offending has formed the grounds upon which the offending has been proved and

the offender has been sentenced, and as a consequence in the cases in which that error has occurred it has been the result that the offender cannot have been sentenced to any penalty that is greater than what ought to have been available. In the case of a basic offence, there is a year less in terms of the maximum term of imprisonment.

I might just flag a curiosity about whether or not it is known if there is any example of an aggravated case that might have been a different source of identification of the offence by reason of the fact that it was aggravated, because there is no such aggravated offence in section 31(1). I am not, as I stand here, aware of any. The disparity between the two available penalties would be more significant in that case—two years out to five years.

If it is known, then to the extent that there is any victim who is aggrieved by the practice, it may be an opportunity to put at rest, at least to that extent, any concern about an offender going underpunished and particularly in those circumstances where it is the aggravated offence under section 31(2) that ought to have been the basis for sentencing. In both of those cases it is true to say that the offender is no worse off as a result of any erroneous reference to section 31(1) as a basis for penalty as opposed to where it ought to have been.

I note, as has been the necessary case in the course of this parliament so often, the bill was introduced in another place and has then come to the House of Assembly, having been passed by the Legislative Council, and so the debate has already occurred, and we have the benefit of that occurring just in recent days. So I am not the first to draw attention to the disquiet, I would perhaps characterise it, although others might describe it in other ways: the caution that has been expressed by the Law Society by its letter to the Attorney that is dated 4 March this year, just a few days ago, by which the Law Society notes the mechanical purpose or the regularising purpose of the bill but cautions about any practice of legislating to regularise in this way, if that is a benign way of putting it, in such a way that might give rise to a deprivation of rights.

Having flagged an interest in the question of whether the full available penalty was not actually availed, and particularly in section 31(2) aggravated circumstances, I just note, on the other side of the coin, the Law Society's concern about legislation adopting a method that might, not necessarily in these circumstances but in others, deprive rights by applying general provisions. I reference the debate in the other place because the letter from the Law Society has already come to particular attention in the course of that debate.

I might just pause to quote from a part of it, under the heading 'Utility of legislation and deprivation of rights' and from numbered paragraph 5:

5. The Society queries the utility of the mechanisms set out in proposed section 31A. It is difficult to ascertain why the imposition of a review process is necessary at all to correct any implications arising from the historical charging error, or to envisage a situation where an offender would seek to review such a sentence.
6. Despite references to appeal proceedings being available to offenders who have been incorrectly charged, it would appear the Bill may provide the prosecution with the ability to also apply under the new scheme.
7. There may have been people convicted of the lesser offence but sentenced on the actual facts of the matter (which would have been a breach by something other than not attending a program as is required by section 31(1)) and the penalty actually applied was that of the more serious offence. In such circumstances it is difficult to see how and why such a person (or the prosecution) would appeal, or even why there would be an appeal other than to correct the section name of the offence as the offence on the face of it would have been properly dealt with.
8. Noting this, the Society queries whether the charging error is appropriately addressed by the simple inclusion of a 'deeming' provision.

I pause there just to indicate that those are questions I think I have had the opportunity to ask and have answered in the course of a briefing. The reason I describe the Law Society's concern in these circumstances as rising as high as a caution is that there is not, as I read it, a specific detriment that is adverted to in the society's letter but rather, I guess, a concern about a generalised process that will be deeming a set of circumstances that were not actually applied at the time and highlighting, I suppose, that for practical purposes it is unlikely that anyone other than the prosecution would be wanting to avail itself of the changes.

I do not understand that there is any contemplated example of the Crown wanting to avail itself of these provisions but rather to ensure that, where sentencing has occurred on a 31(1) basis, it is not, for those technical reasons alone, set aside.

So the Law Society has expressed a view, and it is important that there is an opportunity not only for the Courts Administration Authority, in this case dealing with the practical consequences of the case load before the courts, but the courts themselves and the Crown Solicitor to express a view and to provide advice, respectively.

It is good that there is an opportunity for the Law Society to express a view ahead of legislation of this nature being debated. I do not know the reason why the Law Society's letter has come as recently as it has. I just say that, as a matter of general observation, the more opportunity there is ahead of the introduction of legislation of this kind for there to be that particular stakeholder engagement, and to that I would add the South Australian Bar Association, the better.

It is not only a matter of courtesy but it is for the reason that there is almost invariably, I cannot think of any example, in fact, I would say invariably, a considered and thorough-going source of review and consideration that comes from both the society and the Bar Association. It is valuable feedback in these circumstances and really ought to be taken on board in a timely way and wherever that is really practicable. I do not suggest that has or has not occurred in any particular way for the purposes of this bill, but I do just highlight that. The letter from the Law Society is on the public record and might be referred to in the context of future analogous legislation.

I might not have made it completely explicit—I have already just sort of selectively referred to part of the Law Society's response—but it is fair to say that the Law Society is also concerned about circumstances in which there is an indemnification of the Crown in a blanket kind of way. I take that on board and have some empathy with that view. It ought to be something that is looked at very closely. The Law Society refers to it, in this regard, as follows:

Notwithstanding the assurances as to people not being subjected to a greater penalty than they otherwise would have, the Society queries the justification for the exclusion from liability. This aspect of the legislation is to be questioned; a widespread and systemic problem that attracts specific legislation should not simultaneously deprive a member of the community from a civil remedy that they might otherwise be entitled to. This is especially true in the event that a systemic problem resulted in the deprivation of their liberty.

That is specifically in the context of the proposed section 31A(5). All of that is noted.

I think it is the sincere expectation that the result of the bill is that there is no consequential action. I do not know what consequential action might arise. As I say, I am interested in that particular part of the history that I have highlighted, but I am approaching this bill in circumstances where I am not anticipating—and it is my understanding that the government is not anticipating—that there will be consequential action that results from it, rather it will regularise what has occurred in error in the past.

Turning to the broader context in which this legislation is applied, reference has been made by the minister, in the course of the debate, to the steps that have been taken and a government announcement, also during the course of this week, in terms of the royal commission into the prevention of domestic and family violence. I take the opportunity to welcome the appointment of Natasha Stott Despoja to lead the royal commission. It is an important task and, as has been said in a whole variety of different forums over now several months, it is a matter that has been called for across opposition and crossbench parties, alongside the peak body and leading advocates in this area, now since November of last year.

The government's choice of royal commissioner is, in my view, an inspired one. The work that the royal commission has ahead of it is important work indeed. There is an indication that has been given this week, not only the appointment of the royal commissioner but also an indication of the range of topics that might constitute terms of reference for the royal commission. I trust that that is something that is refined and determined finally in conjunction with those stakeholders, and chief among them Embolden.

It is a matter of some ongoing concern that the government at first took some several weeks, following calls in November last year for the establishment of the royal commission, to come around to agree that the royal commission would be established and funded. I am glad it did. That was in

December. That it has taken until now, March of this year, before those key elements have been determined, is somewhat disappointing. I say that in circumstances where, having come around to the view that a royal commission would be funded, the government was very clear in December last year that it intended to fund and drive a commission process that would be started and completed with urgency, with dispatch, with a view to making sure that it could identify recommendations that could be applied towards improved outcomes and without delay.

So the fact that it has taken until now, until March, for these key building blocks to be announced, is somewhat disappointing. The fact that we learn this week that the royal commission will not start until July this year, again, will be a source of disappointment for those who made those urgent calls back in November. We understand, then, that the commissioner is charged with the responsibility to complete the work of the commission and to report by July in 2025. We will—

The Hon. K.A. Hildyard: Do you want to talk about your record on DV: cutting Catherine House funding, cutting the court assistance service—really?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order!

Mr TEAGUE: So we will now look to put our shoulder to the wheel to do what we can to support the work of the royal commission, particularly when it is up and running later in the year. I have already been in contact with the royal commissioner with my congratulations and expressing my interest to be engaged in that process as much as may be helpful. I have known the commissioner all my life—almost—and hold the commissioner in the highest regard.

I am sure that, as someone who is very widely respected throughout South Australia and around the country, indeed, throughout the world in the range of her extraordinary achievements, she is very well placed to lead the way in terms of where to from here. But that is the work of the year ahead, commencing, as we understand it, in July.

Some words of context about the royal commission that will, we hope, drive improved outcomes over the medium term: in terms of the important work of the headline act and the availability of intervention orders in circumstances of prevention of abuse, I cannot highlight anymore than to stay with those important matters that are to be addressed by the royal commission in any way more effectively the importance of the proper functioning of this legislation.

The availability of process to apply intervention orders in circumstances of abuse is one of the key measures that needs to function in the interests of the safety of those particularly in circumstances of domestic abuse. We bear in mind that the act goes considerably more broadly than that awful context as well. It also serves the important work of providing for intervention orders associated with problem gambling, with tenancy and also with non-domestic abuse and in other circumstances.

So the act has important and wideranging work to do. The need to correct this matter of historical process in terms of the application of orders and their contravention in terms of section 31 is a matter that, as I have indicated, has been the source of advice to government, including last year, and in those circumstances the opposition is pleased to support those changes.

We will look forward to an ongoing review of the operation of the act to ensure that it is doing all the work that it can possibly and appropriately do to protect the focus on those victims of domestic abuse and also those others. We will welcome opportunities to continue to revisit the bill as and when that may be necessary. So in all of those circumstances, I commend the bill to the house and I think I have flagged that particular area of interest in terms of the committee process.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (12:50): I take this opportunity to make a contribution on this bill. It may come across as being quite a technical bill but it does reflect where we are, how far we have come and how much further we need to go to protect women in particular from violence, and domestic violence in particular. I have the ABS statistics of homicide-related offences in South Australia; that is, figures available in 2022. There were 29 victims of homicide-related offences of which more than half—15—were women, and we know that the likely perpetrators of those women would be men who are known to them.

It is a cancer, if you like, that runs right across our community. It starts with coercive control and people who are obsessed with their relationships, and those relationships break down. Usually, the person who has chosen to leave the relationship becomes a victim of domestic violence, and it happens right across the social demographic table.

It does not matter whether you are of a poor background, a background of multigenerational welfare or whether you are successful in your career—we know that there have been some horrific stories of domestic violence when women and children have lost their lives at the hands of men, so intervention orders and AVOs need to be taken seriously. I was pleased to read the briefing here that the situation this bill is amending has not caused anyone to have a higher penalty or a lower penalty than what is required in order to administer the act, and for it to act as a protection and a deterrent. So it does not matter what area you come from, and I was just reflecting on some of the cases that would relate to those in this chamber.

Everybody would remember the former member for Dobell, Craig Thomson, who I believe was from the Health Services Union. He was charged with fraud on union members. After his time in parliament, he also pleaded guilty to a series of violence-related charges against his ex-partner and breaching an AVO. So you can see that even people who excel in their careers and are in a position to give back to the community can be perpetrators in this awful area of domestic violence.

I am very pleased to be part of a government that finally took on the task of removing the gay panic defence—the last state, as I understand it, to have the gay panic defence, not just by a few months or a few years but by more than a decade. I believe we were the last state to still have a gay panic defence. It is clear to understand why that happened. We had Michael Atkinson as the Attorney-General and then John Rau as the Attorney-General, and I am so pleased that the state's first female Attorney-General tackled that.

Vickie Chapman tackled it in such a way as to ensure that the defence that was removed protected women who had to resort to violence to get out of a situation they were in that they could not get out of in any other way. One of the excuses given time and again as to why for some reason South Australia could not remove the gay panic defence was that it would discriminate against women who were trying to remove themselves from a violent situation. Vickie Chapman as Attorney-General was able to deal with that.

Something else that was a very good outcome, a very good piece of legislation from Vickie Chapman as Attorney-General, is that women now have an ability to check the violent record of somebody they may have decided to move into a more permanent or committed relationship with before they make that decision, which is a terrific preventative measure. It is much harder to leave a relationship the more you share in that relationship; whether it be shared finances, home or children, it is more difficult for women to leave that relationship, because they have so much more to lose.

We know time and again that, when a woman is forced to leave a relationship because of domestic violence, they also end up having a lower standard of living in almost every case. In most instances, when men remain they remain in the family home when women leave; they usually are in control of the finances and, although the courts see the finances as being a joint asset, we know that getting that out of the disgruntled partner can be very difficult and very expensive for the person who is the primary caregiver.

Another disadvantage women have in getting out of these situations is that they are then in a situation where they themselves do not have a source of income for themselves and their children. How often do we hear that men whose wives have left them, for whatever reason, particularly for domestic violence reasons, then do not support the children that they both committed to bring into the world and to look after?

There is still a lot more we need to do. I emphasise—and I say this every time I speak on this—that it takes men to stop men behaving in such a manner. We see women at rallies and memorial services on domestic violence, but we need to see more men at those services because it is men who will make the difference. Women are the victims and of course they support each other, but men are the perpetrators and it is so important that we get that message across and for men to say stop and intervene when they see it. It is a community issue, so men need to call it out and intervene whenever they can.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Hughes.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Petitions

WESTERN HOSPITAL

Mr COWDREY (Colton): Presented a petition signed by 11,134 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to ensure the future of the Western Hospital at Henley Beach, and in particular, ensures that the land on which the hospital sits remains zoned for health care services into the future.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I acknowledge the presence in the gallery today of Mae Alshammari, guest of the member for Waite, performing some work experience today. Welcome to parliament. It is terrific to have you with us.

I understand that also joining us is the President of the Ukrainian Association of South Australia—or he will be shortly—Mr Frank Fursenko, to be joined as well by Bernadette Belej, Tania Jarema-Norton and Sofia Bybyk, who are guests of the Minister for Tourism and Multicultural Affairs. We might make additional acknowledgement if others are also to join us. Welcome to parliament. It is a sincere pleasure to have you with us.

Question Time

STATE PROSPERITY PROJECT

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:01): My question is to the Premier. How much has been spent by the government for advertising promotion of what the Premier has called the State Prosperity Project, and what is the expenditure seeking to achieve?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:01): I am more than happy to take on notice the details for the Leader of the Opposition regarding elements of his question.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: As the Leader of the Opposition is well aware, governments have advertising expenditure budgets. We are operating in accordance with those. The former government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —had their health advertising campaigns, and I can't remember the number but there was a big dollar campaign associated with the infrastructure spend. There was campaign after campaign.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I'm not sure if there was an advertising campaign for their land tax hikes. Things of public policy significance do have marketing budgets, or campaign budgets, associated with them. The reason we are doing that—and it is an important question from the Leader of the Opposition—is pretty simple. The State Prosperity Project has a number of policy elements that sit beneath it. There is obviously the Hydrogen Jobs Plan, the Northern Water proposition, and what we are seeking to achieve around green iron.

The hydrogen subject more broadly is complicated, green iron is complicated, Northern Water is complicated and it is important, and I think the South Australian electorate seeks to have an appreciation of not just—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —what the government is doing with their funds, but also why we are doing it.

I think South Australians expect their government—frankly, particularly a Labor government—to be pursuing an agenda around job creation and seeking to bring new wealth into our state, not just for the benefit of workers but also for businesses more broadly. They also expect of government, including a Labor government, that we seek to capitalise on the decarbonisation opportunity.

On this side of the house we believe climate change is real. On this side of the house we believe it deserves action, but we also believe—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Morialta! Member for Hartley!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —on this side of the house, that the world's race to decarbonise is a big opportunity for the state. So there is an industrial policy here, a climate policy here, that comes together in a beautiful coalescence of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: It represents a major agenda that this government has and the South Australian community expect to know about it—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —and that has been communicated to them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I turn to the leader, I observe that the member for Hartley and the member for Morialta are warned.

STATE PROSPERITY PROJECT

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04): My question is again to the Premier. What was the cost of beer coasters and bar mats produced for the launch of the Premier's advertising campaign and what was their purpose?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:05): Going to the pub—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The exchange between the member for Florey and members of the opposition will cease. The member for Flinders is called to order. Member for Chaffey, the Premier has the call.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The TV advertising—

Mr Patterson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett is warned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Florey is warned. The member for Morphett will cease interjecting or I will be forced to initiate his departure under 137A.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I think it is fair to say that one of the most powerful forms of advertising available in the current media landscape remains TV advertising, but it is also one of the most expensive. I think when it comes to media—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: When it comes to media buyers, the government engages media buyers who provide advice on how best to expend a campaign budget to get the maximum impact. That is a prudent thing to do. Some people are at home—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Some people are at home watching TV, some people are at the pub, that is still legal and that is a good thing, so we seek to engage. In terms of the cost of the beer mats and beer coasters, it is a lot cheaper than TV advertising and has an effect in the market.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

DIGITAL EDUCATION STRATEGY

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:06): My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. Did the minister approve a reduction in the budget for the department's digital strategy including the school laptop program of more than \$20 million and, if so, did he inform his cabinet colleagues?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:07): I thank the member for Morialta for his question and his interest in the digital strategy. I would have to take on notice the detail around the former digital strategy, I think, to which the member for Morialta refers. I do seem to recall as well that the former minister for education, now the Deputy Premier, also had a quite sizeable digital strategy which was announced before the 2018 election which might have been cut by those opposite not long after coming to power. I am pretty sure no-one would like to talk about that here, of course, but I am very happy to use the opportunity that the member for Morialta's question provides me to talk about what we have announced.

We know that cost of living is a concern for lots of South Australians at the moment and education now is not just an issue of paying school fees if you might be in the non-government sector or paying the materials and services charge if you are in the public system. I note we have given \$100 off the cost of the materials and services charge again this year, but there are also other costs which add up for families, and a lot of those are around the cost of digital devices which are no longer just an optional extra for people; they are a necessity in terms of the kind of modern education that we seek to give South Australian students in our education system and that can be very expensive.

So what we did announce was a very sizeable contribution toward what by 2026 will be a system where all those students on School Card—and we have also announced, I think, a \$5,000 increase in the School Card threshold, up to about \$71,000 combined household income. Those families who might earn \$71,000 or beneath that figure, and then going up in increments above that depending on how many children they have, don't have to pay the materials and services charge, but by 2026 they will also not have to pay for a laptop. We have started rolling that out to a number of schools. I think it might have been more than 200 that have come onboard straightaway. By 2026, we will have all schools onboard, providing that for families who are eligible for the School Card.

Of course, we know that cost of living is a concern which doesn't just affect those families who might be eligible for the School Card, and I accept that \$71,000 combined family or household income is not a great deal of money, so we are also seeking to change the way that the department

goes about purchasing devices to improve the purchasing power of the department, so that those families who aren't eligible for a free laptop as part of the School Card program can also access devices through their school, through the department, at a lower rate as well.

We are watching this space very closely. I think this is a very significant investment. It is on top of other support that we already provide in terms of access to the internet as well. We know, again, just as having a laptop computer is no longer an optional extra, having access to the internet at home is a necessity for families as well. Sometimes that can be cost prohibitive, so we are supporting families on the School Card to make sure that they are able to afford the cost of home internet or wi-fi. We are assisting them with that as well, and we will keep looking for further opportunities to make sure that that is the case for education in this state, particularly public education, because at its very core it is about accessibility and affordability for all. I think this digital strategy is a great step along the way.

DIGITAL EDUCATION STRATEGY

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): My question is to the Premier. Did the education minister advise the Premier that he had cut the budget for the laptop program by \$20 million—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —prior to the—

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta—

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Premier claiming credit for the program?

The SPEAKER: —there is a point of order which I am bound to hear under 134, and which I will do so.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: the member asked the same question to two different ministers. We speak as one.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We will hear the question.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: My question is to the Premier. Did the Minister for Education advise the Premier that he had reduced funding for the laptop program by \$20 million prior to the Premier claiming credit for the program on 29 January? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We are going to hear the question and then I will turn to the member for West Torrens. Member for Morialta, please conclude the question.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: On 29 January this year, the Premier issued a press release claiming:

...discounts to school fees and laptop purchases are providing South Australian families with much needed cost of living relief—with some families thousands of dollars better off.

The biggest saving for some families will be through the Malinauskas Labor government's new laptop program.

However, documents released to the opposition through FOI have revealed that in late 2022 the Minister for Education approved revisions to the strategy released by the former Liberal government, including delays to the rollout of devices and a \$21.9 million reduction in funding for the program.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I see that the point of order is not being maintained, so I will turn to the minister.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:12): I thank the member for Morialta for the question. I find it a bit rich that we are being lectured on cost-of-living initiatives in the education department.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Chaffey!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Morphett!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: So we had a rushed—

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: We had a rushed program.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: We had those opposite—

The SPEAKER: Minister, please be seated. If there are further interjections from the members I have already warned, they will be departing under 137A. It is impossible for me to hear the minister. The chamber wishes to hear the minister. Minister.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. What we had from those opposite was a pretty rushed policy towards the end of their four years in government, late to the party on cost-of-living issues as per usual from the South Australian Liberal Party.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: No-one would ever accuse those opposite of being in touch. Upon coming to government, of course, we made a series of very significant election commitments around education. One of those was, of course, cost of living as well. We matched those opposite when they made a commitment around \$100 off the materials and services charge. We have now extended that beyond the commitment that was made by the Liberal Party.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: We have delivered it for a third time, and now on top of that comes a digital strategy which by 2026 will see every child who is eligible for the School Card in the public education system get their laptop for free. So on that basis—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: As I said in the answer to the member for Morialta's earlier question—and I know the member for Port Adelaide will remember this about a very significant digital device strategy which was committed to by the then Liberal government in 2018 and the first thing that was done—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: They say it wasn't a strategy, but it had money behind it. It had real money behind it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: —and one of the first things they did was cut it, so I won't be lectured to by those opposite when one of the first things they did when they came to government was cut the initiative made by the member for Port Adelaide.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Hypocrisy writ large.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, please be seated. The member for Morphett, who persistently interjects, will depart under 137A for the remainder of question time. The member for Florey is not far behind.

The honourable member for Morphett having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: Minister, you have the call—you have concluded your answer? Very well. I turn to the opposition.

DIGITAL EDUCATION STRATEGY

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): My question is to the Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Are the Premier's personal claims to be relieving the cost-of-living pressures, through this program that he has claimed credit for, a prime example of a politician peddling BS?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: What a zinger!

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer is called to order. The member for West Torrens, under 134.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 97, sir: such questions are not to involve argument.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This is the second time he has done this in a row, sir. It is getting embarrassing.

The SPEAKER: Yes. I am going to give the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am going to give the—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: I am happy to rephrase it, if you like.

The SPEAKER: Very well. Thank you.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. How many public schools are not yet participating in the primary and secondary student device program? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: I anticipate the point of order is that the question anticipates that there are a number of schools which are not participating, which is a matter of very fine judgement and might invite a sliver of argument.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will give the member for Morialta the opportunity to recast. I am not going to make a ruling, but I will give an opportunity to recast.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Thank you, sir. My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. How many public schools are participating in the primary and secondary student device program? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: it's the same, sir.

The SPEAKER: In fact it is; in fact it is, but I think that we would be testing the patience of the house if we were to entertain that point of order, so we are going to turn and remain with the member for Morialta who, I think, is seeking leave?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Yes, sir.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Thank you, sir. There are 500 public schools or thereabouts in South Australia. FOI documents reveal that one of the cost-saving adjustments the minister approved to the program was that it become, and I quote, 'opt-in and, as such, department funding will only be released to those sites participating in the program and in agreeance with each of the program's terms and conditions'.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:17): I can tell the member for Morialta that the answer to his question is: 226 more than were participating when they were in government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey, order!

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order.

ENERGY BILL RELIEF

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:17): My question is to the Treasurer. Has the Treasurer met with any peak business industry groups in South Australia who have called for the continuation or increase of the government's energy bill rebate scheme and, if so, what is his response?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (14:17): I have had a number of representations from a number of representative groups urging the government to continue the record amount of cost-of-living relief that we provided in last year's state budget: more than \$400 million in a suite of initiatives, headlined by the \$127 million we invested from the state budget—to be matched by the commonwealth's \$127 million—to provide more than 400,000 households with a \$500 reduction off their energy bills.

For those people who were on the then standing offer, with average usage, they would have actually seen an overall reduction in their energy bill, because this was not provided as an amount

of money handed out to a household: it was reduced directly off quarterly bills. So, yes, I have had those representations. What's the government's response? You will find out on budget day.

ENERGY BILL RELIEF

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:18): My question is to the Treasurer. Will the government be providing energy rebates in FY 2024-25 and, if so, who will be eligible to receive them? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr COWDREY: The SA Business Chamber—

Members interjecting:

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

Mr COWDREY: —has recently called for the upcoming state budget to include electricity relief for small businesses. In addition, South Australian Mid-Year Budget Review papers reveal that the government expects to collect over \$2 billion in additional revenue than was expected when Labor's first budget was delivered.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (14:19): Well, if the member for Colton was listening to the answer that I delivered to the house about 90 seconds ago, he would realise that we will be revealing these plans in the state budget.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I have also made it clear—

Mr Cowdrey: How many businesses are shutting down right now?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —at the press conference which was live streamed—

Mr Cowdrey: Give them some certainty.

The SPEAKER: The member for Colton is warned.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —where I handed down the Mid-Year Budget Review that we have made it clear that we will be looking to include cost-of-living relief in our budget this year. So my answer of now 120 seconds ago stands. I urge the member for Colton to open his ears and peel his eyes for the budget.

STATE ECONOMY

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (14:20): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on the South Australian economy?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:20): While those opposite would have you believe that things aren't performing very well in South Australia, independent organisations such as the Commonwealth Bank say that we have the best performing economy in the nation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: That has been reported on in this place earlier. But today, the ANZ Stateometer released their report. It is telling because, rather consistently with the Commonwealth Bank, the ANZ Stateometer makes it clear that the South Australian economy is leading the way—leading the way.

The South Australian and WA economies are the best performing in the nation. This is obviously in stark contrast to the experience we have seen in the past, but this ANZ Stateometer puts to bed the criticism from the shadow Treasurer, who would have you believe that things aren't

travelling well. What the Commonwealth Bank, the ANZ and organisation upon organisation now independently are telling us—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —is that the South Australian economy is performing exceedingly well—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —in comparison to the rest of the country. Only minutes after the ANZ Stateometer released their report—

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hartley!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —the Australian Bureau of Statistics released another set of economic statistics today regarding what is happening with exports in our country. There is some really interesting data that has come out of this that is rather shocking for many throughout our nation right now. Year on year, New South Wales exports are down 19 per cent; Queensland is down 15 per cent; Tasmania, down 4.4 per cent; NT, down 8.4 per cent; Victoria, down 3.3 per cent; WA, down 1.6 per cent; South Australia, up 8.7 per cent—up 8.7 per cent. So while across the country their value of exports is going down—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —by 7 per cent, we are going up by 8 per cent.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hartley!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I want to take the opportunity for acknowledging just how happy the opposition is about this good news.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Their enthusiasm for the positive performance—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is warned.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —of the South Australian economy is here for all to see.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Now, what we know is that these numbers matter. These numbers matter, because what it demonstrates—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —is that notwithstanding the economic challenges—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey, order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —that exist throughout the country, South Australian households and businesses continue to perform well. But we are alive to the fact that while the South Australian economy is performing well, and there are some businesses and some people who are doing very well with it, there are others in our community who aren't necessarily experiencing that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: People who are on fixed incomes; people who are price takers in the labor market, particularly people on low wages, which is why this government has a very deliberate predisposition to make sure that, when we allocate cost-of-living relief, as the Treasurer has done substantially in the most recent state budget, we allocate the support in the community to those who need it most. That is what a good Labor government does: committed to growing the economy, committed to lifting people up but also, where we can, providing support to those who need it most. That is a balance that this government pursues and continues to commit itself to as we contemplate the next budget.

The SPEAKER: Before I turn to the member for MacKillop, I observe that the member for Chaffey is now on two warnings. He will be joined by the member for Morialta and also the member for Hartley.

NARACOORTE FIRE

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:24): My question is to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. Can the minister give an update on the resources that were deployed to yesterday's fire in Naracoorte?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (14:24): I thank the member for his question, primarily as he and so many other members in this place from across the political divide care deeply about their communities, particularly at this time of year, facing significant fire risk. Yesterday at about this time of the day a substantial fire in Naracoorte became apparent, with particular warning messages being relayed to his community. In the space of question time and immediately thereafter I was able to speak with the member for MacKillop immediately, and he expressed to me at that time the concern that he had for his community.

Perhaps before I speak specifically about the assets and the resources that were deployed to the member's local community yesterday, can I first note the exceptional work that has been undertaken for now some 24 hours in responding and controlling the Naracoorte fire just north of the town itself. It has been burning in particularly inaccessible areas and has meant that the tactics, from an operational response to this fire, have been difficult in part but have also enabled a full spread of resources to be deployed, not only with support from CFS with multiple appliances, volunteers and personnel and, I understand, also backed up from the MFS in Mount Gambier, with SES crews supporting as well, but also a very significant number of aerial assets.

By the time question time was complete yesterday, there were already, I believe, six aerial assets, new aerials bombers and observation aircraft, that were being utilised to attack the fire, suppress the fire but also provide real-time intelligence back to the CFS incident management teams that had been deployed.

These were resources that you, sir, may have seen, being a local member who I know is very proud to have some of these new assets positioned in his electorate, as is the member for Flinders over in Port Lincoln: Black Hawk helicopters in the air. Some wonderful footage, quite extraordinary footage, that has been circulating on social media was the Black Hawk coming in through the Naracoorte Swimming Lake, picking up water in literally seconds—I think about 45 seconds from in and out—and dumping that on the fire. Over 80 drops were made on the fire to suppress it.

What is of particular note is that the member and I were joined by the Minister for Regional Development in Naracoorte late last year—I think October last year, just before the fire season—to

announce that for the first time ever there would be a forward deployment of aerial aircraft, including the brand-new Black Hawk, in the member's electorate, supporting the South-East, an incredibly important part of our state, with significant risk but also a very significant contributor to the economy, which does need that very quick support, and we saw that yesterday.

Part of our 31 aircraft around the state, as we currently stand, have pre-deployed, as I mentioned, over in Port Lincoln, in the Adelaide Hills, in Houghton and down in the South-East. Whilst we have had some relief so far this summer, can I take this opportunity to say, as so many members in this place know, the summer is still going. This week and in the coming days we will see not only significant heat but an increasing fire risk. As we have become too accustomed to, a March period will bring significant risk to our community but one which our wonderful firefighters are well equipped and well prepared to be responding to.

NARACOORTE SPECIAL EDUCATION FACILITY

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Education. Will the government fund a special education facility within the Naracoorte community? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and the leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr McBRIDE: During the government's country cabinet visit to MacKillop, the Naracoorte South Primary School highlighted that students with additional learning needs don't have the option of attending a special education setting within our own community. To do this, they currently have to do a 200-kilometre round trip to Gordon Education Centre in Mount Gambier.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:29): I thank the member for MacKillop for his question and for his advocacy on this really important issue. I remember very well the country cabinet meeting that we had last year in Naracoorte, a very well-attended country cabinet community forum where the principal from Naracoorte South Primary School stood up in front of what was a very big crowd and asked a very important question.

Obviously, as a minister at these things, when difficult questions are asked of you sometimes you wish it wasn't so, but I have to say that the principal of Naracoorte South Primary School has my respect for being courageous enough to stand up in front of that crowd and on behalf of her whole community to fight for better services for kids with disability in regional areas.

We know it is tough. As someone who grew up in a country school, I remember well the tyranny of distance and what it means particularly for vulnerable people in terms of getting the specialised services they need. I think I was quite honest in my response on that day to both the member for MacKillop, to the audience and to the principal of Naracoorte South Primary School when I said that there is certainly a gap there at the school in the area, which means that families who have young ones with a disability, who would ordinarily require and should have the support of specialised disability services within the school, have to travel a long distance, as the member for MacKillop said, which is not ideal.

The complexity that we have in regional areas, particularly in some of South Australia's regional areas where we have relatively small populations but very large distances, means it can be really hard to get the kind of critical mass of students you need to make a model work. That is an excuse I am not going to use. It is not an excuse I used at the forum and it is not an excuse I used to the principal of the school either, because the truth is it is just not good enough and we need to do these things better.

I committed on that occasion, as did the chief executive of the education department there at the forum, that we would find a way. That work has started. I am pleased to give a short update to the member for MacKillop about what we have done. The first meeting occurred quite early after that community forum, I think as early as November. The second round of meetings occurred in February and there are more meetings that will occur this Friday.

We are looking at what we can do to get the numbers across the area that we would need in order to find a model of care at the school. The department and I remain confident that we can find a way of doing it. It will be tricky. It will probably end up being something that we have not done

before in the public education system, but there are real upsides to that outside the positive impact it will have on the member for MacKillop's community. If we can get that model right there, for what is a relatively small number of kids with disability, then there is no reason we can't roll that out further into other parts of the state where we see the same issue with service provision.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to update the member for MacKillop on what we are doing. I hope that I can come back to this place in the not too distant future and talk about a positive outcome for young people with disability in that area. I will be very pleased to keep the member for MacKillop up to date as we go.

LETTER TO RENTERS

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:33): My question is to the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs. Is the minister aware of any letter sent to renters across South Australia dated February 2024 and, if so, what, if anything, was the cost to South Australian taxpayers to produce and send the letter? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TEAGUE: A letter from the Premier dated February 2024 with the subject line 'We're making renting fairer' has been received by thousands of renters across South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:33): I am happy to answer the shadow minister's questions and I am happy to advise the house, just as we have advised quite a number of renters throughout the state, that the state government, as the shadow minister will be well aware, is proud of the fact that we were able to get legislative changes in this place, led by the minister, to advance the concerns of renters and materialise them in substantial change to give renters more rights and more considerations in what is a very difficult market for them as things currently stand.

So we have written to renters throughout state. I wrote to renters throughout the state advising them of the changes and their additional rights as a result of that successful policy endeavour led by the government. The cost of that letter was the cost of the printing of the letter and the postage of the letter, so rather modest, particularly given the size and the nature of the changes—and we made them.

I am aware of the fact, and I was advised of the fact earlier today, that the opposition are seeking to raise their concerns about the Premier writing a letter to renters simply advising them of their new rights, and that's fine. I wondered, though, whether or not the opposition, when they raised their concerns in the media, advised those outlets about other letters that had been written and paid for by taxpayers, because the government is aware of a letter from none other than the Leader of the Opposition, paid for by the taxpayers of South Australia, regarding changes to the Residential Tenancies Act. I think the Leader of the Opposition talks about 'Labor's war on landlords'—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —paid for by taxpayers in a highly partisan letter, which is very different in tone from the letter that I wrote. 'I urge you to voice your thoughts and concerns about these impending changes', under the title of 'Labor's war on landlords'. Now, I read the Leader of the Opposition's advocacy against renters having more considerations and more rights and I thought, 'Well, somewhere down here there will be a PS or a little asterisk where the Leader of the Opposition will actively and proactively disclose whatever interests he might have opposing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

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

The SPEAKER: Members to my left and right, the member for Morialta must be heard under 134—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The Premier is now going well beyond the cost of the letter that he sent to people who are renting in South Australia as the Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hartley is warned! We have taken in a point of order; it's necessary to dispose of it. I will listen carefully. As, of course, Speakers before me have ruled, there is a degree of latitude that is extended to ministers, including the Premier. Some latitude is also extended to the Leader of the Opposition. You know my enthusiasm for a quote from Speaker Eastick, but of course I could also turn to Speaker Oswald or Speaker Trainer, or many others. In any case, the precedent is clear. I will listen carefully; some context is permissible.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: On this side of the house we actively encourage people to invest in property. We believe in the power of property investment. There is absolutely nothing wrong with South Australians aspiring to acquire a piece of property and then rent it out. In fact, they've got an important role to play within the marketplace, but we equally believe that renters have rights. We equally believe that there should be a balance that takes into consideration the legitimate concerns that renters have in a very, very tight rental market, which is why we made these changes, which is why we want to make sure that renters are advised of these changes.

We are grateful for the retail industry who have supported the changes that we have made. It is very, very disappointing that the Leader of the Opposition has opposed those changes, as he has made clear in his correspondence to people throughout the state, but we've got the balance right and people deserve to know about it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Heysen, unless your question is a supplementary, I am turning to the member for Waite. Is it a supplementary?

Mr TEAGUE: It's the same topic; it's not strictly a supplementary.

The SPEAKER: Well, that's not the answer I was after. You had your chance. Member for Waite.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (14:39): My question is to the Deputy Premier. Can the Deputy Premier please update the house on South Australia's response to climate change?

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) (14:39): I am delighted to respond to the question from the member for Waite. Members will be aware that this jurisdiction was the first in the world to have a piece of legislation about climate change. The original Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act back in 2007 built on what was already starting to be a world-leading effort to have an intermittent renewable energy supply for our electricity system.

As we have recently learned, we are doing so well—and we are in intermittent renewable energy the best in the world—that we believe that we will get to 100 per cent by 2027. It's wonderful to see that at least one side of parliament is proud of that. The greenhouse gas emissions act, however, does need—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: —to be updated and we are currently out to public consultation on the YourSAy website to ask people's views on the suggestions that we are making about the way in

which it will be updated. It will of course have an update in the emissions targets. Now, at present, the bipartisan emissions target is to have emissions reduction of 50 per cent by 2030 and net zero by 2050, so that at present forms a proposal for this bill.

I would note at this point that we are already at 42 per cent below 2005 levels in our emissions and, although much of that has come from the renewable energy, it has not exclusively come from there. It is also about changes in land use and it is an impressive record but of course is not yet at the 50 per cent nor anywhere near as yet the net zero that is required by 2050.

Let's bear in mind that if we don't as a world reach those targets, we will be living in a world that has heatwaves so frequently that—

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia interjecting:

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: It's wonderful to know that there are still some people who are questioning—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: —climate change.

An honourable member: It's extraordinary.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: It's absolutely extraordinary.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Elder, order!

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Now, people are quite happy to continue to express those views, which I know are not the views shared by the Leader of the Opposition, and yet a semi-backbench there is quite happy to continue to express their views of doubt about climate change—last year, having been the warmest year ever on record in this world and the September having been the hottest September which had followed the hottest three months on record across the world.

The fact that we have had a moderately mild period thanks to La Niña means nothing, and the farmers are going to be first on the frontline, of course, and are therefore often the most concerned about making sure we respond to climate change.

The propositions that we are putting before the people through the YourSAy website are also suggesting that we have five-yearly emissions reduction targets so that we are not just talking about 2030 and 2050 but have a five-yearly staged target; that we have a statewide emissions reduction plan so that it is clear how the emissions will be reduced and that that will be updated; that there will be statewide climate risk assessments so that we are able to identify the risks and opportunities, and also therefore to inform adaptation planning—we are already experiencing the consequences of catastrophic weather events—and we need to make sure that we are adapting particular infrastructure to be prepared for still more.

There will be the ability for the Premier to nominate a public sector entity organisation to prepare a climate change plan for that entity and also to have a public sector action plan so that government is leading by example. That is out with YourSAy at present until 5 April, and I encourage those who would like to see us respond to climate change and also adapt economically as fast as possible to participate.

RENEWABLE ENERGY TARGETS

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): Supplementary, Mr Speaker: just for clarity, does the minister plan to legislate the 2027 renewable energy target that was announced a couple of weeks ago?

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) (14:43): Yes, sorry, I am happy to clarify that. When we first put this up for consultation, we had the original target and we have now informed people that we are revising that to the one that was 100 per cent by 2027.

LETTER TO RENTERS

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs. What was the source of the information used to prepare the Premier's letter dated February 2024? Was it the bonds database held by Consumer and Business Services?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (14:43): I am advised it was the bonds database that was used by CBS to produce those letters.

YORKE PENINSULA FERRY

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:44): I have a question for the Minister for Tourism. Has the government made any progress on enabling a ferry to transit between Adelaide and Yorke Peninsula?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:44): I thank the member for Narungga for his question. Yorke Peninsula tourism is going absolutely great guns at the moment. We know that during COVID people, particularly from South Australia, discovered their own backyard. It is worth \$430 million a year. This is way above the 2025 target.

There has been quite a bit of infrastructure, particularly in areas like Port Vincent. Of course, we know people love to go there to fish, to swim, and to relax. We have also had some breweries that have been developed there and some fantastic distilleries as well. I have talked to SeaLink about the potential of having a ferry from Glenelg to Port Vincent. In fact, I am meeting with them—as I do regularly—and I invite the member for Narungga to join me to have that conversation with them as well.

Of course, any time you look for significant infrastructure we would be looking at a business case, we would be looking at private investment into this situation. However, we should be bold, because on this side of the house we are supporting tourism. We think it has a great future and, while we have already achieved our \$10.2 billion visitor economy in the past year, we have ambitions to go further and further.

The Yorke Peninsula is one of those areas that has great opportunity. Just recently I have had roundtables, and I have had them in three different areas of Yorke Peninsula. We have seen areas like Moonta, with their Copper Trails and their bike hire, becoming more and more attractive to people. Of course, Innes National Park is a much-loved area of the Yorke Peninsula and we want to engage people to enjoy the national park more and more. That is why we have the Experience Nature Tourism Fund, which is \$500,000 year upon year for tourism activities within national parks or accommodation adjacent to national parks.

We believe in tourism, we believe in supporting our regions. We know that there has been a fundamental change to tourism, with 46¢ or 47¢ in the dollar now spent in our regions, and the Yorke Peninsula got a really big increase in that area.

I am going to talk about regions and tourism more and more. Importantly, it is for us to look towards the future, to take these bold ambitions and bold opportunities and have those conversations.

DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:47): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier apologise to 'Natalie'. With your leave, sir, and that of the house I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TEAGUE: 'Natalie' (not her real name) received a letter from the Premier, on the face of which was set out her full name and address. 'Natalie' lives at an undisclosed—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, there is a point of order from the member for West Torrens which I am bound to hear under 134.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The opposition is now asking questions of anonymous people on the basis that the Premier owes whoever this person is an apology. It is hardly within the standing orders.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will hear the member for Morialta.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The consistent tradition of Speakers is to allow such questions. When a person of the characteristics that the member for Heysen is seeking to describe is in question, it would be most inappropriate to use their details and name, which goes to the heart of the point of the question. Leave having been sought, I request and urge that the member for Heysen be allowed to finish the explanation.

The SPEAKER: I will listen to the explanation.

Mr TEAGUE: I will commence the explanation once again, for the benefit of the house. 'Natalie' (not her real name) received a letter from the Premier, on the face of which was set out her full name and address. 'Natalie' lives at an undisclosed location as a victim of domestic violence. She reported feeling fearful and vulnerable upon receiving the letter.

The SPEAKER: I am going to permit the question. I will seek advice from the Clerk in the following days. Premier.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:48): The letter we have written to people did not disclose their address to anyone apart from the recipient of those letters, which is utterly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —appropriate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Furthermore, one of the things that was top of mind when we—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: One of the things that was top of mind for the government when we were contemplating these changes regarding the way tenancies operate, and the rental market more broadly, was actually to enhance the support that had been provided to victims of domestic violence. We did that through a range of measures that were directly informed by advocates in that regard and I want to thank the Minister for Women, who is responsible for stopping violence against women, for that advocacy.

These are serious changes that we have made to the Residential Tenancies Act. They are not just about supporting renters in the context of the amount of rent they pay, but also a range of other considerations as well. So the very people who now have additional rights—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: It is important that the very people who are the beneficiaries of those additional protections and additional rights know about them. If there is someone in a vulnerable circumstance who isn't aware of the rights afforded to them, if they are not aware of the enhanced provisions that are there to protect their interests, then it is almost as though they don't exist.

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta, order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: That is why we have written to them via direct mail, the most discreet and direct form of communication. It is not a broadscale TV advertising campaign. In this instance, we are directly communicating with the very people who now have additional rights as a result of the changes that the government has made.

MAJORS ROAD INTERCHANGE

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (14:51): My question is for the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister inform the house of the progress of the Majors Road interchange and changing views on the project?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:51): Thank you to the member for Davenport. I have to say, it's very hard to find an opponent of this project—very hard. When you are spending \$120 million on a—

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —key election commitment to open up vast parts of the southern suburbs to a corridor that has been closed to them for so long, I have got to say there is a lot of support. Friends of Glenthorne Farm weren't initially supportive, I was told by the Leader of the Opposition. Today they were at a press conference with us, talking about how much this is working. Riding for the Disabled are big supporters of what we are doing. The local community are supportive.

Just to give some background, this proposal will also increase the tree canopy along that corridor by 20 per cent; 40,000 tonnes of asphalt; 5,000 square metres of concrete; nearly 1,000 tonnes of steel—South Australian steel—and nearly 90,000 metric tonnes of earthworks. We are talking about a project that is going to fundamentally change the—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I've got to say, hearing the interjections from members opposite about climate change, trying to mock it because we are doing road infrastructure—they are doing it in a way to try to mock the fact that because we are building new infrastructure, somehow we are climate denialists. It is a ridiculous argument to make, a completely ridiculous argument to make. All the interjections from members opposite about climate change just show you that—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Now they want to change the subject.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Do you want to talk about climate change or don't you?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Do you want to talk about climate change or don't you?

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I understand that members opposite are upset about this project being so popular and successful because the only person left—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Even Heysen is getting fired up. He's even getting fired up! I think what has happened here is there is a bit of bruising that has occurred. They started reading the paper again and didn't like what they saw.

Anyway, I think once you realise that everyone in that local community, people around that local community, people who actively use facilities in and around the area, support this, there is one obstacle left—one. It is amazing—it is the local member. The local member is opposed to this project, and I think it is the worst form of base politics I have ever seen in my life.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If you only followed my example. If you only all followed my example.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, that's true. It's true. Exposing the opposition is something I do enjoy, and exposing this hypocrisy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —I have to say is beyond belief. When you speak to locals that their local MP actually opposes what we are doing on Majors Road, they almost don't believe it, because it's so ridiculous. They almost don't believe it, but after they have met him they do.

Members interjecting:

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

BATS

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Energy. Is the minister taking any action to prevent power outages caused by bats and, if so, what action? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr BATTY: My constituent, Lloyd from Dulwich, received a text message from SA Power Networks last month stating:

Power outages in the past few weeks around Dulwich have been caused by an expanding colony of grey-headed flying foxes or bats. Outages related to bats will generally occur between dusk and dawn in summer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:56): It's fascinating how the wheel turns, because when I raised the fact that bats were causing outages in 2017, members opposite mocked me. They said, 'Bats can't cause outages. It's just that it's a weak grid.' Here we are later, demanding to know what I am going to do—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —to stop bats causing outages.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Newland!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Cue the outrage—cue outrage!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Hammond!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, I do see the irony.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I see the irony in the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: After they privatised the distribution network to private operators, they demand to know what we are going to do to ensure that the privatised network operates all the time. Isn't it amazing? Isn't it absolutely amazing?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Flinders!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What we have done is—bats are causing problems for the network and they are causing outages—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As soon as you try to explain what we are doing about it—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —they interject, 'What are you doing about it?' Is it any wonder you had to resign so quickly? Is it any wonder? Is it any wonder?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I mean, it wasn't even two years in!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Newland! Member for Morialta, under 134.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: standing order 98, serious question. The minister should address it.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Taylor, order!

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. There is considerable merit in the point of order. I will listen carefully. I bring the minister to the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is a serious question, especially when we are heading into a weekend when it is going to be considerably warmer and people are going to need their air conditioners; especially, vulnerable people will need their air conditioners on.

What SA Power Networks is doing is developing technology that can withstand what the bats are doing to short their systems. They are rolling that out. Obviously, that would require a regulatory reset by the regulator, so SA Power Networks is considering this technology in light of the growing population of bats that are causing these outages.

Despite the giggles around it, this is actually a very serious issue, because they are causing some serious damage to the network and it's damage that we will all have to pay for through our bills, because of the way the opposition structured the privatisation of our distribution networks.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Members opposite yell 'Rubbish'. No, it's actually a fact. It is actually an established fact.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yell, yell.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The what?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It comes from what?

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Look, if I held the functions and powers of a minister, perhaps potentially then. I would not be the one sticking my head up above the parapet to try to have a go. Your government thought you weren't even worthy enough to hold a portfolio position.

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Wave your hands as much as you like. There is a reason you got one vote—one reason.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: 'I don't know who I'm talking to?' I know exactly who I'm talking to. Do you know how I know? They tell me. They tell me who I'm talking to. This is a serious issue that needs serious contemplation—

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Flinders!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —and SA Power Networks are looking into the matter to try to deal with it via a technological solution because of the migration of these bats towards South Australia. The advice I have also had is that the heatwave will play some part in alleviating the numbers of the bats. The numbers do grow through their breeding season and there needs to be a technological solution to this. SA Power Networks are looking at it and there is work being done to understand exactly what the forecasts are for the bat population in South Australia, especially in Adelaide, and the damage it would do to our network. It is a growing problem.

The question will be the cost and what the regulator believes the appropriate allocation of that cost will be to SA Power Networks to try to deal with this problem over a five-year reset. I am happy to offer the member a briefing on the technological solution and tell his constituents that we are working on it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

BATS

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Is the minister taking any action to manage bats in Adelaide and, if so, what is the action? I seek leave to explain the question, sir.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: In a recent media release, SA Power Networks claimed the initial colony numbered in just the hundreds, but the colony is now totalling 46,000 and their nocturnal search for food is now disrupting the power supply of more than 100,000 homes each year.

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): There are, of course, a number of species of bats that live in South Australia, and without knowing which species they are and how protected they are it is difficult for me to discuss.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: If we are talking about the bat colony in the Botanic Garden, which I am not certain that's what the member is referring to, they are a protected species at a national level and, therefore, are not able to be culled despite frequent calling for culling from the other side.

Parliamentary Procedure

USE OF NAMES IN QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER (15:02): Before we turn to grievances, very briefly, in relation to the matters earlier raised, *Erskine May* notes that the House of Commons has a strict prohibition on the use of names of individuals and organisations, noting:

...a question introducing names (whether of persons or of bodies) invidiously or for advertisement or in any other way not strictly necessary to render the question intelligible is not in order.

However, the Assembly has a more relaxed approach, and I will give that further consideration.

Grievance Debate

WESTERN HOSPITAL

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:02): The Western Hospital is vital to the western suburbs community and to the broader statewide health system. Today, prior to question time, I tabled the first 11,000-plus signatures of the community-led petition launched in response to the hospital being placed into voluntary administration. The response has been overwhelming, with people from the western suburbs and across South Australia signing the petition: from West Beach to West Lakes, from Henley to Flinders Park, from Woodville West to Ottoway, from Fulham Gardens to Torrensville, and even as far as Encounter Bay, Uraidla, Keith and Port Lincoln. This petition is an indication of how many people and how strong the community support is, and how wide the provision of the hospital's services stretches and impacts.

It is important that the government, the administrators and potential buyers understand the importance of the Western to my community and more broadly. The response and the thousands of signatures speak for themselves. It is abundantly clear that from the community's perspective the hospital needs to continue, not just because of its immense connection to the area but also because of what it would mean for the broader South Australian public health system, should the hospital close. In the context of having ramping now two or three times worse than when Labor took office, the importance of this hospital has only increased over the past two years.

We are talking about a facility that is absolutely vital and provides vital services, whether it be through the GP clinic, inpatient beds or oncology and other services there. It has been amazing in the time that I have been out collecting signatures the number of people that have reflected on being born at the Western, of having their own children at the Western, or it being the place where they have had life-changing surgery or simply seen their long-term family GP. As media commentators have said, to this point this hospital is way too big to fail having regard to the immense role that it plays in ensuring that there is significant pressure taken off the public system. Its contribution is enormous.

I, and certainly others in the community, am sure that there is a greater role that the government can play to ensure the future of the Western Hospital, and that is the basis of the petition tabled today on behalf of my community. It calls on the state government to come out and provide assurance that the land on which the hospital sits will not be rezoned into the future and will be kept as land that can only be used for private healthcare services or public healthcare services into the future. I think there is also a place for the government to provide certainty, as best as possible, and an assurance of the level of public day surgery or elective surgery work that can be conducted at the Western Hospital to make the hospital as appealing an asset as possible for sale.

I want to thank sincerely the many people and organisations from far and wide who have made this all possible, who have dedicated hours upon hours collecting signatures. In particular, there is Colleen Billows, who joins us in the chamber today—a local community legend whose late husband, Gordon, was the inaugural chair of the hospital. Her efforts have been simply remarkable. Angelo Piovesen, the Chair of the Friends of Western Hospital, has likewise been incredible. Together, they have both crisscrossed the western suburbs collecting signatures.

Many locals have also come in and collected pages of signatures. There has also been a stand at the hospital itself. Many of our local community groups, businesses and clubs have also lent a hand. I hope to not forget any of them but I do want to read them all into *Hansard*. Can I sincerely thank: Henley and Grange Meals on Wheels; Charles Sturt Memorial Trust; Airport Over 50s Club; Fulham Community Centre; Lockleys Bowling Club; Drakes Mini at West Beach; Aldi at West Lakes; St Michael's College; Woodville-West Torrens Football Club; Leading Edge Physiotherapy at Henley Beach; Drakes at Fulham Gardens; West Beach and Districts Community Bank; Pharmacy + Co at Fulham Gardens; La Luna Cafe in Henley Beach South; Foodland at West Lakes; West Torrens District Cricket Club; Henley Sharks Football Club; various Probus clubs throughout the western suburbs; Our Lady of the Sacred Heart church at Henley Beach; Rowing SA at West Lakes; Drakes Mini at Grange; Macchinetta Coffee House on Grange Road; and Grange Jetty Cafe.

That list and the number of signatures really do demonstrate how much my community has driven this petition, to make it abundantly clear how important the hospital is to our community.

WORLD LYMPHOEDEMA DAY

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:07): I rise to acknowledge that yesterday 6 March was World Lymphoedema Day, which falls during Lymphoedema Awareness Week, this week, and International Lymphoedema Awareness Month. For those who may not know, lymphoedema is a condition where the accumulation of excessive amounts of protein-rich fluid within the tissue results in swelling of one or more regions of the body. Lymphoedema usually affects limbs, although it may also involve the trunk, breast, head and neck, or genital area.

There are two types of lymphoedema that may arise because the lymphatic vessels or nodes have been damaged or were not formed correctly. Primary lymphoedema is a congenital condition resulting from abnormal development of the lymph vessels and may be present at birth, develop at the onset of puberty, or not become apparent for many years into adulthood. Secondary lymphoedema is the most common type of lymphoedema and occurs following damage to the lymphatic system which can result from trauma, infections, quite often from cancer treatment involving the removal of lymph nodes and radiotherapy, or can develop with the progression of malignant disease.

Treatment for lymphoedema is centred around an accurate assessment, appropriate garment fitting, education and self-management. Manual lymphatic drainage massage may also help. The South Australian government is pleased to support South Australians living with lymphoedema through the South Australian Lymphoedema Compression Garment Subsidy Scheme. The scheme provides eligible South Australians living with lymphoedema access to up to two subsidised compression garments or adjustable wrap systems per affected body part, every six months at no cost.

Our government are also supporting people with lymphoedema and this important scheme by more than doubling the budget allocation for this scheme since June 2022 to ensure that South Australians with lymphoedema have access to this crucial service. Wearing correctly

measured and prescribed compression garments can support people with lymphoedema to reduce the development of complications from lymphoedema and improve their health outcomes. Compression garments are available in a wide variety of designs, fabrics and compression levels. These compression garments and other services and treatments are provided to South Australians with lymphoedema through the public health system or approved private prescribers. Services include assessment, education and management, advice on therapy options, tailored treatment options and prescription of appropriate compression garments.

It is also important that we continue to look to future treatment solutions for those with lymphoedema, which is why the Flinders University lymphoedema research unit is doing just that. The lymphoedema research unit is actively involved in clinical research related to lymphoedema, including clinical trials of various treatment and management strategies.

I would like to take the opportunity to thank all the clinicians and staff involved in treating and supporting South Australians with lymphoedema. I would also like to acknowledge Lyn Balfour and Dr Debbie Geyer, President and Vice-President of Lymphoedema Association Australia, for their continued advocacy and support for those people living with lymphoedema.

I also recognise the work of the Lymphoedema Association Australia in their campaign to increase awareness this month to 'Shine a Light on Lymphoedema'. Lymphoedema Association Australia organised for many of our local landmarks, including Adelaide Oval and our own Parliament House, to be lit up blue last night to raise awareness of lymphoedema. I would also like to acknowledge the passionate patient advocate Monique Bareham, who is a member of the Lymphoedema Compression Garment Subsidy Scheme advisory group and who has been a passionate advocate on behalf of consumers for many years. I was delighted recently to appoint her to the Health Performance Council, representing consumers broadly across our state. She is also a former president of Lymphoedema Association SA.

I also acknowledge Kellie Thomas, another former president of Lymphoedema Association SA and now South Australian working party chair of Lymphoedema Association Australia, for raising awareness and continuing to advocate for South Australians with lymphoedema. Thank you to all of those advocates for the work that you have done that has helped to lead to this scheme and the expansion of this scheme that has helped so many South Australians with this horrible condition.

HYDROGEN POWER STATION

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (15:12): The Premier travelled to the Upper Spencer Gulf last week, where, amongst his announcements, he confirmed another broken promise by the Malinauskas Labor government regarding their \$600 million experimental hydrogen power station that Labor themselves have admitted is not aimed at delivering cheaper electricity bills for struggling South Australian households. After his trip, South Australians now know not to trust anything he or his ministers say around cost of living, because he thinks when politicians talk about reducing living costs, and I quote, 'nine times out of 10 it's all BS'.

South Australians are also starting to understand it is not just cost-of-living commentary from the Premier that is 90 per cent BS; it is also his election promises, his promise to fix ramping. Let's talk about his hydrogen power station promises. Before the election, Labor's policy document clearly stated, 'Labor will build a new 200MW Combined Cycle Turbine'. Combined cycle turbines are used to provide base load power, something that intermittent wind and solar cannot. Fast forward to last week and the Premier has given up on his promise to construct a combined cycle turbine, instead opting for a LM6000 aeroderivative open-cycle turbine, effectively a jet engine that usually hangs off the wing of a plane.

I pointed out that this broken promise of a base load generator was likely over a year ago, when the government released their request for proposals in late 2022, and the Premier has now confirmed this. You have to ask why. Maybe because the last combined cycle turbine was commissioned in South Australia over 20 years ago, because they just do not have the flexibility to effectively operate in a system where wind and solar at times are producing energy all the time. Or was the promise broken because combined cycle turbines are much more expensive and would have blown the \$600 million budget to bits?

Regardless, this was obviously a BS promise that removes a base load generator for a peaking plant and therefore fundamentally changes the nature of this project. This has major implications for industry in South Australia, who thought they were getting a base load generator. Instead, they are getting a power station that might run for an hour or two in the late afternoon, after work, when people are actually getting home from work.

We also know that this is not the only promise to be broken in regard to the hydrogen power station. Labor have previously dropped their promise of 3,600 tonnes of hydrogen storage and also the promise that it was liquefied hydrogen storage. That was in order to avoid a massive cost blowout in the hundreds of millions of dollars. Instead, they are aiming for 100 tonnes of gaseous storage.

Remember, Labor claimed the cost for this 3,600 tonnes of liquefied hydrogen storage would cost \$31 million, but expert advice from the CSIRO has shown that that much liquefied storage would cost north of \$310 million. As a result, the project has had a drastic cut in storage and with not enough fuel to run as base load for long periods the Premier's BS promise of a combined cycle turbine is now some jet engines. These are two broken promises of four of the main pillars of their hydrogen plan and it begs the question: what other promises will be broken and fall into the BS category?

Just like the cheat that food companies make by reducing the size of the chocolate bar to keep the cost down, this government keeps changing the nature and the scope of what was promised to South Australians prior to the state election, promised three years ago, before the massive jumps in construction costs and inflation that have occurred in the last two years, to try to keep within their phony \$593 million budget.

The Premier is hoping that no-one notices his promises were BS as he spends hundreds of thousands of dollars on advertising that largely relies on projects initiated under the former Liberal government and that I was involved in as minister for trade and investment, such as the Northern Water Project, which is looking to unlock enormous opportunity in Spencer Gulf and mining projects in the Gawler Craton. The possibilities at Cape Hardy and the \$140 million Port Bonython hydrogen hub that the former Liberal government committed \$40 million to, all to cover up the Malinauskas Labor government spending \$600 million—and it could be more, hundreds of millions of dollars more—on an experimental hydrogen power station that is not aimed at delivering cheaper electricity bills for struggling South Australian households.

BUCKINGHAM ARMS HOTEL REDEVELOPMENT

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (15:17): I rise today on an important community win that we have had. A short time ago, the State Commission Assessment Panel published that it has rejected the Buckingham Arms proposed development at 1 Walkerville Terrace, Gilberton, which is a significant win for our local community.

The myriad reasons that SCAP rejected this proposal were very extensive, one being the complete overdevelopment of the site. This site has caused a lot of community concern over recent months. The site was rezoned a few years ago up to six storeys. You can imagine the community concern when a proposed development came out that was 10 storeys instead—three 10-storey towers, almost 200 apartments, of which only 24 were affordable, and more than 300 car parks.

This development is at an incredibly busy five-arm intersection in my community. For anyone who drives to work or drives home through Northcote Terrace or Walkerville Terrace, you will know the site that I am talking about and how busy that intersection already is. If you can imagine a development of this scale being plonked right on that five-arm intersection, you can imagine the concern of my local community.

Yesterday, the community came out in force at the SCAP, which was deliberating the proposal. I was first up to give the views of my community on this proposal. As I was saying earlier, those concerns centred around the excessive scale and mass of the development, the impact on traffic and also the impact that it would have as a gateway or an entry statement to Medindie, Walkerville and Gilberton, character suburbs known for their heritage. We are incredibly pleased with today's outcome, and I just want to list a few of the reasons for SCAP rejecting this particular proposal. Fifteen reasons were published today. They were:

1. The proposal did not meet performance outcome 1.1 as the proposal was for high-rise development that has not demonstrated high-quality design.

2. The proposal does not meet performance outcome 1.1 as the proposed built form both dominates and negatively impacts the existing local heritage place through massing, setbacks, scale, design, materials and architectural features.

3. The proposal does not meet performance outcome 2.1 as the building design does not positively contribute to the public realm through acceptable building design via scale and massing at ground level.

Reason No. 5:

5. The proposal does not meet performance outcome 5.1 as the increased dwelling yield from the proposal does not satisfactorily manage offsite impacts through design quality, and it is considered overdevelopment of the site.

6. The proposal does not meet the performance outcome 5.2 as it has not been designed to minimise impact to adjacent residential land uses.

7. The proposal does not meet performance outcome 6.4 as the proposed pedestrian linkages between the underground parking area and the proposed townhouses are not considered safe or convenient.

Reason No. 11:

11. The proposal does not meet performance outcome 12.6 as the proposal is not considered to be durable and able to age without ongoing maintenance required.

These are just some of the 15 reasons that SCAP deliberated that this development was completely unnecessary and unreasonable for this particular site.

As I said, this site had been rezoned to up to six storeys, and I believe our community understands that it is an important site for development. We understand the need for housing. This site is important because it is close to public transport, to our city, to our Parklands and to our services, and so we very much look forward to more sustainable and sensible proposals being proposed for this site in the future.

With my remaining time, I just want to shout out to all the people in my local community: for attending the community meetings, for putting in submissions, for attending the SCAP hearing yesterday. This is a wonderful example of the community coming together to fight for better outcomes for our community. We support development. We understand that development can be positive for a community. It can bring more people to the area, it can create vibrancy and it can support our local businesses. But development should not be thrust upon a community at all costs, and so we very much welcome SCAP's decision today and look forward to more sensible and sustainable proposals for this site in the future.

BAROSSA VALLEY TRANSPORT SERVICES

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:22): Last year, this state government announced a series of land releases in both the north of the Adelaide fringes and in the south of Adelaide as well. This was to enable the construction of over 25,000 new homes. That plan included releasing some land in Concordia, which is in my electorate: some 10,000 homes over the next decade. What this means in essence is that Concordia, which is between Gawler and the Barossa Valley, is going to have 10,000 new homes or around 25,000 new people over the next decade.

In response to that announcement, I did call on the government to do a number of things: first of all, to expand a feasibility study that the government had already launched to look at what would be required for a private tourist train to come to the Barossa Valley. I thought that it was just common sense that, given taxpayer money was being used to look at what would be required for a private tourist train, why not open that up and expand that to look at what would be required for a public passenger train to come to the Barossa Valley. I am pleased to say that the government did see the logic in my question, and they answered that by expanding the feasibility study, looking now

not just at the private tourist train but also at what would be required for a public passenger train to come to the Barossa Valley.

On Monday this week, *The Advertiser* had a front-page story in relation to the RAA, which supports the extension of the Metro train network to Aldinga in the south and to Concordia in the north. The RAA is concerned that the proposed population growth in peri-urban areas will result in a gridlock of the existing road network without additional transport options, and I quote Mr Nick Reade from the RAA who said:

Imagine what would happen if an extra 100,000 people jumped into their cars and joined the morning commute? Our road network couldn't absorb that without significantly increasing congestion and travel times.

In response to the RAA calls, I did note that the government said that nothing was off the table, which is a big tick in terms of transport, but the problem is that when the feasibility to look at both the passenger train and the tourist train was first announced, we were supposed to be seeing the results of that by the end of last year. We are obviously a few months from that date and we are yet to see any outcome from that, so I am just urging the government to make sure that they put their pedal to the metal in doing this planning.

As you know all too well, Mr Speaker, we saw the absolute shambolic planning process which came with the Mount Barker redevelopment and adding in new homes up there. That is something that your community and people of the Adelaide Hills are now paying for decades later. We simply cannot afford a situation where the government fails to put in the preparation work to expand our population, and it is not just in relation to transport. It has to be in relation to looking at what is required for education, what is required for the health needs in our local community.

When it comes to planning decisions, we need to make sure we have the community involved in something that is so astronomically and so fundamentally going to change the landscape of a region. We need to make sure the horse is put before the cart because otherwise we will end up with another disastrous result like Mount Barker, which in many ways has had some of its challenges addressed but it took far too long and we cannot afford for that to happen in the Barossa Valley.

I also note that if we take a look at the sheer number of people—100,000 more on our road network—it is just not possible. That is why we need to look at every single avenue to increase transport opportunities, not just with train but also with things like calling for Uber to be expanded to the region of the Barossa Valley. Those are some of the things that I have been focused on. With 25,000 more people moving into Concordia, I just urge the government to do all of the appropriate planning to make sure that our region is well-equipped to handle this growth well into the future.

VAGINAL CANCER

Mrs PEARCE (King) (15:27): Being one day from International Women's Day, I am tempted to use this as an opportunity to celebrate the many women in my life, women who I am eternally grateful for, but I think they would understand my desire today to talk about one specific woman—my friend Kate.

I am so fortunate to have formed life-lasting friendships during my school years. Maybe it is one of the benefits of being raised in a country town. My friendship with Kate is certainly one of those. Kate is one of the most formidable women I know. She has the driest sense of humour. She is a fierce supporter of women. She is a beast on the hockey field. She has been a tradie up in the mines and, for many years now, she has been keeping communities safe through her work as a police officer. So it is safe to say she is one bloody tough cookie.

But over the past couple of years she has had a fight on her hands and it has been really tough. She has been fighting vaginal cancer, a cancer which she received diagnosis of during her pregnancy of her third child. It was not an easy road for her to be able to get that diagnosis either, and what she has had to endure has been one of the hardest things that I have witnessed somebody go through.

Through her experiences, which have been trying and isolating, her one desire outside of kicking its arse is to encourage greater awareness of this form of cancer. To help, I thought I would share a couple of pointers from her for those who have only just learnt about this form of cancer. Firstly, Kate wants you to know that it exists. You see, last year it was only around 100 women who

were diagnosed with vaginal cancer, so it is not overly common to hear about it or know of somebody who is going through this. From what I can see, it does not have its own standalone day nor does it have its own ribbon.

Of course, there is Gynaecological Cancer Awareness Month, which highlights the major gynaecological cancers of which there are around eight. But as Kate pointed out to me, how many of us can name just four of those cancers? She certainly could not until she received her diagnosis.

All cancers are terrible, but some are more uncomfortable to talk about than others, and that certainly needs to change. People are robbed of their possible support networks if they are unable to feel comfortable talking about their diagnosis and their journey.

That leads me to Kate's second point. Please get to know your body. Do not feel uncomfortable talking about it, and please do not make others uncomfortable for talking about theirs. As Kate said to me, everybody knows how to feel for lumps and bumps when it comes to breast cancer awareness, and that is fantastic. It is a testament to the hard work of the movement to reduce the stigma and encourage the health and wellbeing of women. However, how many people truly understand the female reproductive system and how to protect it?

HPV vaccines are incredibly efficient, but women still need to ensure they are keeping a regular check of their bodies and getting their pap smears. It pays to be safe and alert, even if it is uncomfortable. If you do not have a cervix you certainly still need a smear, and we encourage vault smears. As a government we want to ensure fewer women miss out on regular testing, which is why we provided funding towards the You Can Do It campaign, aiming to share the news that women are now able to undertake self-collection tests at home.

So please, if you are a woman who has been putting this off, use this as an opportunity to get yourself sorted today. If you are a woman who has concerns, and you maybe feel that something is just not quite right with your body, please go and see a doctor and seek advice. Putting it off will only put you further at risk.

Kate and I have a little tradition. Many of our catch-ups involve walking around Cobbler Creek and talking a bit of smack. It is one of my favourite things to do, and I think it is one of hers as well. It is why I have decided to participate in the March Charge this year. I am aiming to cover 150 kilometres this month, hoping to raise funds towards cancer research, prevention programs and support services.

I have covered 31 kilometres in the past week and, yes, I am a little bit stiff, but it is nothing compared to what people like Kate have had to endure. To all who have supported me with this endeavour and all who will support me for the weeks to come, thank you very much. Let's work together to help fight cancer.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 19 March 2024 at 11am.

Motion carried.

Bills

INTERVENTION ORDERS (PREVENTION OF ABUSE) (SECTION 31 OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

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

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:32): Indeed, Mr Speaker. I just spoke at length before the lunch break, so I will not elaborate at length, but I will say thank you very much to the Attorney-General in the other place, the Hon. Kyam Maher, for his expeditious and thorough work to draft, with the support of the Attorney-General's Office and the others I mentioned previously, and expedite this really important legislation that we debate today.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr TEAGUE: The orders that are the subject of section 13 programs are in respect of all of the purposes and objects of the headline act, including problem gambling and tenancy. Domestic abuse has been referred to at length, of course, in the second reading as well as non-domestic abuse and other purposes. My first question is: to what extent is there data available, and can the minister advise the committee about the range and scope of section 13 programs that have been made available over the relevant period, that is, on the one hand the life of the act, but more particularly the period during which it has been said the charge has been erroneously applied?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: Thank you to the member for the question. As I am sure he is aware, the programs he refers to are administered by the court in terms of which particular programs a defendant is directed toward. I can certainly say broadly that those programs deeply focus on perpetrator intervention, the desire to shift attitudes that lead to disrespect and violence toward women. In terms of naming each of those programs that the court has directed particular defendants toward, I can certainly speak at length about the content of those programs but to actually name each of those programs that a range of organisations run, including non-government organisations, we would certainly have to provide the member with a list of those programs. But I can say broadly that they focus on that shifting attitude and behaviour.

I would also add that from opposition just a few years ago, we did understand that there was not a severe enough penalty for those who did not attend those particular programs, so at that time from opposition, unfortunately, the then government did not immediately support the bill that I put forward but, after some time, and after the Independents at that time supported that bill, we did increase penalties through that bill for non-attendance at those programs.

We did that because we know that those programs in terms of shifting attitudes and behaviours that lead to disrespect and violence towards women are incredibly important in our quest to help prevent the terrible scourge of domestic, family and sexual violence. I can speak at length about the content, the reason why, the measures that we took from opposition and, indeed, that we have taken since being in government to support those programs and to toughen penalties for non-attendance, but to name each of those programs, I will make sure that we get that list to the member if that is what he is looking for.

Mr TEAGUE: I am happy to have the names of the programs. We are in the committee with this technical task of identifying matters that are going to result from the particular changes, so I am endeavouring to get to that rather more directly. Perhaps this is a way of repeating the question. As we know, the section 13 intervention programs are applicable to the range of purposes to which the act is directed, and there has certainly been a focus on the domestic violence aspects of the operation of the bill. The question goes to whether or not, and if so how widespread and how much, the subject of offences under section 31(1) are each of those programs.

For example, the minister might be able to inform the committee that this is wholly and solely a matter for domestic violence programs that are the subject of section 13, but it may well be the case and it would certainly assist the committee to know the extent to which intervention programs have been directed in circumstances other than domestic violence, for example, and if so have been in turn the subject of section 31(1) prosecutions.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: This work, as I outlined in my second reading speech, was all about making sure that where those offences had been inappropriately or mistakenly recorded as 31(1) offences rather than 31(2) offences that particular error was rectified. That has been the focus of this piece of work, and rightly so, to fix the error that had occurred over those years.

In terms of taking research into for what other reasons people had been subject to intervention orders, outside of domestic violence or domestic abuse, that has not been the subject of this particular bill, but I can certainly speak to the Attorney-General directly and ascertain that information in terms of the numbers of intervention orders that people have become subject to that relate to matters that are not domestic abuse.

Mr TEAGUE: I appreciate that on both fronts and look forward to the minister providing both sets of information on notice. I look forward to those responses. Just to be clear, there is nothing on the face of the bill that goes, as I read it—and I stand to be corrected—to any particular function of the act. If it is the case that this is a matter that is dominated by, or indeed wholly and solely related to, issues about the prosecution in domestic abuse circumstances, then I am glad to hear that.

Otherwise, on the face of the act, the act has the range of purposes providing for intervention orders in those range of circumstances that I have spelled out. They are on the face of the long title of the act, and so perhaps the overarching question might be put another way: how many prosecutions have there been over the course of the relevant period that has been identified, and of those, how many, if any, are in circumstances other than domestic abuse intervention orders?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: I am not really sure which clause the member is relating the particular question to, but I will refer the member back to my speech where I spelled out these issues. We know that there were 771 particular charges. In terms of the deeper breakdown of the nature of those particular types of breaches, that is not work that has been done in relation to this bill.

The focus of this bill, as I spoke about at length—and this time, hopefully, the member can take this on—is on making sure that an error is rectified. So women, on the whole and in the majority, who have potentially felt or been unsafe as a result of this particular issue that we now rectify, this bill is about supporting those women and making sure that that error is rectified. That is the purpose of it.

The government taking this forward absolutely speaks to our stringent and enduring focus on addressing this particular range of issues. We have a very proud record of doing so. We will continue to focus, as we should, on making up for that lack of action over the last four years of the previous government, where particular bills were not supported and action was not taken. We will continue to make sure that we focus on these matters, as we should.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): It is longstanding practice that at clause 1 of a piece of legislation, more general questions about the policy decisions that took place before the bill was enacted are allowed. Are there further questions? You have had three questions already, member for Heysen. We will allow you to have one more, if you like.

Mr TEAGUE: Thank you. I appreciate it. There are plenty of occasions on which one might compare and contrast or highlight policy responses.

The Hon. K.A. Hildyard: Like you did in the speech.

Mr TEAGUE: Exactly. That is the occasion, as is the—

The Hon. K.A. Hildyard interjecting:

Mr TEAGUE: That might be something we come back to in the third reading. I appreciate the opportunity just to make clear the nature of the question, and if answers are not available straightaway, then I understand, and I appreciate the two matters that the minister has taken on notice so far.

Just to be clear, and in the context of circumstances in which section 31(1) concerns actions for breach of that part of an intervention order that concerns an intervention program, what I am concerned to identify for the benefit of the committee is the range of such intervention programs and the range of charges for offences in a variety of circumstances. I just give the example of a problem

gambling circumstance in which an intervention order is applied, together with the possibility of section 13 measures.

I am very conscious of the fact that section 31 provides, among other penalties, for expiation. In terms of getting to the question the subject matter of which I well and truly foreshadowed in the second reading, I am interested to identify the prevalence of circumstances in which intervention programs are applied in the range of different circumstances, because it will in turn inform the committee and inform the wider community about the application of the act, and particularly section 13, and the scope with which police have been applying their operational process in terms of charging matters under section 31(1) where section 31(2) was appropriate.

Now, if that is happening wholly and solely in domestic abuse circumstances, then it is good to know about it. I suggest it is important to have that on the public record, if not immediately then on notice. If the minister has nothing to add now then so be it, and I would appreciate the minister taking that matter on notice.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: I am not taking the question on notice again. It has already been asked and I have already fulsomely answered the question and certainly advised that we would endeavour to provide a list of the range of programs in relation to the different sorts of matters for which an intervention order may be applied. I have been very clear that the majority are for domestic violence-related offences, but I have already undertaken to provide a list. I do not see anything new whatsoever in this particular set of questions.

Clause passed.

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3.

Mr TEAGUE: Clause 3 is a convenient point to address the question that I foreshadowed during the second reading debate, and that is whether or not it is known that there is clear air in terms of the prosecution of aggravated offences subject to section 31(2), or if they have all been caught up, or if it is not known. Where there is an intended charge for an offence against section 31(2) that is aggravated, have those all been caught, in which case can comfort be provided including to those who are protected on the face of the intervention order?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: This is an area that I am deeply familiar with, having looked into the particular strengthening of penalties through the work that we did from opposition. As I understand it, the member is asking how many of the incorrect charges were actually contraventions of the aggravated form of the section 31(2) breach of an intervention order offence. The aggravated form of the section 31(2) offence, which attracts a higher maximum penalty in circumstances where there was a reasonable likelihood that a child would be exposed to the conduct constituting the offence, was only introduced by an amendment to the act which took effect from April 2022.

As I said, I am very familiar with that because that is the work that we progressed from opposition. The charging error was conclusively rectified, as I set out in my second reading speech, from May 2019. Therefore, none of the affected defendants could have, of course, been charged with the aggravated form of the section 31(2) offence, because it simply was not in existence at all at the relevant time.

Mr TEAGUE: Thanks for that answer. It serves to highlight the relevant periods of time. There is no risk therefore of anything other than the charge involving a disparity between the penalty for the basic offence under section 31(2) and the maximum penalty under section 31(1).

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: I think I am giving a similar answer to what I gave for the last question. The offences that a particular defendant was charged with attracted the penalties that were relevant at that time. As I said, this matter that we addressed in terms of rectifying the inaccuracies in charging was resolved by May 2019, so because these aggravated penalties did not exist at that time—I feel like I have already answered this question; I am not sure if there is a way to reframe it—they were charged and attracted the appropriate penalties at the time. On 4 April 2022, from memory, this new amendment to the act strengthened penalties specifically for breaches of domestic violence-

related intervention orders. That was not actually in existence at the time when these charges were first made. If there is another aspect to the question, please let me know.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Would you like to rephrase the question, member for Heysen?

Mr TEAGUE: Yes. The answer to the first question is that the section 31(2)(b) aggravated offence did not come into existence until after the problem period—I got that, loud and clear. The answer to the second question is really more one of reassurance. I think the short answer is yes. The point is that it is not for me; I am asking the question.

We are dealing with the history of the legislation that has applied since 2011 at least. All I am doing is asking for clarity in terms of the known maximum penalty for a breach of section 31(1). At present it is two years' imprisonment. The known maximum penalty for a breach of section 31(2)(a) basic offence is three years, as I understand it. We have dealt with that in question one.

With regard to the one-year difference that applies right now in terms of the difference between the basic offence in section 31(2) and the offence in section 31(1), has that applied at all relevant times and, therefore, are we able to confirm, advise the committee, that we are at all relevant times talking about a disparity of one year in terms of the maximum imprisonment that is available pursuant to either of those offences? That is my understanding.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: I will talk about the penalties during the period when those who were subject to those incorrect charging matters would have committed the offence, so the relevant period. During the period 9 December 2011 to May 2019, the relevant penalties were: for a breach of section 31(1), an expiation fee of \$160 or a fine of \$1,250. For a breach of section 31(2), it was two years' imprisonment or a fine of \$10,000.

As I spoke about earlier, the Labor opposition and now the Labor government, has a long and proud history of reform that helps to prevent domestic, family and sexual violence. During the course of opposition, we moved a bill to strengthen penalties for breaches of intervention orders. We did that work. It was initially rejected by the then Liberal government, of which the member was a part. It was rejected and rejected and then the crossbench supported the bill and it passed. At that time, when that piece of legislation came into effect, the relevant penalties changed. That time was after the time when those incorrect charges were attributed to particular defendants, the 700 defendants we have spoken about.

Mr TEAGUE: Can I add, for what it is worth, that, as I understand it, the section 13 provisions, the subject of the headline act, were introduced in 2015. Section 13 at least was amended in a couple of different ways in 2015. I guess what I am looking for is an indication, again I think it is clear enough, that notwithstanding changes to section 13 along the way and notwithstanding the introduction of the aggravated offence, at all relevant times, the difference in the maximum penalty that is associated with what we will call the erroneous charge, is a year. That might have varied over the period. If so, let's hear it.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: It is not correct to say that the difference was a year because there was not a penalty at that time. As I have spoken about at length, we changed that to strengthen penalties but there was not a period of time of imprisonment in the original penalty. Does that make sense?

Mr TEAGUE: Yes. So what was it?

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): The minister has already indicated that.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: I will say it again. I will read it again. During the period 9 December 2011 to May 2019, the relevant penalties were: for a breach of section 31(1), so the programs, etc., non-attendance, etc., an expiation fee of \$160 or a fine of \$1,250. For a breach of section 31(2), the penalty was two years' imprisonment or a fine of \$10,000.

I was so disappointed that the then Liberal government did not initially support it. The reason I strengthened those penalties was because we know that often when an intervention order is first made that can be an incredibly dangerous period for a woman who is a survivor, who has taken that

courageous step to apply for an intervention order; we know that that is a really dangerous time in terms of reoffending.

The reason that I moved legislation to strengthen the penalties was to act as a further deterrent for those perpetrators at any time, but particularly at that time when we know there is a heightened danger of reoffence. I think I have set out the time frame of when I moved that particular legislation, when that legislation came into effect. I have certainly articulated exactly what the penalties were at the time when the charges we now know were attributed in error, and I have certainly set out the time of the legislation coming into effect to strengthen those penalties.

What I can also say to the house is that during that period we moved multiple pieces of legislation to help to prevent domestic, family and sexual violence. One of those I actually moved twice, and I was so disappointed that the then Liberal government just refused—absolutely refused—to support that legislation. That was legislation to include the experience of domestic violence as a ground of discrimination in the Equal Opportunity Act.

Following calls from women's organisations, industrial organisations, the then equal opportunity commissioner—the now equal opportunity commissioner certainly supports it—we moved that bill twice. It was not supported. I am really proud that since coming to government we have made sure that that particular piece of legislation has passed. Similarly, we now have legislation in the upper house in relation to ensuring that those who commit a serious domestic violence-related offence are electronically monitored as a condition of their bail, and I look forward to when we debate that particular piece of legislation in this house. That is a really important step forward.

I could go into a range of other programs, funding, etc., that we have initiated but I will save that for further answers relating to questions that the member may have. However, I do want to highlight that one of the really important ways to progress prevention is to make sure that we have appropriate penalties. This legislation certainly goes to that. One of the other really important strategies in prevention is to make sure that at the earliest possible opportunity women who begin to experience or are worried about particular behaviour, or are beginning to experience domestic, family and sexual violence, have somewhere to go.

What happened under the previous government is that there were particular hubs that began to be established, but what we discovered from opposition is that there was no funding for those hubs. One of the many things that we have done that helps in these efforts to prevent violence at the earliest point is to ensure, with the support of national funding also, that there are now paid staff members in each of the 10 regional hubs, and we have committed funding to open a southern domestic violence prevention and recovery hub and a northern domestic violence prevention and recovery hub in the metropolitan areas. The southern hub is already open and absolutely supported by community, and the northern domestic violence prevention and recovery hub is close to being launched. That will provide a really important place to prevent violence as early as possible.

Clause passed.

Clause 4.

Mr TEAGUE: We can consult the record to see that section 31(1) and (2) have been amended in the course of the last government in 2018 and in 2021, and in other respects was amended in 2015, so through the period that we have been concerned with. Resisting the urge to set out histories of other matters—

The Hon. K.A. Hildyard interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Order!

Mr TEAGUE: What has been made clear is that—and forgive me if I am the one who is a bit slow off the mark in this regard—for at least a substantial part of the relevant period, that is between 2011 and 2019, the contravention of a section 13 aspect of an intervention order attracted a fine, and slightly less of a fine than it does presently, not a term of imprisonment.

Leaving aside the virtues of superimposing that possibility for 31(1) that has happened recently, is it not the clear case that for a large part of that period of time, there is a clear difference between a 31(1) contravention in terms of penalty—no prison term attaching at all—and the penalty

that attached for the contravention of any other substantive term of an intervention order—two years, as the minister has advised, for the bulk of that time.

So, for at least a substantial part of that time, for better or worse, there was a substantial term of imprisonment attached to a 31(2) offence, whereas there was no term of imprisonment attached to 31(1). If an offender was facing the court and erroneously sentenced according to 31(1) on 31(2) evidence, then there is a certainty—and I hesitate to put it as high as a certainty—or the possibility to apply a term of imprisonment on that offender that might otherwise have been applied had the penalty regime then in force been applied correctly, then the opportunity to apply a term of imprisonment is lost altogether.

Therefore, through that period, one can presume that there are impositions of pecuniary penalties, that is until the change is made, and at and from the time that the term of imprisonment is attached to 31(1) the problem becomes a narrower problem in terms of the maximum penalty. Is that a correct state of the affairs for the relevant period of time, or has there somehow been a capacity to sentence pursuant to 31(2) at all times and therefore the problem has not existed? That is not the way I understand it.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: I spoke about this in my speech and I think the question goes to a really important point for bringing this bill to the house. What we need to be clear about, and I think it is a very important point for those people who applied for intervention orders in terms of people who may be worried about safety, etc. is that the paperwork treated the offence, the charge, as 31(1). What the court actually did was treat the particular conduct as an offence under 31(2).

Therefore, people in relation to particular types of breaches and circumstances did face imprisonment because the court treated the offence rightly, because the conduct constituted a breach under section 31(2). The error was about the paperwork, how the offence was recorded in terms of the actual charge on which section the breach related to.

Mr TEAGUE: Thank you for that answer, minister. That was not my understanding prior to the answer. I am not quarrelling with it; I appreciate the answer. So it is not just the case that the court received evidence in accord with section 31(2), it is that the court has also consistently sentenced as though the charge was brought under section 31(2), and therefore there is actually no disparity, no inconsistency at any time in relation to the maximum penalty that might be applied—and leave aside the aggravated point, or post relevant period of time.

At no point has there been any disparity between either the capacity to receive evidence that might be relevant to section 31(2) or the court's actual proceeding to sentence as though sentencing under section 31(2). If that is the case, that renders this about as close to the line in terms of necessity and brings into focus, I suppose, the Law Society's observations in terms of the adequacy of a deeming provision.

I do not want to gainsay the advice the Attorney and the government have received, and the reasons why we are here. We are supporting the bill. However, if that is the assurance that has been provided by the minister, then that really does leave us in territory that is even narrower than I perceived it until now and I guess the benefit of this committee process, at least for my purposes.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: What I can say, in relation to the member's question, is that, based on the advice that has been received, we are going as far as we can to limit avenues for appeal without completely shutting the door.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Mr Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Third Reading

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (16:20): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker, for your work there as Chair. I trust that the questions that the member for Heysen had following the explanations that I provided in my second reading speech now make things clearer for him.

I want to reiterate something about this bill and then go back to a point that I made earlier about prevention. First of all, I reiterate that this bill is about providing assurance to those who have applied for an intervention order, about providing them with comfort about their safety. It is about, as I just said in relation to the last question, making sure that we close particular avenues for appeal. It is about us absolutely rectifying a past error that happened for a period of time that was not rectified under the previous government. It is now rectified, and I am very glad that the opposition has chosen to support the bill and that we can now progress it.

I would say one other thing that I did not have time to speak about earlier and that is in relation to the prevention of domestic, family and sexual violence. I spoke about the intervention orders to which this bill is subject, I talked about what we do in the community, but there is another very important thing, and that is that we know that the core, at the heart of the horrific scourge of domestic family and sexual violence lies gender inequality which creates disrespectful attitudes toward women and leads to violence toward women.

So to tackle the awful scourge of domestic, family and sexual violence, we all have to be aware of what we are doing to create in every aspect of community life, in our economy, gender equality and that includes in here. That includes making sure that in this place we show that we value women, that we want equal numbers of women and men here in the parliament, that we value diversity in decision-making. It means actually deliberately taking steps to make sure that you understand, and that each political party understands, that talent and merit is not gendered and therefore taking decisions to make sure that we display gender equality in here.

I am really, really, really proud that on this side of the house over some years we have taken steps to recognise that there are roughly equal numbers of men and women of merit, to make it clear that we understand that when there are not equal numbers of men and women in our party taking on parliamentary positions that we do something proactive about it. We have done that. We now have more than 51 per cent of women on the government benches in this house. That is really important for this place. It is really important in terms of the message that we send to our community.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: I would hope you agree with this. It is incredibly important that we do that—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order, members! Member for Morphet!

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: —and that as leaders in our community we show that we understand what it takes to create that gender-equal future. I am so proud that the Labor Party and this Labor government has taken those steps to ensure gender equality on this side of the house. It is so important for so many reasons—so many reasons.

It is so disappointing that on that side of the house they have not. They have two excellent, outstanding women on that side of the house—brilliant women. I absolutely have the highest respect for those women. They are wonderful women. They are great advocates for their community and great advocates for the state.

I say happy International Women's Day for tomorrow to those two women on that side of the house and to the many women on this side of the house as well. I genuinely have deep respect for

all of the women in this parliament. I have deep respect, deep gratitude and deep satisfaction that on this side of the house we have taken those steps to advance gender equality.

I am utterly disappointed that those on that side of the house consistently send a message, given their lack of attention to advancing gender equality, demonstrated by the lack of numbers of women in this house. I am so disappointed they have consistently refused to take those proactive steps to turn that around. That sends a terrible message to girls and women in our community. It sends a terrible message about their complete and absolute lack of understanding about what it takes to advance gender equality and why that is so important.

It is important because it actually makes a difference to the aspirations that girls and women have. It makes a difference in our economy. We know that if we encourage that equal active participation in the workforce and tackle women being more likely to engage in insecure work, that makes a difference for those women and also for our economy. We know that every decision-making body, in sport and in every aspect of community life, is enriched when we have gender equality.

I am absolutely dismayed, and frankly appalled, that those opposite have done nothing to advance it. It is so important. Gender inequality, we know, lies as a terrible, pervasive cause of domestic, family and sexual violence. When we all stand up and say that it is incumbent on all of us to play our part in helping to prevent domestic, family and sexual violence, that means playing our part in creating gender equality everywhere, including in here. I wish that you understood that on that side of the house. I fervently wish that. I absolutely wish that. This parliament would be enriched, our community and our economy would be enriched, and more girls and women would see this as a pathway for them.

On that note, again I wish all the women in this house, on both sides of the house, and the entire parliament, including all the staff here in parliament, a very happy International Women's Day for tomorrow. I had hoped to have an opportunity earlier to do this. I also say, in closing, that I intellectually understand—as we all do—why gender equality is so important in here. We understand it; we get it.

When these wonderful women came into parliament post the 2022 election what they showed us is that when you have roughly equal numbers of women here the feeling of this place is different, and that matters. That absolutely matters, for so many reasons. I say thank you to all the women and all the men who work to advance gender equality, and reiterate why it is so important, including in the prevention of domestic, family and sexual violence, which this bill goes to the heart of.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (16:29): Can I say the electors of South Australia—indeed, more particularly, the electors of Dunstan—will have the chance on the 23rd of this month to elect another star Liberal woman to join the ranks on this side of the house, because I can tell you that Dr Anna Finizio, in every context in which she has been described, has been described as nothing short of a star candidate.

This is in spite of and in the face of the most outrageous conduct by the colleagues of the minister, including one who is used to sitting a couple of seats down who has taken the step to, it would appear, flush out what is ordinarily a point of vulnerability for an applicant—in this case, a shining star young woman applying to apply her skills in an area of policy—having a letter of job application flushed out and used for the most base political purposes. This is something that has happened as recently as the last week, by a colleague of the minister, who has just hopped up and given us a lecture on how to treat women, and women who would be in public life.

As we on this side of the house listened silently to that contribution, it is well to make clear that the time for that sort of conduct—I mean, how outrageous to take a confidential document that an individual has chosen to put forward—

Mr ODENWALDER: Point of order, sir.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): There is a point of order from the member for Elizabeth.

Mr ODENWALDER: Point of order: I fail to see how this is relevant and how the minister is, indeed, responsible for this conduct.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): I might remind the member for Heysen that third reading contributions are generally only on the contents of the bill.

Mr TEAGUE: On the point of order, in the context of what we have heard from the minister, it would be a travesty not to set the record straight and that is what I am endeavouring to do.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Again, member for Heysen: any member present in this chamber had an opportunity to ask for a point of order on the minister, and no-one did. Members have the capability to put the record straight, as you put it, in other ways rather than at a third reading contribution on this piece of legislation.

Mr TEAGUE: I might say that in the course of the debate on this bill and in the course of my second reading contribution, I had occasion to reflect on the important work that is to come with the royal commission.

The Hon. K.A. Hildyard interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order! The member will be heard in silence.

Mr TEAGUE: That was admonished in the course of the committee by the minister, who described my contribution, I think, in terms of 'a little speech' that had inspired the minister to then embark upon some wideranging comments that the minister indicated that the minister would not have otherwise embarked upon but for that 'little speech'. In the circumstances of that having been raised I will put on the record, in the course of this third reading commitment, the contribution of the former Marshall Liberal government in this area to address domestic and family violence, including by the then first female Deputy Premier of South Australia—

The Hon. K.A. Hildyard interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order, members! Member for Heysen, you might sit down for a second. Members, I know this is an important issue about which people can get very passionate. I understand that, but the member has the call and he has the right to be heard in silence, as do all members when they have the call. Member for Heysen.

Mr TEAGUE: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. The then first female Deputy Premier of this state and Attorney-General, and the Hon. Michelle Lensink as Minister for Human Services, and I single out for particular recognition Carolyn Power MP, the then member for Elder and the Assistant Minister for Domestic and Family Violence Prevention—who was herself the subject of the most egregious campaign that the state has ever seen—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Member for Heysen—

Mr TEAGUE: —showing enormous disrespect to a female candidate for office at the 2014 election, 'Can you trust Habib?'

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Member for Heysen! You are in danger of being named. You will not speak over the Chair. As a former Speaker of this place, you should know the rules. Now, you will confine your remarks to the bill.

Mr TEAGUE: The member for Elder, having come into this place and taken up the role of Assistant Minister for Domestic and Family Violence Prevention in circumstances that I know the minister would condemn—just as the minister should condemn the actions of her colleagues in the last week in relation to a present candidate, the star candidate, Dr Anna Finizio. The media release to which I refer conveniently sets out—

Mr ODENWALDER: Point of order, Mr Acting Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Member for Heysen, again! I do not know how many more times I need to warn you before I take action against you. Please confine your remarks to the bill at hand. There has been a point of order taken by the member for Elizabeth to which I have agreed. Now, I invite you to do so.

Mr TEAGUE: I am doing exactly that, Mr Acting Speaker, in that the bill is amending, as we know, the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009. In bringing the debate to a conclusion and reflecting on the ground that we have covered in the course of the second reading debate and in the course of the committee process, there has been significant reflection—indeed, the assertion has been put in terms of the work that has been done, including directly in the context—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Member for Heysen, I again remind you that if you disagreed with comments that the minister made you had an opportunity, as all members did, to raise a point of order. You chose not to do so. To ask the Chair to give you an opportunity to address something that you felt was wrong at the time to which you did not take a point of order is not correct. I will ask you to confine your remarks to the bill at hand.

Mr TEAGUE: And again, we may be at—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Attempting in a roundabout way to explain why it is that you feel you do not need to is not itself confining your remarks to the bill. Now, you will confine your remarks to the bill, please.

Mr TEAGUE: We may be at cross-purposes, Mr Acting Speaker, because the bill indeed continues the important work that this house has been dedicated to undertaking over a sustained period of time. There have been particular references to amendments to the act that have been applied since its enactment—in the first instance in 2009—and in particular to amendments that have been made to penalty provisions the subject of section 31 offences, which is the very matter that the bill is addressing itself to. Those are matters that, where they have arisen in substance, are the subject of considerable focus and investment, including by the previous government.

In terms of the changes that this bill is advancing, the changes have been deemed necessary, on advice. They will ensure the regularisation of process in relation to section 31 and section 32 offences. What is clear is that if we are to ensure the efficacy of this legislation then we must continue the work of ongoing amendment, and that includes the work that has been described in the course of the debate.

It is not a matter of drawing any particular contrast, but we cannot see as anything other than intertwined, one with the other, measures for the obtaining and, if necessary, the charging for contravention of, in terms of intervention orders with the amendments that were made the subject of the Statutes Amendment (Domestic Violence) Act 2018. This expanded the definition of abuse and increased penalties for repeated or violent breaches of intervention orders. It allowed police-recorded interviews with victims to be admissible evidence in court and introduced a standalone criminal offence of non-fatal strangulation.

That went along with amendments to the Sentencing Act 2017, which lowered the available discount for very serious offences against the person, including those that are often experienced in a domestic violence situation, and ensured that the penalty given to perpetrators of domestic and family violence reflect the seriousness of the crime; and, indeed, amendments to the Victims of Crime Act 2001, which removed the requirement for all victims, including victims of domestic and family violence, to have any contact with the perpetrator when accessing compensation; together with the abolition of the defence of provocation, legislation in the course of the Marshall government that contained family violence-specific provisions to ensure that evidence of family violence and the circumstances surrounding it can be taken into account both at trial and at sentencing.

That is not to mention the range of measures and programs that have been applied over the course of that period of time, providing the substance and context within which the application of enforcement, the subject of the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act is there precisely to ensure. They included:

- early intervention, impacts of violence on children program;
- the \$1.9 million Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme trial;
- \$600,000 over two years to keep victims of domestic and family violence informed;
- \$2.4 million over three years for Relationships Australia South Australia's rebuild program;

- \$250,000 to the Office of the Commissioner for Victims' Rights;
- the Family Safety Framework within the Department of Human Services;
- \$1.66 million over four years to the 24/7 DV Crisis Line;
- \$954,000 over three years to Yarrow Place;
- the Women's Domestic Violence Court Assistance Service commonwealth partnerships;
- \$4 million for 40 new crisis accommodation beds, a subject that continues to be a matter of question, support and continuation in the term of the present government;
- \$1.66 million to fund the Women's Safety Services SA domestic violence crisis hotline 24/7;
- \$353,000 to fund the new life-saving domestic violence app;
- \$624,000 to fund the South Australian Coalition of Women's Domestic Violence Services, the peak body;
- funding to assist in opening nine DV safety hubs in regional areas, a matter that the minister has referred to in terms of the south—

The Hon. K.A. Hildyard interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order! The member will be heard in silence.

Mr TEAGUE: There was also:

- \$1.86 million towards funding the national sexual violence prevention campaign program, Stop It at the Start;
- a \$5 million interest-free loan to develop a new DV support housing initiative;
- rolling out of the Ask Angela initiative, designed to assist women facing sexual harassment in licensed venues; and
- release of the Committed to Safety, a-whole-of-government new policy designed to address domestic, family and sexual violence in South Australia.

I am indeed referring to a long list of measures. There are no prizes—

The Hon. K.A. Hildyard interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order! Members, I again repeat my advice I gave the member for Heysen: if members are of the opinion that what a member is saying is contrary to the standing orders, I invite them to raise a point of order. Otherwise, the member will be heard in silence.

Mr TEAGUE: There is no prize, nor is there a monopoly on wisdom or measures in this most vital of areas. I just take the opportunity to reiterate that when one does not adopt an inherently combative approach to the circumstances, one can address the facts as one finds them.

In identifying the fact that this week we have received the welcome news that Natasha Stott Despoja is appointed as the royal commissioner, to commence work in July this year, I have set out as well the course of action that we understand from the public record is to transpire from here. If the government regards that as criticism, including as criticism for not being quick enough in terms of proceeding of this area, so be it. It is a matter of a statement of the circumstances as we know them. If I have set out any facts incorrectly, then I stand to be corrected about that. Appointment this week for commencement in July, for conclusion by July 2025—that is what has been set out on the record.

Again, to be clear, I have indicated how much I welcome the particular appointment and that I look forward to contributing in any way I possibly can to that work, but it would be a mistake to indicate that this is somehow an area in which there is either somehow residing wisdom on one side of politics over another—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Members, order! Minister, order please!

Mr TEAGUE: If we are to see progress, we must apply an evidence-based approach. We must apply an inclusive approach.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Point of order.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Member for Unley, you do not quite have the call. Member for Unley, you have a point of order.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I do, sir. The minister continues to interject, despite your request for her to cease.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Thank you, member for Unley. Members, the member for Heysen has the call. The member for Heysen deserves to be heard in peace, as does every member in this place when they have the call. I have already directed the member for Heysen to confine his remarks to the bill because of views raised by the member for Elizabeth that he was not doing so. He has, to his credit, seemed to have taken that advice on board and I am pleased he has done so. He will be heard in silence for the amount of time that he has left.

Mr TEAGUE: In order for there to be progress in this important area—whether it is via a relatively mechanical piece of legislation, such as the bill before us, and covering a wider range of circumstances it must be said than the area that is of most acute concern in terms of the debate, or whether it is traversing the broader challenge of identifying ways forward that will be examined by the royal commission, and indeed, every step in between.

I certainly do not come to this debate or this area professing to have any particular special wisdom. I do, however, wish to be given an opportunity to participate. I cannot do anything about my gender, but I understand I might be the only male shadow minister or minister for that matter—I again stand to be corrected—for the prevention of domestic and family violence in the country. It is a matter that White Ribbon has made a point of drawing attention to in terms of the responsibility that men have as the vast majority of perpetrators of domestic and family violence.

I am who I am. I will look to apply what ability and diligence I can to contribute in this area of policy that is so much in need of improvement in terms of outcomes, but I will look to do so in ways that do not proceed on the basis that one side of politics somehow holds all the inherent wisdom and has undertaken all the relevant and important steps.

I pay tribute to the first woman Deputy Premier of South Australia, the Hon. Vickie Chapman, for her work in this area, the ongoing work of the Hon. Michelle Lensink, particularly during her time as Minister for Human Services, and the work of the member for Elder, as she then was, Carolyn Power, as Assistant Minister for Domestic and Family Violence Prevention.

In reflecting on the committee process then more particularly, I am glad that the minister has taken those two matters in particular on notice, and I am conscious that the act is an act that is concerned with intervention orders that are applied in a range of circumstances in addition to those of domestic abuse. I just say again, important work for intervention orders includes that for which the act is responsible in terms of problem gambling, tenancy orders and non-domestic abuse, and the data in due course in terms of actions for breach of those section 13 orders will, I am sure, inform the house in terms of ongoing reform of the headline act. With those words, I do commend the bill to the house.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (16:50): I also take the opportunity to speak in a short manner on the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) (Section 31 Offences) Amendment Bill for it does span an important topic. I think it is quite clear that everyone in this house is strongly against domestic violence, family violence and sexual violence as well. It is a terrible scourge in society and affects so many people, and so many women especially. The statistics are very high. I have a family of four children, two girls and two boys, and a wife of course. The statistics are shocking, to think that other families are going through their life subjected to domestic and family violence.

Your family home is meant to be a sanctuary. You come home and find shelter and emotional and physical sustenance from your family. As a father, that is what I want for my wife, for my

daughters and, importantly, for my sons as well. I want them to be exemplary citizens and part of the solution to end domestic violence, and I think all in this house want to see that happen.

In South Australia, just before the end of last year, we had the shocking six deaths in very quick succession, so close together, from domestic violence. That has resulted in a royal commission which, as the member for Heysen said, all in this house—and certainly, this side of the house—support. I reflect back when coming into parliament on some of the terrible instances throughout the nation that really crystalised legislators, not only here in South Australia but across the country.

There was the terrible murder and death of Hannah Clarke up in Queensland at the hands of her husband, setting fire to not only her but the children as well. It shocked the nation. Closer to home, in South Australia, we had a terrible example of family violence against a defenceless baby effectively in young Kobi Shepherdson, who was killed at the hands of the father by jumping off the Whispering Wall. A defenceless young infant who should have been protected by her father was instead, out of all control, killed in a horrific manner. That is, of course, the reason why all of us here want to see the end of that.

Bringing legislation into this house, and amendments, to prevent abuse will certainly be looked at favourably because of that. So this is more along those lines. It continues along the path, as I said, of coming into parliament and looking at how this scourge can be fought. The work that was done by the former Deputy Premier, the first woman Deputy Premier here in South Australia saw that there was progress. Of course, as the royal commission that has been announced shows, there are still gaps that need to be closed.

Nonetheless, effort was put in to end this scourge. Legislative changes, if I reflect on sitting in here and looking at them, one was expanding the definition of abuse and then giving increased penalties for repeated and violent breaches of intervention orders—I mean, stopping abuse being on the fringes in the grey area for perpetrators to get away with terrible acts of undermining the trust that family members put in one another. Those changes came through.

Another was allowing police-recorded interviews with the victims to be admissible evidence in court. We know how confronting it is for victims to have to face the perpetrator of the violence, so to make those interviews admissible will hopefully lead to prosecutions and will hopefully put offenders behind bars. It allows for more evidence to be given against perpetrators and increases the likelihood that they will be prosecuted, charged and then made to pay for their crimes but also then having that as a deterrent for other people who for whatever reason would go down this dark path.

Also, I remember a standalone criminal offence for non-fatal strangulation. Again, this is talking about expanding the definition of abuse. With the intimidation and threat that can come from strangling someone, the perpetrator may well know, 'Well, I am not going to go so far as to kill them, but I am doing it definitely to scare them, to control them,' but because it did not result in death, again, being able to get away with that was eliminated. It was a standalone criminal offence for non-fatal strangulation to take away the opportunity for what is a quite horrific way of controlling other family members, especially loved ones.

That relates to being able to charge these and expand the range of abuses, and then we looked at how sentencing can also be used as a deterrent. This included lowering the available discount for various serious offences against the person, often including those who are experiencing a domestic violence situation, ensuring that the penalty given to perpetrators of domestic and family violence reflects the seriousness of the crime. I think that certainly sent a message to South Australia in general that domestic violence is not to be tolerated at all.

There were also amendments to the Victims of Crime Act, because unfortunately I think it is one in six women who are subjected to domestic violence. They then have to deal with being a victim for the rest of their life. We know the detrimental effect that has on them, and the detrimental effect it has when the violence happens in the home to children. I talked before about myself having four children and just trying to model good behaviour at all times for them, making sure that the boys specifically are learning to treat women with respect.

If I get back to victims of crime, there was the removal of the requirement for all victims to have any contact with the perpetrator as they went about accessing compensation and, also, abolishing the defence of provocation, getting rid of this ridiculous defence that, 'I was provoked into doing this. I would not normally do that.' Again, I think that is sending a message that domestic violence, family violence, sexual violence are not to be tolerated under any circumstances.

Of course, laws are in place but it is also about providing support networks as well. One of those measures was in relation to providing more crisis accommodation beds. These are very important.

I was able to get a tour of one of these facilities, and the thing that was very noticeable about it was that the location was not to be disclosed. The reason for that is because, in normal circumstances, one of the real issues around domestic violence is that the woman who flees from the man—and in most cases it is the woman who is experiencing the violence—has nowhere else to go and quite often ends up going back into the family home, the very home where violence has been thrust upon her. They go back into a dangerous situation literally because they have nowhere else to go. Sometimes it is not even themselves they are thinking of, because if they have kids it is because of their children as well.

By having these crisis accommodation beds—I think 40 in all at a cost of \$40 million—it allows them somewhere to go, and by not disclosing where the locations are the perpetrator cannot hunt them down and try to reinstitute the terrible and despicable behaviour towards them. This is an important measure.

Reflecting on that, there was an evaluation by, I think, Flinders University into the benefit of these crisis beds. It is certainly very cost-effective, but the alternative could be to quickly go into a hotel or motel at short notice. These are small places, notably motel accommodation, and are not ideal places for people to stay on an ongoing basis, especially when you have children as well. There is no kitchen there to prepare food, there is no laundry for the children as well. By having more beds available for crisis accommodation, it allows the women primarily and their children to establish some normalcy in their lives, and it helps them with their emotional wellbeing.

It also allows the service providers, when going to help them, to be able to provide better outcomes. It allows for more intensive support for the client because it is much more of a homelike experience for them as well. So these crisis accommodation beds are very important and they have helped out many households; I think in just one year alone over 100 households were able to be helped this way.

It is an important measure that, as I said, was brought in by a number of projects. I think there was \$21 million all up in funding towards this by the former Deputy Premier. We also had the Hon. Michelle Lensink in the other place doing that as well, and of course the then Assistant Minister for Domestic and Family Violence, Carolyn Power, was also instrumental in this. In fact, she was the first Assistant Minister for Domestic and Family Violence with that focus on trying to overcome this scourge as well.

Another initiative that is really beneficial is the right to ask, the ability for people at risk of domestic or family violence to be able to find out whether their partner has had a past history of domestic violence offences. It allows information to be gathered from SA Police about the current partner's, or even a former partner's, violent offending history.

As I said before, having a young family—they are now getting to their teenage years—and being a father, it goes from the stage of being able to look after them and wrap your arms around your own children to them going out into the outside world and starting to have their own partners. I am not putting any sort of aspersions over their current partners.

The ability for all females to be able to check on any violent offences that their partner has allows an understanding of what is happening, because these things can be hidden for a period of time but you do not want to see it resurfacing and then taken out on the women by violent partners. Of course, other measures were put in place in terms of early intervention because in this bill we are talking about prevention of abuse and intervention orders.

The other part of intervention is to try to stop these occurrences from happening but also to teach and give people the skills to be able to recognise potential behaviours that could be coercive, that could be violent and how to handle them. Money was provided; \$200,000 from the Justice Rehabilitation Fund was committed to deliver a program which will provide one on one intensive and assertive engagement to help support young people between the ages of 12 and 25 who are at risk of experiencing domestic violence to be able to understand and recognise behaviours.

And to recognise that it is not acceptable, because while I talked before about modelled behaviour within the family, unfortunately there are some families where it is the complete opposite, and the modelled behaviour is violence and aggression and so the children are not equipped with the knowledge of what is acceptable behaviour, why violent behaviour should not be accepted, why it should be walked away from and not tolerated at all. I was certainly in awe of this program as well.

I know as we go forward, the member for Heysen talked about his commitment to play a role in this, and what I would also mention is the shadow cabinet's commitment to play a role here. You would notice that six of our shadow cabinet are females. They bring to it certainly an equality of thought. They also give a background to provide a female perspective and that will continue. So certainly when there are calls to say what is going on around equality, that is certainly being demonstrated on this side of the house in terms of the make-up of the shadow cabinet, that is certainly committed to getting rid of the scourge of domestic violence.

We will certainly be looking at continuing measures as we go forward because I think it is beholden on all of us, for all of our constituents that we represent, because no matter male or female, you are elected into this parliament to represent your community. Certainly in the case of the constituents of Morphett, I want to do everything possible to make sure there is no domestic violence, no family violence, no sexual violence that happens in my electorate and then more broadly in the state of South Australia and in the country of Australia as well.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (17:08): I was waiting for a male from the Labor Party to get up and speak but I will speak on the bill. I note that we were very pleased to hear the third reading speech from the minister. There were no objections to the minister's reading of her speech because we thought it was all relevant. I think anything we can do to talk about stronger representation of women and the treatment of women is related to this bill. This is what this bill is all about. This bill is about protecting women from these men who think they should have power over them.

As I look at the portraits in this place, it reminds me of Joyce Steele, the very first woman to be elected to this parliament, the Liberal member for Burnside. She went on to be the first female minister in South Australia, the Minister for Education.

What is extraordinary about that story is that I know that on both sides of this chamber we are very proud of the fact that we were the first place in Australia to allow women to vote, in the colony of South Australia. We were not the first place in the world. New Zealand actually did that a few months before South Australia, but we were the first in the world to allow women not just to vote but to actually run for parliament.

It was an amazing demonstration of a failure of a political tactic for the conservatives who were in this parliament at the time, who thought the world was going to collapse, that South Australia's economy was going collapse, that all these women making decisions about who should represent them in the parliament was going to be a disaster. They tried to sabotage the bill by moving an amendment to not only allow women to vote but to allow women to run for parliament. They supported that amendment and the amendment was successful, and then of course the bill was successful. It completely backfired. What a great story to tell here in South Australia.

But it took Joyce Steele 65 years to be elected into this place. It was 65 years before she was elected. In 1959, dear old Tom Playford was Premier. If you read Stewart Cockburn's book about Playford, he will tell you that he was an old fuddy-duddy, a very conservative old fellow. When Joyce Steele turned up for her first day here in the parliament, he greeted her by saying, 'Hello, girlie.'

I tell that story to my school tours and I quickly look to see the expressions on the faces of the girls who are in the tour. They are horrified, and rightly so. It does demonstrate how we have come a very, very long way. However, you never see Labor recognising the fact that Joyce Steele

was the first woman elected into this place. They wait two more electoral terms for Molly Byrne. They give awards in schools about the first Labor woman elected into this place.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order! Members, the member for Unley has the right to be heard in silence.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. It is as though they cannot concede the fact, or admit to the fact, that she was the first woman in this place—and in the upper house at the same time there was a woman elected from the Liberal and Country League—before the Labor Party did it.

I am very proud of the fact that my children's school, Unley High School, has a picture hanging in the school of the first female Prime Minister, who was a student at that school: Julia Gillard. I am very proud that my children went to the same school that produced the first female Prime Minister here in South Australia. She is a member of the Labor Party. She was a Labor Prime Minister, but I am still very, very proud of the fact that it happened. I talk to students about that, but you will not see that from Labor. You will not see that from Labor, because they want to politicise every single opportunity. We saw that demonstrated by the minister in her third reading speech.

Here is another interesting fact: I have been told—and I guess it was a reliable source—that when Molly Byrne turned up for her first day here she had to use the male toilets, because despite the fact that 65 years earlier this parliament said that women were welcome, that women could be elected, no-one had bothered to put female toilets in the building.

It is quite an extraordinary story, but it is a story of celebration. I think there is no doubt that we are all very proud, and I certainly like to tell that story. The minister is right: we need a parliament that is representative of our community, and women are 50 per cent of the community, but we also need a parliament that is representative of our community from the professions, from the trades, from the many occupations, from the many social demographic groups. We have a lot of work to do in that place. I think that as we get closer to our goal of this place being a fifty-fifty share of men and women, we will also expand the backgrounds and experience that are brought into this parliament because we do need to make sure we share the aspirations of those whom we represent.

We know that parliaments around Australia and around the world have, over the years, become dominated—members of parliament—by people who have been in professional politics for a very long time. We need more people from small business. It is very hard to move from small business into politics. You cannot just win the election and then leave your business and walk into the parliament; you have to decide what you are going to do with that business that you may have had for 20 years and the staff that you have, and how you are going to manage it. I know that it is very difficult for a member of parliament to be involved in a family business while they are a member of parliament, so most people decide to move that business on or close it down or whatever.

I imagine that there are other professions where it is more difficult: for example, if you are a GP going into politics, all those people you have been servicing for 20 or 30 years will, all of a sudden, need to find another GP. Obviously we need to look at ways to make these pathways easier or have an understanding of how those pathways could be difficult for some professions and for some people—who might have different pathways or different occupations that really have nothing to do with politics or government or administration—to come into this place.

If we go back to the founding of this green chamber, it was really all about people. Consequently, we need to ensure that we continue to have good policy like the legislation that was spoken of by the member for Heysen and the member for Morphett about what South Australia's first female Deputy Premier and first female Attorney-General brought to this place. Much of it was long overdue and much of it was innovative, and particularly for the benefit and safety of women. With those remarks, I conclude my contribution to this bill.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CHILD SEX OFFENDERS REGISTRATION (CHILD-RELATED WORK) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 March 2024.)

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (17:18): I had gone through the many jobs that I held from a very young age and the jobs that all of my children had held from a very young age. I will also speak again about just how important it is to ensure that there are positive experiences and opportunities afforded to all children and young people. All young people—everybody's children—deserve to be safe at work. It is absolutely abhorrent and disturbing to think of a child sex offender working alongside any young person. This bill aims to and helps to make sure that those who are convicted of those heinous child sex offences cannot do so.

Children and young people in our state absolutely deserve to work in a safe and a supportive working environment where they can learn new skills, form new friendships and learn more about the world of work and what is required. At this moment in time, there is nothing at all preventing a registered child sex offender from taking a job working with those under 18 years of age. They are rightly not allowed to apply for or engage in child-related work, as a number of speakers have traversed, whether that be in an education setting, in sport, in social work or in a range of other environments. However, working in a business that employs children is not currently considered child-related work and this bill rightly changes that.

This bill amends the definition of child-related work in the Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006 to include work in a business or an undertaking that employs children and where the work will involve contact with a child. The act defines contact with a child as 'physical contact' as well as written or oral communication. This bill will help stop child sex offenders from working with or alongside underage employees, unless it could be shown that the work involved no contact with somebody underage.

Very importantly, additional power given to the police commissioner through this bill will allow the ban on child-related work to be varied or revoked in a limited number of individual cases only if the commissioner deems that the person would not pose any risk to child employees. Exemptions may be appropriate in some circumstances on a case-by-case basis—for example, if it could be shown that their work involved no contact with children, where perhaps they worked at completely different times of the day. But having said this, this bill rightly sets up very, very stringent conditions around this to help ensure people do not slip through that safety net.

We know that child-related work is also regulated in the Bail Act. This bill will effectively amend the Bail Act provisions, preventing alleged child sex offenders from working alongside or having contact with child employees whilst their charge is pending. A bail authority may lift this condition if satisfied that the proposed work does not pose a risk to children.

There will be transitional arrangements in place on commencement of this bill. Registered offenders whose employment is affected by these amendments must, within 30 days post commencement of the amendments, notify their employer and SAPOL of their intention to make an application to vary their employment conditions. While their variation application is being considered, they will be able to continue working either until their application is determined by the commissioner or until six months after the commencement of the act, whichever is earlier.

The changes to the Bail Act only apply to persons who apply for bail after the commencement of the bill; however, a person already charged but not yet convicted of a registrable offence before the commencement must still notify their employer within seven days of commencement.

The Malinauskas Labor government is steadfastly committed to doing what it can to help protect, support and empower the most vulnerable members of our community. This reform complements the strong suite of commitments we have already delivered since the 2022 election, including closing loopholes that make it easier for people who possess child pornography or childlike

sex dolls to get bigger sentence discounts or bail, increasing penalties for a range of child sex offences, and boosting funding for victim survivor support services.

Our process of reform will continue. This bill represents another really important step among many. We will continue to take steps forward.

I wholeheartedly thank the SDA union, South Australia and Northern Territory branch, and their secretary Josh Peak, and the teams that have been relentlessly advocating for this change in legislation. I thank them for their enduring advocacy for young people at work. This commitment to workers is exemplary and to young workers particularly.

I commend those in the other place, the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. Connie Bonaros, for their tireless work in this space also, working to ensure children and young people can undertake employment as safely as possible. I thank my ministerial colleague the Attorney-General, the Hon. Kyam Maher, for his work in the other place to ensure that this very sensible and fitting bill was passed through that chamber.

Children and young people are a crucial part of the South Australian workforce. They deserve the very best and safest start to a hopefully fulfilling working career. Again, in their first opportunity to earn money for themselves, to develop independence and vital work skills, it is our duty to keep them as safe as possible whilst they engage with those important opportunities.

I thank all of the businesses here in our state that employ young people under the age of 18 and help them grow those skills to later thrive in life. I also thank all of the members who have spoken to this really important bill before the house, and I commend this very important bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr TEAGUE: I take the opportunity at clause 1 to start by adverting to the matters that I indicated I would raise in the course of my second reading speech. First among those is the express support of Business SA by its letter of 18 August 2023 to the Attorney—its support for the measures and the work the bill will do. At the same time I take the opportunity to note, as a number have, the work of unions. I think those on the government benches have singled out the SDA and Josh Peak in particular, someone whose name is prone to be confused with mine sometimes, when it is announced on the radio; people prick up their ears and say, 'Hang on. What was the source of that?'

Conscious of the fact that unions have had things to say about this debate along the way, just like there have been a whole range of contributors, Business SA has expressed its sentiments, including by this letter to the Attorney that I have referred to. The primary concern that Business SA has raised strikes me as a practical matter, that the concern might be able to be put at ease, if not comprehensively addressed by the minister's advice to the committee, because of course we are now embarking into new territory.

We are going to be using the definition of 'child-related work' in a new way that it has not arisen before—that is, rather than identifying types of work that are essentially child-focused, we are now going to be talking about workplaces in which children are present. That is an important change and important distinction. Business SA raises in that context a concern about awareness and about the possibility therefore for those who might be caught up with the operation of the act, both employers and relevant employees, to be made aware of the new laws and in terms of the practicality of time frames for compliance with the new act.

Obviously, we know that compliance with these provisions is very important for a whole variety of reasons that might be obvious. If there is a failure to comply that leads to a compounding of the circumstances that are faced by an individual, then we can head off in areas that are unintended. Unintended exacerbation are circumstances and matters that need to be dealt with very carefully.

The first question in that context to the minister is: is the minister satisfied that there is a program, with or without direct involvement of Business SA, in ensuring that those who might be affected in every respect will be made aware of their obligations? If so, how is the minister so satisfied, and how is that process of awareness-raising going to occur?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: I think this was also traversed in the third reading in the other place with a clear explanation about this particular matter by the Attorney. I think the Hon. Michelle Lensink asked a similar question. It is a good question. What I can say is that this bill does not impose new obligations on businesses. The way that this is set up through this legislation or through this bill is that the onus of compliance absolutely falls on the offender, and the risk of noncompliance and the particular penalties that that will attract also fall on the offender. What I have been advised is that it is SAPOL's intention to communicate the onus of that compliance and that risk of noncompliance very clearly to those who are registered child sex offenders.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

**MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (REGISTER OF INTERESTS) (WATER ENTITLEMENTS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

BAIL (CONDITIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 17:36 the house adjourned until Tuesday 19 March 2024 at 11:00.