

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 25 September 2019

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. A.L. McLachlan)** took the chair at 14:15 and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:16): I bring up the 25th report of the committee.

Report received.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: I bring up the 26th report of the committee.

Report received and read.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: I bring up the report of the committee on its Inquiry into the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) (Remote Area Attendance) Variation Regulations 2019 (SA).

Report received and ordered to be published.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

South Australian Government Boards and Committees Information as at
30 June 2019-Report, 2018-19.

Question Time

AGED CARE CCTV STEERING COMMITTEE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding aged care.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The minister told ABC radio this morning that he had not personally heard the probity concerns raised by Mr Stewart Johnston and is waiting to be briefed by his ministerial staffers who did in fact have this discussion with Mr Johnston. The minister this morning stated:

I was only involved in part of the meeting. I wasn't involved in the meeting when Stewart was highlighting some detailed concerns.

The minister went on to say:

...he indicated he had detailed information to go through, I suggested he go through that with my staff, they will then prepare advice for me and we'll take action that's required.

And:

...Stewart indicated he wanted to go through detailed documents, we agreed that would be best done with my staff.

My questions to the minister are:

1. Have your ministerial staff now briefed you on the serious probity issues and concerns that Mr Johnston raised?
2. How does the minister reconcile the statements he made this morning with what he told the chamber when he said he had spoken to Mr Johnston twice?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:21): As I advised the council yesterday, on Monday night I spoke to Mr Johnston and in broad terms he raised more specific information about probity concerns. I arranged for either an adviser or myself to meet with him the next day to go through the specific issues. I have received advice from my staff. I have raised issues with the chief executive of Health. I have received initial advice from the department on the probity concerns. The initial advice highlights inaccuracies and misunderstandings of the facts, which deal with a number of the concerns raised. Once the advice is finalised, I will consider what further action is appropriate.

AGED CARE CCTV STEERING COMMITTEE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): Supplementary arising from the answers: what were the probity concerns that were raised?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:22): As I indicated to the house, I am looking through those issues, and once I am fully briefed I will take whatever action is appropriate.

AGED CARE CCTV STEERING COMMITTEE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): Supplementary arising from the original answer, where the minister explained that he has initial advice from his department on probity concerns and the minister said, I think, that many were found to be inaccurate complaints. Does that initial advice show any veracity or any of the complaints having any merit?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:23): Any further comment I will be making about this matter will be after I have received further advice.

AGED CARE CCTV STEERING COMMITTEE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): Further supplementary arising from the original answer: minister, you detailed that there were inaccuracies in the complaint made. I think it is quite reasonable that you detail whether there were any inaccuracies or any with merit?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:23): As I said, the advice I have received is initial. Obviously, that means I am seeking further advice.

The PRESIDENT: Further supplementary, Leader of the Opposition.

AGED CARE CCTV STEERING COMMITTEE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): Has the minister instigated any action, or asked his department to take any action, over any of the complaints about probity raised by Mr Johnston?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:24): I have nothing further to add to my earlier remarks.

AGED-CARE FACILITIES AUDIT

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:24): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. How long ago did the minister receive the audit report of the state's 46 aged-care providers, and does the report outline any concerns about the treatment of aged-care residents in state-run facilities?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:24): The state government has received the independent statewide report in relation to residential aged-care facilities. Having received departmental advice, I am seeking further information before releasing the report and our response. I think it's appropriate to highlight to the house that, over 16 years, Labor never independently assessed standards at aged-care facilities not subject to commonwealth accreditation.

This government has done so. We are committed to raising standards across the network. We don't need lectures from the party that brought us Oakden.

AGED-CARE FACILITIES AUDIT

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:25): Supplementary: if the report outlines serious concerns, why won't the minister release it now?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:25): Right from the beginning of this process—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I am not sure what part of 'from the beginning of this process' includes the word 'Labor', but if the Hon. Mr Hunter wants to try to disrupt the proceedings of this house by interjecting so that I can get no further than four words, I am happy to try to answer all questions within four words. What I am trying to say to the honourable member who asked the question is that, right from the beginning of this process, it was clear that issues would not be left hanging until the report was tabled. The clear understanding of the department and myself was that, as issues were raised, they would be addressed.

AGED-CARE FACILITIES AUDIT

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:26): Supplementary: when—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Thanks. When did the minister receive the report, and what action did he immediately take following the receipt of the report?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:26): I will take on notice the date—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Allow the minister to answer.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —on which I received the report. My office and I have been going through that material. We have already sought further information, and we will, as I said in my original answer, prepare the response in due course.

AGED-CARE FACILITIES AUDIT

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:26): Further supplementary: can the minister give a rough indication of when he received the report?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:27): I have taken that on notice.

AGED-CARE FACILITIES AUDIT

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:27): Further supplementary: why has the minister's department refused an FOI application for a copy of the report, describing it as an 'internal working document'?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:27): I am happy to seek details from the department. I am not aware of that application.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE BIRTHING UNIT

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:27): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding the Flinders birthing unit.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: The minister and the shadow minister were yesterday emailed by a grandfather in the southern suburbs concerned for his daughter's treatment following a caesarean section at the Flinders Medical Centre. The caesarean was completed at 10.50am yesterday;

however, a bed was not made available until 6pm, some seven hours later. This comes just one week after the closure of Flinders Private Hospital's obstetrics services, which doctors in the area said was likely to put undue pressure on public hospital maternity services.

As at 5pm yesterday, the SA Health inpatient dashboard showed that there were 52 obstetric patients at Flinders for just 50 beds. My question to the minister is: what action did the minister take following the receipt of the concerning email about the shortage of obstetric beds and a seven-hour delay for this woman following her operation?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:28): The email that the honourable member refers to hasn't been brought to my attention. I am happy to seek further information and provide advice.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE BIRTHING UNIT

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:28): Can the minister advise how long he thinks is appropriate for a person to wait after having a caesarean?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:28): I am not going to comment on clinical matters.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (14:29): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Allow the member to ask this question.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: I'm going to start again, sir. I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding suicide prevention.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: During the last week of sitting, I had the opportunity to update the council on some of the important work going on in this area following World Suicide Prevention Day on the Tuesday and before R U OK? Day two days later. Will the minister update the council on recent developments in suicide prevention?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:29): I thank the honourable member for his question. I again recognise that the Hon. Mr Dawkins has been a long-term, passionate advocate for suicide prevention, and I welcome his continued energy in this area of public policy. As the honourable member points out, we have recently commemorated Suicide Prevention Week and R U OK? Day. Although it is a relatively recent initiative, R U OK? Day already enjoys wide support.

The Marshall Liberal government has a key focus on suicide prevention. We have committed \$2.5 million over four years to support suicide prevention networks. Building on this investment, at the start of this month the Marshall Liberal government partnered with the Morrison Liberal government to support the rollout of the Way Back Support Service here in South Australia. The Way Back Support Service is an initiative of *beyondblue*, specifically designed to provide suicide prevention support to people who have previously attempted suicide and have been discharged from hospital. The Morrison and Marshall Liberal governments have jointly committed \$2 million to roll out this service in South Australia.

Suicide is a complex area, demanding a range of responses depending on the individual and their own personal circumstances. In particular, the months following a suicide attempt is a time when people are vulnerable and most in need of support. This is the space in which the Way Back Support Service will provide personalised care to South Australians. The commitment of commonwealth and state funds will allow a support coordinator from the service directly to contact clients referred to the service to guide them through the time following their suicide attempt or crisis and discharge from hospital. The program is tailored to meet individual needs. It provides a range of services, including

help accessing clinical care during periods of increased risk and referrals to community-based counselling services.

Today, we received a national update on suicide. Data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics on causes of death found that the national suicide rate has come down from 12.7 deaths by suicide per 100,000 of the population to 12.2. Closer to home, and a tribute to the efforts of so many people in this field, the South Australian suicide rate has also dropped from 12.8 deaths by suicide per 100,000 of the population to 12. It is now below the national rate, I understand, for the first time in a decade. I particularly welcome the significant decrease in suicide in country South Australia. But there is still more to be done.

Initiatives such as Suicide Awareness Week and R U OK? Day have helped many Australians to realise that an important primary response to suicide prevention is compassionate listening and response and increased connection. While the Way Back Support Service provides support to people in a more targeted way, we can all offer basic support to people in our lives who might need to hear the question, 'Are you okay?' I encourage all South Australians today and every day to think about their families, friends and acquaintances and to have conversations with them to make sure they are okay.

SURVEILLANCE DEVICES ACT 2016

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:33): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the minister representing the Attorney-General on the topic of the Surveillance Devices Act 2016.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The Surveillance Devices Act 2016 restricts the installation, use and maintenance of surveillance devices and the communication of that information in material from these devices. A listening device, an optical surveillance device, including mobile phones, which capture video footage or photos, are covered by the provisions regulating these surveillance devices. Controls by investigating agencies, including SAPOL, are required, with annual reporting in relation to these surveillance devices. My question to the Attorney-General is: how many times in the last and first reporting period of the Surveillance Devices Act have the surveillance devices been used with regard to entry into a brothel, the section 32 warrant powers and the surveillance of prostitution-related offences?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:34): I am happy to refer the honourable member's questions to the appropriate minister or ministers and bring back a reply.

HOSPITALS, ALUMINIUM CLADDING

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question about hospitals.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It was reported today that there is aluminium cladding that poses a risk in five regional hospitals around South Australia: they being Mount Gambier, Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Whyalla and Port Lincoln. The aluminium cladding that was used in the devastating Grenfell Tower fire in London was black core aluminium cladding, and we know that it had disastrous effects. It is understood that there is further investigation at these five hospitals about the exact risk that the aluminium cladding poses. My questions to the minister are:

1. Has the minister or his office received a copy of the new audit report scheduled to be released within the next month?
2. Can the minister assure people in these regional areas that the cladding is not the highly flammable black core cladding that was found in the Grenfell Tower?
3. What has the minister personally been doing to ensure the safety of both patients and visitors to these hospitals?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:35): I thank the honourable member for his question. The initial advice I have received from the office of minister Knoll is that his department has concluded the investigation phase of the cladding audit, which includes a group of hospitals. That advice states that none of these hospitals were rated above a moderate risk. This means they either had a minimal safety risk or provided sufficient fire safety provisions to allow occupants and visitors to safely exit the building during a facade fire event.

HOSPITALS, ALUMINIUM CLADDING

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): Supplementary question: has the minister or the minister's office received a copy of an unreleased audit report that goes into further detail about these five regional hospitals, and does the minister have any knowledge of whether black core cladding is used in these hospitals?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:36): I am happy to take both questions on notice.

ABORIGINAL SUPPORT PROGRAM

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding a support program for Aboriginal families in South Australia. Can the minister please provide an update to the council about how this pilot program will help Aboriginal families with complex needs?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:37): I thank the honourable member for her question. I am very pleased that the second pilot program in the families section within my department has been announced, the first one being the northern pilot being run by Anglicare. More recently, we have announced that \$2.2 million will be provided to Kornar Winmil Yunti to provide this intensive support program, specifically designed for Aboriginal families and run by what is known as an Aboriginal community-controlled organisation in Adelaide's west with the aim of keeping families together.

Recognising that families in Adelaide's western suburbs need support, this pilot will help families so that their children grow up safely and stay connected to community and culture. KWY Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Family Services will codesign the program. They and their CEO Craig Rigney would be well-known to a number of members of the chamber, as they are already running domestic violence and family services and receive state and commonwealth funding for those programs.

They will codesign the program with input from Aboriginal community members and other government and non-government stakeholders over the next six months and then it will be delivered over two years. The new program will be tailored to provide intensive, culturally-led support for Aboriginal families who may struggle with child neglect, homelessness, family violence, drugs, alcohol and mental health. The new pilot will allow social workers to work with families on a 24/7 basis in their home environment to help them manage issues and improve overall family functioning, with the aim of keeping families together if it is safe to do so.

What we know from the research by the Early Intervention Research Directorate is that programs, in order to make them more effective, need to be more intensive and intervene earlier, and this is consistent with that model. This pilot forms part of the statewide child and family support system that we are currently in the process of designing in the long-term expectation that more children will be able to live safely together with their families at home. We are also, within this process, committed to the Family Matters principles and supporting the development of Aboriginal governance organisations and front-line workers.

We know that particularly, according to the latest Australian Institute of Health and Welfare data, Aboriginal children are more likely to be involved in child protection services, and that is a sad situation that the government is very keen to correct. Through this codesign process, working with an esteemed local South Australian organisation, we are hoping that families will be more connected and that children will be raised in those supportive environments and that we will enable children to be kept in their families rather than entering the child protection system.

LAND TAX

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:40): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Treasurer regarding land tax.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Today's BDO SA State Business Survey of 177 businesses shows business confidence in South Australia has plummeted to its lowest level in five years. Eighty per cent believe the economy is either stagnating or going backwards, double last year's figure and the highest since 2015. Forty-nine per cent believe the tax reforms announced by the Treasurer were unfair. Considering it has now been 100 days since the Treasurer first announced the land tax reforms, my questions to the Treasurer are:

1. Does he take comfort in the results of the survey?
2. Does he bear responsibility for the negative, gloomy feeling from the business sector and the community?
3. Will he now rethink his plan of pushing his reforms through before it is considered by a parliamentary inquiry?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:41): Can I respond to the last question: no, we won't be. I thank the honourable member for his questions. We are always interested in any surveys or indeed public commentary, media commentary of either investor confidence, investor views in the South Australian economy or, indeed, any other area as well.

The BDO survey to which the member has referred is one of many surveys. I refer the honourable member to the recent ANZ Stateometer, which highlighted—and this is well post the budget—that the South Australian economy was the only economy operating in what they referred to as the top right-hand quadrant—that is, accelerating and with momentum. This was a survey done of all states, not just looking at the state of South Australia, done by the national body, the ANZ. It is a regular publication that is produced, which compares sentiment and conditions not only in South Australia but with other states and territories as well. When one looks at the ANZ Stateometer, it is in stark contrast to the views expressed by the 170-odd firms surveyed by BDO.

We welcome all commentary in relation to investor views. I referred briefly yesterday but didn't have the actual copy of the article, but let me refer to the views of someone outside of South Australia in relation to the property market, investment market in South Australia. Quintessential Equity, as I said yesterday, have a \$150 million capital raising, looking for new investment opportunities. Let me quote their executive chairman, Shane Quinn, who says Adelaide is a particularly attractive investment destination for their \$150 million. He said:

Adelaide has benefited from significant overseas and interstate investment in the last year, a sign of confidence in South Australia's economy that has been growing consistently for the last decade.

Quintessential Equity, as I indicated yesterday, recently bought—I didn't mention the exact location—431 King William Street for \$43.1 million from Adelaide property developer Mr Makris. They have indicated the investment climate in South Australia is particularly attractive for people who are wanting to invest in state and regional economies.

So the answer to the honourable member's question is no, we don't subscribe to the gloom and doom of some in the state's economy. There are many who want to talk down South Australia's economic performance for their own purposes. They are entitled to do so. But equally, we don't have to agree with those particular views. We are entitled to quote the ANZ Stateometer as a reputable, independent, nationally based comparison of economic performance in South Australia with all other states and territories, to look at people and individuals and organisations with large lumps of money looking to invest that money somewhere who say that South Australia is a particularly attractive place at the moment to invest.

I would encourage the Hon. Mr Pangallo, rather than perhaps just picking up those who subscribe to the doom and gloom view of South Australia's economy and its future, to occasionally have a look at some of the more optimistic assessments. It would do wonders for his health, I am

sure, and it would do wonders for his outlook on the state's economic future and the prospects for young people in particular in terms of future economic growth in South Australia.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, a supplementary.

LAND TAX

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:45): Thank you, Treasurer, and I certainly hope they do invest that money in South Australia. Can you please clarify for me, are you quoting from Mr Makris himself? You mentioned the name Makris in there.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:46): No.

The PRESIDENT: The Treasurer just answered no. Do you have a further supplementary, the Hon. Mr Pangallo?

LAND TAX

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:46): If that is the case, is Mr Makris connected to that company, Treasurer?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:46): I am not sure where the honourable member is getting—I am not quoting Mr Makris. I said that the company, Quintessential Equity, had bought a property from Mr Makris. How the Hon. Mr Pangallo gets from that that I was quoting Mr Makris, I have no idea. I have no idea when one quotes specifically that it actually bought a property from Mr Makris—and I was quoting from a newspaper report—how one could infer from that that I was quoting or putting words into Mr Makris's mouth. No-one listening or reading what I said, other than the Hon. Mr Pangallo, could actually infer that.

MENTAL HEALTH COMMISSION

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:47): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. How does the minister reconcile the evidence he gave to the estimates hearing when he said there would be a full-time mental health commissioner with a job ad for the mental health commissioner which states that there will only be part-time positions available?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:47): The government is committed to refreshing and strengthening the Mental Health Commission. The initial preference was for one full-time and two part-time commissioners but feedback suggested that securing good candidates would be best facilitated by offering the roles on a part-time basis. A key goal is to engage the voice of lived experience. Providing for part-time commissioners maximises our flexibility in making the roles manageable for more people—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: A point of order, Mr President: some of us in the chamber are interested in mental health issues. I would like to hear the answer and I can't hear it because of the noise from the other side.

The PRESIDENT: Can the opposition benches restrain themselves and allow the minister to answer?

The Hon. S.G. WADE: As I indicated, the key goal of the process of strengthening the Mental Health Commission is to engage the voice of lived experience. Providing for part-time commissioners maximises our flexibility in making the roles manageable for more people, particularly consumers and carers. The government may appoint one of the members of the commission on a full-time basis, if that helps secure the right people and create the best mix of skills and expertise. Labor neglected the commission and it now criticises the Marshall Liberal government as we strengthen it.

MENTAL HEALTH COMMISSION

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:49): A supplementary: is the minister expecting Commissioner Burns to apply for one of the three part-time mental health commissioner positions?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:49): I can't answer for Commissioner Burns.

MENTAL HEALTH COMMISSION

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:49): A further supplementary, sir: if there are three part-time commissioners, who will be in charge of the commission?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:49): The three commissioners together constitute the Mental Health Commission. This is one of the aspects of strengthening the commission. There is more than one voice in mental health. It is not unusual for mental health commissions to have more than one member, and my understanding is that the national commission might actually have seven members. We are a relatively humble—

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: Several, anyway.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The Hon. Mr Dawkins indicates several. In that respect the South Australian Mental Health Commission, with three members, would be relatively modest, but I can assure you that it is more diverse than the commission the former government established.

MENTAL HEALTH COMMISSION

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:50): A further supplementary: did the minister meet with Commissioner Burns to discuss this change of plans prior to publishing the advertisements for the part-time positions?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:50): I'm not exactly sure what I am being asked here. If I am being asked did I discuss with Commissioner Burns the possibility of part-time commissioners, the ad, and so forth, I haven't engaged Commissioner Burns in the selection process. I would have thought that if the honourable member is expecting Mr Burns to be an applicant, it may well be inappropriate for him to be consulted on the selection process.

MENTAL HEALTH COMMISSION

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): A supplementary arising from the original answer: when was the decision made to replace a full-time commissioner and two part-time commissioners with three part-time commissioners, and why didn't the minister correct the record at the first available opportunity so that it is not standing that he misled parliament when he said a full-time commissioner?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:51): I stand by my previous answer, which is that the initial preference was for one full time and two part time. I would also remind the house, for those who didn't actually hear the first answer, that the government may yet appoint a full-time commissioner.

MENTAL HEALTH COMMISSION

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): A further supplementary: will the minister apologise for misleading parliament?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:52): I did not mislead parliament. If the honourable member seeks to make such an assertion, standing orders require it to be done by substantive motion.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: If you have finished I would like to hear from the Hon. Mr Hood.

LYMPHOEDEMA SERVICES

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister update the chamber on initiatives for South Australians living with lymphoedema?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:52): I thank the honourable member for his question and for his interest in health. Lymphoedema is the term given to swelling, usually although not exclusively in the limbs, resulting from malfunction of the lymphatic system.

Treatment for breast cancer is a common cause of lymphoedema. One of the treatments available to people with lymphoedema is compression garments, which assist in reducing the development of associated complications.

At the 2018 state election, the Marshall Liberal government committed to preparing a business case for a compression garment subsidy scheme. We delivered on this commitment and, following the business case, SA Health is establishing an advisory group with key South Australian lymphoedema stakeholders to inform and support implementation of the compression garment subsidy scheme.

These stakeholders include those who can provide the insight coming from lived experience, such as the Lymphoedema Support Group of South Australia, the Australasian Lymphology Association and the Lymphoedema Action Alliance. Invitations for the advisory group were emailed out last week and many invitees have already responded, including the Lymphoedema Support Group of South Australia. I met with the support group in May to discuss the challenges for people living with lymphoedema and to discuss the need for the establishment of a government subsidy scheme in South Australia. The first meeting of the government scheme advisory group will be next month.

This work by the Marshall Liberal government will build on the announcement in May by the commonwealth government of an estimate of \$8 million over four years for a subsidy scheme for specialised compression garments for post breast cancer patients suffering from lymphoedema. SA Health will work with the commonwealth to ensure these initiatives are complementary and coordinated.

I am pleased to be part of a government that is delivering a garment compression scheme after years of inaction by the former government, and I look forward to better services and quality of life for people living with lymphoedema.

CLIMATE CHANGE HEALTH IMPACTS

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (14:54): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing about climate change and health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: Three weeks ago, the Australian Medical Association (the AMA) released a statement formally recognising that climate change is a 'health emergency' in this country and around the world. At the state level, we have a State Public Health Plan 2019-2024, which also acknowledges the serious health impacts of climate change. In fact, the issues raised by the AMA are pretty much the same as those identified in the State Public Health Plan, such as more deaths and illness from a range of causes, including heat stress, increasingly severe weather events, vector-borne diseases and mental ill health.

The State Public Health Plan also identifies that a whole-of-government approach is needed. The state government has a Health in All Policies approach, which is about promoting healthy public policy based on the understanding that health is not merely the product of healthcare activities but is influenced by a wide range of social, economic, political, cultural and environmental determinants of health. According to the SA Health website:

The South Australian Health in All Policies initiative is an approach to working across government to better achieve public policy outcomes and deliver co-benefits for agencies involved including to improve population health and wellbeing.

The policy describes all of the different government agencies that are involved as partners in the program, and they are called Public Health Partner Authorities; however, the one agency that is not included is the Department for Energy and Mining. In other words, the agency responsible for improving fossil fuel mining and fossil fuel power stations, and handing out tens of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money as subsidies to big fossil fuel companies, isn't even at the Health table. My questions of the minister are:

1. Given the clearly acknowledged role of the fossil fuel industry in exacerbating climate change and therefore exacerbating public ill health, why isn't the Department for Energy and Mining established as a Public Health Partner Authority with SA Health?

2. Is the minister working on a response to the AMA's statement about climate change being a 'health emergency'?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:56): I thank the honourable member for his question. I suppose it's an issue of how the government organises itself to deliver on our policy objectives. The honourable member rightly highlights South Australia's strong record in health and health policies. In fact, to pay tribute to governments of both persuasions over the last 30 years, South Australia has been a world leader in that area.

I think it would be misleading to suggest that every area that touches on health needs to be led by Health and therefore is, if you like, a subject of a Health in All Policies approach. For example, I expect the Minister for Environment to be the lead minister when it comes to our response to climate change. I do not dispute at all that climate change has a significant impact on health outcomes, but in my view Health will provide a strong supportive role to an Environment-led response.

In terms of the public health partners, my understanding of the public health partners under the act is that agencies, on a bilateral basis, discuss with Health how they can support public health initiatives. I take the honourable member at his word that that particular department is not a member. It doesn't mean that they are not at the Health table, so to speak; we deal with all departments and, for that matter, the wider community. You can be a public health partner without actually being a government department. In fact, I think the majority of public health partners are not government departments, but I may be wrong on that.

Just to reiterate my points: the South Australian government's response to climate change, in my understanding, will be led by Environment. Health stands ready, willing and able to play our part.

CLIMATE CHANGE HEALTH IMPACTS

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (14:59): Just a supplementary: the second part of my question was whether the minister was working on a response to the AMA's recent statement, which declared that climate change was a 'health emergency'?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:59): No, I am not, because my understanding is that the Minister for Environment and Water will be leading the government's response to climate change.

E-CIGARETTES

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Is the minister satisfied with the current compliance of e-cigarette operators under the law, and how many inspections has SA Health undertaken of e-cigarette retailers since the laws commenced?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for his question. I am not aware of being given any information in relation to compliance activity. I would make the point that, to allow additional time for e-cigarette retailers to adapt their operations in relation to the Tobacco and E-Cigarettes Products Act 1997, it only became an offence from 1 October to advertise and promote e-cigarettes, to have e-cigarette products on display at the point of sale and to sell e-cigarettes by indirect orders. In relation to those elements, they do not become a compliance issue in less than a week, but in relation to the other elements I am not aware of any compliance activity to this date.

E-CIGARETTES

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:01): Supplementary: is the minister aware of whether any expiation notices have been issued or prosecutions commenced under the e-cigarette laws since their commencement, and has the minister received any reports of tobacco or nicotine being sold under the counter, to coin a phrase, at e-cigarette operators, or does he believe that is happening?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:01): I am happy to take the honourable member's questions on notice.

E-CIGARETTES

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:01): Final supplementary: will the minister consider implementing the recommendations of the bipartisan select committee report that flavours of vaping products attractive to children should be banned?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:02): From my recollection, there were three recommendations of the committee that have still not been implemented, and I certainly think that we should be looking at the select committee work, the work in other jurisdictions. I am keen to have conversations with my federal and interstate colleagues, because I think recent events in the United States have highlighted the fact that e-cigarettes are a significant risk which may not yet be fully understood. If the honourable member is suggesting that, considering recent events, we need to look again at whether we should be strengthening the e-cigarettes legislation, I think that is a valid point: recent developments are concerning.

DUBAI TRADE AND INVESTMENT OFFICE

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Can the minister share with the council news of the planned South Australian government trade and investment office in Dubai?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:03): I thank the honourable member for his question and his ongoing interest in expanding our global footprint. The Marshall Liberal government is committed to creating jobs by boosting South Australia's inbound investment, international trade and supporting our exporters. We have committed \$12.8 million to establish South Australian trade and investment offices in key overseas markets, and we have already opened trade offices covering the key markets of China and North Asia, and we will open offices in both Houston, Texas, and Dubai in the Middle East early next year.

The Middle East and North Africa region, known as the MENA region, is a well-known logistics hub and a centre for global trade, making it an important growth opportunity for our state. We already have direct flights between Adelaide and Dubai and Doha to grow our exports and bring visitors to our shores. Nearly \$305 million has been invested from the UAE into South Australia since 2003, creating over 500 direct jobs, and South Australian companies have invested around \$166 million into that region.

Interestingly, the South Australian Space Industry Centre (SASIC) and the Australian Space Agency also have active MOUs with the UAE Space Agency that focus on industrial R&D collaboration, academic and research exchanges and the capacity building to drive growth in the space industry.

On 13 September, I had the honour of speaking at an event cohosted by the Australia Arab Chamber of Commerce and Industry, DFAT and Austrade and heard insights from Mr Arthur Spyrou, the Australian ambassador to Abu Dhabi; Mr Jonathan Muir, the Australian ambassador to Doha; and Mr Ian Halliday, the consul general in Dubai and the general manager of MENA for Austrade. All three gentlemen said they couldn't wait for South Australia to establish our office in Dubai, and that they would give their support to the South Australian initiatives in the region.

At the event, I announced that recruitment of the Dubai director is now open and that we plan to have the Dubai office fully functioning well before the Dubai Expo 2020, which will be held in October next year. The expo will coincide with the 50th anniversary of the founding of the United Arab Emirates, will be the first world expo to take place in the Middle East, North Africa or South Asia and is expecting 25 million visitors from 180 countries. This gives South Australian companies the perfect opportunity to showcase their capabilities, products and services to the region, and our office will be there to support them in all of these opportunities.

Of course, another major event coming up in the region is the FIFA World Cup in 2022 in Qatar, and I am sure our Dubai office will be working to create opportunities for South Australian businesses to showcase their products and services on a global stage. The Dubai office will be vital in supporting South Australian companies looking to expand into the Middle East and North Africa region and will provide a valuable resource for companies based there that are looking for opportunities to trade with or invest in South Australia. Our growing network of international trade

offices increases our state government's capacity to offer real business and investment opportunities to our exporters, and in doing so to generate more wealth and jobs for South Australians.

DUBAI TRADE AND INVESTMENT OFFICE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:06): Supplementary arising from the answer: has the minister on official duties visited Dubai or areas in that region?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:06): I thank the honourable member for his question and his ongoing interest in my travel. No, I have not visited that particular part of the globe as a minister. I visited it a number of times in opposition, and I would urge the members opposite to get out and have a look around the world. It is something that might broaden their horizons a little bit, to have a look at what other parts of the world are doing. We are in the recruitment phase for the director of the office, and I am sure that next year I will be able to report to the honourable member that I will have visited the Middle East.

DUBAI TRADE AND INVESTMENT OFFICE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:07): Further supplementary: the minister talked about the recruitment process for the office. Can the minister outline the remuneration level for the director of the office, how many people will be in that office and whether anyone has been appointed to that office yet?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:07): I will start with the last question first. No, nobody has been appointed. As I said, it was only on 13 September—so that's only 12 days ago—that the actual advertisement went live. I know we are a fast-acting, quick government, but we do need to take a little bit more time than 12 days to appoint somebody.

I don't have the exact figure of the remuneration package. As members would know, the arrangement is that we employ people with Austrade, so they are employed on a similar salary package and, my understanding is, with similar qualifications and similar responsibilities as within Austrade, but I will bring back those details for the honourable member.

DUBAI TRADE AND INVESTMENT OFFICE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:08): I have a further supplementary arising from the original answer, where the minister referred to meeting representatives from that part of the world and targeting space industries: can the minister outline which particular space industry companies in the UAE he or his department or this office is targeting or will be targeting?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:08): As I said, if the honourable member had been listening, it was an MOU with the United Arab Emirates Space Agency that focuses on industrial R&D collaboration, academic and research exchanges and capacity to build and drive the space industry growth. It is actually with a government space agency, like the national Space Agency that we have here, and Mission Control, and the SmartSat CRC is based here. This is, as I said—I repeat it again—an MOU with the United Arab Emirates Space Agency, so it is a government to government MOU.

As the honourable member would know—and he should know, because I think there were many hundreds of MOUs signed by his former government and his very good friend the Hon. Martin Hamilton-Smith; they signed hundreds of MOUs—it is at the initial stage. Sadly for the members opposite, they didn't actually have the capacity to follow them up.

Now that we have this MOU in place, one of the functions of our representative there will be to actually expand on that and look for opportunities for South Australian initiatives to be used there. Certainly, with the great announcement in the United States in the last few days, with President Trump and our Prime Minister Morrison talking about the collaboration of going, firstly, to the Moon and then on to Mars—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Point of order, Mr President: the supplementaries have been quite succinct in their asking, and I don't think they called for the member's reflection on whether Mr Trump is going to Mars.

The PRESIDENT: You are asking about relevance. You are straying, the Hon. Mr Ridgway. We have 10 minutes left, and I am keen to get to the crossbench, so finish it off and sit down.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: That will present exceptional opportunity for investment—

The PRESIDENT: I said finish it off and sit down. Don't interpret my words.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: —across the space sector from all of our allies and friends that we do business with.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: One supplementary.

The PRESIDENT: I will allow one supplementary, as long as it's a sensible one, otherwise I am going to sit you down.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It's not a sensible one.

The PRESIDENT: It's not a sensible one. Right, the Hon. Mr Darley.

LAND TAX

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:10): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer advise, in his opinion, whether the majority of the constituents who attended the land tax forum organised by the member for Adelaide were supportive or not supportive of the government's proposed land tax changes?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:10): The majority would have been not supportive.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:10): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Why has the number of mental health clients waiting over 24 hours in emergency departments in the Central Adelaide Local Health Network gone from 7 per cent in 2017 to 24 per cent in 2019?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:11): Would the honourable member mind repeating the question?

The Hon. T.T. NGO: Why has the number of mental health clients waiting over 24 hours in emergency departments in CALHN gone from 7 per cent in 2017 to 24 per cent in 2019?

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I am happy to check the honourable member's figures, but I don't believe those numbers are correct. Long waits were twice as common in 2017 than Labor is willing to admit and more than three times more the year before. My understanding was that the waits were 14 per cent in 2017. Also, Labor is not comparing like with like in relation to the current year. The current year is a year-to-date figure and, as you might have noticed, we are only in September.

In terms of action on mental health, I would remind the house that this government is committed to addressing the long waits in mental health. We have opened the Royal Adelaide Hospital psychiatric intensive care unit, we opened the Lyell McEwin short stay unit and, in the middle of this year, we have opened 10 more forensic mental health beds at Glenside. In that context, the year-to-date figures that Labor refers to—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, could you please restrain yourself because I can't hear the minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The forensic mental health beds at Glenside opened in the middle of the year, so obviously the full year impact of those beds is yet to be seen. Also, we have seen a positive response to the implementation of the Court Diversion Program. We are actively reviewing our mental health bed utilisation to make sure that we are making the most of all the resources available to us, in particular the additional Glenside beds.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:13): Supplementary: will the minister now reverse the funding cuts to non-government organisations delivering mental health programs that keep people out of emergency departments?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:14): The South Australian government has not cut mental health funding in relation to the transition to the NDIS. We are delivering on an agreement signed by the former Labor government.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:14): A supplementary: can the minister guarantee that no new patient will be worse off under the reductions in funding for mental health?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:14): I'm not sure what the honourable member is referring to. If she's referring to a client who is not eligible for NDIS services, then they wouldn't be getting NDIS services, ipso facto, and so how can they be better or worse off? In relation to the NDIS, people transferred to the NDIS, that is the responsibility of the commonwealth.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:15): Further supplementary: will the Mental Health Services Plan, now six months overdue, commit funding to combat these increased emergency department waiting times for mental health patients?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:15): The honourable member might say that the Mental Health Services Plan is six months overdue. I just make the observation that the last statewide mental health plan expired seven years ago under the former Labor government. In terms of the Mental Health Services Plan, yes, it will help address better services to South Australians who need mental health support, including in emergency departments.

The PRESIDENT: One further supplementary, the Hon. Mr Ngo.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:15): Will the minister commit to the Mental Health Services Plan funding?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:16): When the Mental Health Services Plan is released it will be released.

WINTER TOURISM CAMPAIGN

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:16): My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Can the minister please provide an update about the results of the SATC's winter tourism campaign?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:16): Of course, members opposite are talking about 'old mate', which is exactly what you want to do. We want you to be talking about it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: You're still talking about it. This is the winter campaign, not the spring-summer campaign, 'old mate', that we're talking about. Nonetheless, it's good to see you still talking about it because it was designed to provoke comment and commentary and it still is. Look at this: it's still going on, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: I'm holding you to a strict time limit, the Hon. Mr Ridgway, because I want to get to another question.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Mr President, I'm being distracted. I want to talk about the winter campaign, I'm sorry. In March 2019, the SATC launched the domestic winter campaign, designed to highlight South Australia as an ideal winter destination. We wanted to highlight South Australia's

offerings that are best experienced in the cooler months. The campaign showcased many unique experiences and locations across our state and regions and around the city, from Adelaide to the Flinders Ranges and the outback to the Limestone Coast and the Fleurieu Peninsula to the Adelaide Hills and the Clare Valley.

The aim of the campaign was to bring South Australia to the front of people's minds when booking a holiday. We wanted to let everyone know what South Australia has to offer and to showcase many of the wonders of our state. I'm pleased to report that the campaign has been declared a success. Many local operators in the tourism industry reported a noticeable increase in bookings and many more inquiries to their region.

Mount Lofty House, for example, saw a significant boost in stays from last year; it was up by 80 per cent year on year. Visits to the d'Arenberg Cube rose by 20 per cent year on year for the length of the campaign. EP Cruises doubled their passengers from last year, and the HideyHOLE reported that their online followers had increased tenfold. The campaign made use of striking imagery of unique locations from around our state. The Limestone Coast's Ghost Mushroom Lane reported that after being featured in the campaign they saw 20,000 visitors in just eight weeks. Furthermore, the SATC has reported that their consumer website, www.southaustralia.com, saw more than 1.7 million domestic visits last year, a 72 per cent increase year on year.

It has been fantastic to see the winter campaign has made so many Australians aware of the depth of experiences on offer around Adelaide and South Australia. Our burgeoning visitor economy is now at a record \$7.2 billion—and I want to repeat that: \$7.2 billion. It is vital that we continue building upon this to bring more people into our great state. As we know, 43¢ of every dollar is spent in regional South Australia.

So with all of that in mind, Mr President, you will be aware that we have now already launched our spring and summer campaign, which has already generated a phenomenal response, as we saw again here in the chamber today. Our message is clear: don't put off coming to South Australia; come and experience it for yourself and see all that we have to offer.

REGIONAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:19): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question about regional health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: A couple of days ago, I had the great pleasure of meeting the hardworking and dedicated chair of the Streaky Bay and Districts Medical Clinic Association, a wonderful community-based organisation established last year in a desperate attempt to keep open the medical clinic in the picturesque township on South Australia's West Coast. Over the past 14 months, the association has, as I understand, written to the minister twice, pleading for government funds to help keep open the doors of the town's only medical clinic.

Currently, the local community, via local council loans, has spent \$300,000 to ensure that that happens, but the money is running out and the clinic is in a position where it is likely to shut its doors before the end of the calendar year. Not only will patients be forced to Ceduna, Wudinna, Elliston or Port Lincoln for medical services, 110 kilometres away—Ceduna being the closest—but there are issues obviously in those areas as well in terms of lack of GP services. It is estimated that there are currently 30 towns in the broader West Coast-Eyre Peninsula region without a GP. My questions to the minister are:

1. Given the dire nature of the situation, why hasn't there been any formal response to the Streaky Bay and Districts Medical Clinic Association, despite their desperate pleas for funding?
2. Do you think it's fair that people are disadvantaged against receiving basic medical services purely based on the region or area in which they live?
3. Will the government now step in and guarantee emergency funding to ensure that the clinic is able to remain open beyond 31 December this year?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:21): I will need to check the record but the honourable member's question implies that I haven't engaged with the Streaky

Bay clinic. My recollection is that not only have I visited the clinic and met with both local representatives and members of the committee on Eyre Peninsula at Streaky Bay but that I have also met them in Adelaide.

I think it was only in the last sitting week that I reiterated again our concern about the rural health workforce and particularly the consultation that is underway currently in relation to the rural medical workforce. It has been only in the last months that I have met with both the federal Minister for Health and the federal minister for rural health and in both contexts the issues in relation to Eyre Peninsula were discussed.

The federal government was very generous recently in providing \$300,000 for a new community initiative in the region to develop health services, which I understand Streaky Bay is part of. I think that group is called the Northern Eyre Peninsula Health Alliance. It doesn't just deal with medical practitioners; in fact, one of the key people involved in that process is a dental practitioner. However, the leadership on the Eyre Peninsula, both in the local government sense and in a health sense, are actively engaging both the commonwealth and state government and a range of bodies, such as the Rural Doctors Workforce Agency and the universities, to do what we can to address these significant problems.

One of the early initiatives of the government was to deliver on its commitment to double the number of medical interns in country South Australia, and that was achieved by five interns being based in Whyalla but working across Eyre Peninsula. We will continue to work with towns such as Streaky Bay. We appreciate that every South Australian should have fair access to adequate medical services, and we continue to be concerned about the sites without general practitioners. That is the whole reason why this government committed to and is delivering a Rural Health Workforce Strategy.

Matters of Interest

GRAHAM F. SMITH PEACE FOUNDATION

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:24): It is a great honour to rise today and speak about the Graham F. Smith Peace Foundation 2019 Peace Rules showcase and the Sri Chinmoy Oneness-Home Peace Run Torch-Bearer Award presentation. The Graham F. Smith Peace Foundation was established in 1989 as the Graham F. Smith Peace Trust in memory of the legacy of Graham Smith, who was a lifelong educator and peace activist. I would like to pay tribute to the founder, the wonderful Leonie Ebert, who established the peace foundation in honour of her late husband, Graham Smith, and congratulate the foundation for celebrating its 30th anniversary this year.

It was a great honour to attend the Peace Rules Performing Arts Award Showcase, which was held on Thursday 19 September 2019. The students from participating secondary schools were asked to create and present a three to five-minute performance, film or multimedia work on the theme of 'peace rules'. It is the second Peace Rules showcase, which involved South Australian students to give voice to the question, 'What can I do to contribute to peace through the arts?' These young performers projected their social responsibility through their bold and creative expression.

I was most impressed by the quality, the creativity and the thoughtfulness of the performances and projects presented by the students. It was the most amazing showcase, where young people were able to deliver their powerful and engaging messages to advocate for peace through performing arts.

Congratulations go to all the participating schools for their inspiring showcase, which include Aberfoyle Park High School, Adelaide High School, Blackwood High School, Golden Grove High School, MQ Dance Education, Navigator College, Nazareth Catholic College, Para Hills High School, Pembroke School and St Aloysius College.

It was an honour to present awards to deserving winners. Para Hills High School received the excellence award for their pieces 'We Stand for Peace' and 'Red Dust Plain'. The merit award went to Blackwood High School's 'Breaking Silence', and the encouragement award was presented to Golden Grove High School for their piece 'Silence'. Congratulations to everyone.

Such a showcase requires people who are committed to make things happen seamlessly. I wish to thank and congratulate the Peace Rules showcase committee; stage manager, Jamie

Veneman; Robyn Callan, the assistant stage manager; Corinne Berry; and all committee members for their hard work and dedication on this important showcase. The Peace Foundation is run entirely by volunteers, and I thank all those individuals, presenters, award judges and sponsors who supported the showcase and enabled teachers and students to engage in performing arts projects to promote peace.

In addition to the Peace Rules performing arts awards, the Peace Foundation this year also incorporated the Sri Chinmoy Oneness-Home Peace Run in the presentation of the Torch-Bearer Award. 2019 marks the 32nd anniversary of the Sri Chinmoy Peace Run in Australia. The motto of the peace run is 'Peace begins with me', a message that empowers every single person to contribute to a brighter and better future for all.

It was wonderful to catch up with South Australian coordinator, Ivan Marek, and his wife, Helen, along with Januja Reynolds, John Willis and other peace runners on the night. I can still vividly remember the time we spent together when I welcomed the peace torch runners on the steps of Parliament House on Saturday 15 September 2018.

I was deeply honoured to be presented with the Peace Run Torch-Bearer Award this year during the showcase. It was a very humbling experience and a memorable occasion to accept the award in the presence of Leonie Ebert, an inspiring and remarkable community builder, who was the 2018 award recipient of the Peace Run Torch-Bearer Award. It was one of many public recognitions for her longstanding commitment in promoting peace in all its forms.

Thank you sincerely to everyone at the Graham F. Smith Peace Foundation and the Sri Chinmoy Peace Run teams for their enduring passion to promote peace so that we can all enjoy living in a harmonious and inclusive society.

INTERNATIONAL SAFE ABORTION DAY

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (15:29): On 28 September, it is International Safe Abortion Day. Initially, the date commenced as a day of action to decriminalise abortion in Latin America and has grown to now being celebrated around the world in over 65 countries. The theme this year is 'Abortion is healthcare' and #MyAbortionMyHealth. This is based on recognition that abortion is an important element of women's reproductive lives and health. Further, it is integral to a woman's right to bodily autonomy.

The facts surrounding abortion law are as follows. One in two women around the world do not have access to safe and legal abortion. According to research estimates, unsafe abortions cause 47,000 deaths, and millions of women worldwide require surgery and/or treatment for complications arising from unsafe abortion. Finally, providing women with affordable access to family planning services, which would also incorporate provision of safe abortions, reduces the health risks women currently face.

In fact, a leading research and policy organisation committed to advancing sexual and reproductive health and rights, the US research and policy organisation, Guttmacher Institute, predicts that there would be around 14.5 million fewer unsafe abortions and 38,000 fewer deaths due to unsafe abortions annually just by providing proper access to contraceptives alone. Put simply, encouraging women to exercise their rights and responsibilities regarding sexual behaviour and reproduction, freely and with dignity, it contributes towards the important goal of gender equality.

This year marks the 125th year of women's suffrage, a celebration of progressive laws which has focused discussion on what we need to reduce inequalities and discrimination experienced by women. One way we can move closer towards redressing the imbalance is by addressing our retrograde laws in South Australia, which includes laws on abortion.

We have signed countless UN conventions and covenants involving abortion or reproductive rights. Yet, this year, the Morrison Liberal government failed to sign the UN International Women's Day statement despite its being backed by 57 other nation states. He turned our country away from a commitment to implement greater policies and legislation that respect the economic, social and political rights of women and girls.

Ironically, this was despite foreign minister Marise Payne advising the UN that gender equality was one of five guiding principles for Australia's time on the council just prior. Put adequately by Edwina MacDonald, the legal director for the Human Rights Law Centre:

No government can truly support gender equality and human rights without supporting access to safe abortions and reproductive rights.

Concerns are also growing in South Australia about the relocation of surgical abortion services from the Pregnancy Advisory Centre and Women's and Children's Hospital to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The combined closures have caused a significant blowout in waiting times for women seeking an abortion, which would undoubtedly have a significant impact on the mental health and wellbeing of the women.

The experiences of 'Nicole', which were reported recently by the ABC, are alarming. She was booked for a surgical procedure at 12 weeks despite being eligible for a medical abortion at five weeks. She was directed to the wrong floor of The QEH, treated without sensitivity by medical staff despite her obvious distress about having the procedure, was required to change in public toilets and not provided any pain relief.

We must thoroughly consider incidents such as Nicole's, as we have a duty of care to ensure our public health system is efficient, safe and non-discriminatory. We need to ensure our laws protect women and afford them proper health care. Abortion law reform goes to the heart of a policy and program of reducing discrimination and working towards gender equality. We are slowly making inroads with recent High Court authority affirming the legitimacy of safe zones. It is time we start redressing the imbalance as legislators.

SPIT HOODS

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:34): I rise to speak on the controversial and outdated use of spit hoods in custodial settings, a matter raised yesterday in this place by the Minister for Human Services, the Hon. Michelle Lensink. SA-Best welcomes the tabling of two reports in the Legislative Council, the Ombudsman's investigation concerning the use of spit hoods in the Adelaide Youth Training Centre and the term 4 2018 report of the Visiting Program and Review of Records of the Adelaide Youth Training Centre. We were eagerly awaiting both reports to assist us in finalising a private member's bill on this very issue that I intend to introduce in parliament in the next week of sitting.

The disturbing incidents reviewed by the investigation undertaken by Ombudsman Wayne Lines highlight the need for legislation to ensure that the barbaric practice of deploying spit hoods is banned in both youth and adult custodial settings. The Ombudsman found their use involved the unnecessary application of force and restraint, which is contrary to the objects and guiding principles of the youth justice system and the Charter of Rights for Youth Detained in Training Centres.

In response to issues raised by evidence given to coronial inquests into recent deaths in custody, including that of Wayne Fella Morrison, and concerns expressed by the Guardian for Children and Young People along with findings and recommendations of the Ombudsman's report, our proposed bill will seek to ban the use of spit hoods in all custodial settings, juvenile and adult, effective immediately.

I will just comment further on the ongoing inquest regarding Wayne Fella Morrison, and will highlight this more when I speak further on this matter. We know in that case that Mr Morrison had been taken into custody on remand. Due to overcrowding he was held at the Holden Hill cells before being moved to Yatala, where he was waiting to appear in the Elizabeth Magistrates Court by video link.

Hours before he was due to appear there was an altercation between Mr Morrison and two guards in his holding cell, and up to 12 guards are said to have wrestled Mr Morrison to the ground in a nearby corridor. CCTV played for the court showed him being pinned to the floor while his hands and legs were cuffed. A spit hood was placed over his head, and a group of officers carried him chest down, face down, in a prone position into a prison transport van.

Four guards accompanied him in the back of the van. For three and a half minutes no-one knows for sure what happened, but it is the subject of an ongoing inquest. There is no CCTV footage

showing what happened, and I understand that the four prison guards involved have refused to make any statements. That is something that is the subject of ongoing discussion in the coronial inquest, and I understand the matter is also being referred to the Supreme Court.

The Guardian for Children and Young People has identified court cells and custodial transport as other detention settings that the bill we will introduce will cover. As noted yesterday by minister Lensink, South Australia has the dubious distinction of remaining the only jurisdiction in Australia still using spit hoods in youth training centres. I expect, with this coronial inquest, we will be hearing much more in relation to these spit hoods, not only in youth detention centres but also, as I said, in adult custodial settings.

I was somewhat heartened to hear, based on the report provided, that spit hoods have been utilised only once since March 2019. That is a significant reduction from the reported 57 uses of spit hoods in youth training centres from October 2016 to 2017. An immediate ban is absolutely achievable, in SA-Best's view. We need to learn from the best practice of other jurisdictions, which have long ceased using these spit hoods, to ensure that staff are adequately supported in implementing the changes and that they are not placed at increased risk.

I am confident, given the appropriate expertise and resources, that the relevant departments are capable of achieving this in a safe and expeditious manner. I look forward to further debate on this issue in coming weeks.

HOCKEY SA

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:39): I rise to speak about Hockey SA, the principal governing body for hockey in South Australia, which acts on behalf of its members to grow and progress the sport through espousing excellence on and off the field. Hockey SA endeavours to promote good sportsmanship, integrity and transparency, financial responsibility and sustainability, ethical leadership and innovation in the game, and inclusivity to encourage the involvement of South Australians of all backgrounds and abilities.

I had the privilege of representing the Premier and the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing at its recent 2019 awards night, which recognised the outstanding achievements and services to hockey within South Australia by individuals, clubs and regional associations. At this prestigious event, the hockey community gathered together for the presentation of numerous awards including Club of the Year, Coach of the Year, Outstanding Service to Hockey, Regional Association of the Year, Hockey SA Volunteer of the Year, the Female and Male Rising Stars of the Year, and the Best and Fairest of the Men's Premier League and the Women's Premier League.

For members who are not familiar with the history of Hockey SA, it was formed in 1903 to support players after the sport was introduced into South Australia by predominantly naval personnel. Significantly, hockey was initially played predominantly by women, with men's competitions only commencing at the turn of the century. I was surprised to learn it is currently the third largest participant sport in the world, after soccer and cricket, with two billion people competing at some level and involved in the game.

In South Australia, there are over 8,000 registered participants, comprising approximately 50 per cent men and 50 per cent women, with half of these players being members of one of our 23 metropolitan clubs and the other half belonging to one of the 11 associations in regional areas. The age of these players range from just six years old right through to about 70. At the elite level, we have one South Australian player on the men's national field hockey team, the Kookaburras, which are presently ranked number one in the world, and four South Australians on the women's national field hockey team, the Hockeyroos, who are ranked third in the world. Hockey SA proudly invests its time and resources into ensuring South Australia's best players have the opportunity to participate in numerous international competitions, including the Olympics, the World Cup, the Champions Trophy and the Four Nation Tournaments.

One of Hockey SA's primary mandates is, of course, to encourage greater participation in the sport. In 2018, it expanded the delivery of its Sporting Schools program to raise the profile of hockey throughout South Australian schools, with 3,000 children choosing to be involved. This marked the biggest increase in engagement in the sport through this particular initiative. A two-year funding grant from the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing to promote inclusion in the game also

enabled Hockey SA to facilitate over 50 come-and-try sessions for women, where females with little or no experience were able to try the sport in a safe and friendly environment.

It was also able to introduce a new competition for males over 50, utilising a modified game format to offer men in this age group a chance to keep active, to keep competitive and to be social. These unique and innovative pursuits are just a few of the very commendable activities Hockey SA has established for the benefit of a whole cross-section of the community.

At Hockey SA's awards ceremony, I had the privilege of presenting the Female Rising Star of the Year and Male Rising Star of the Year awards. These are annually presented to participants aged between 16 and 21 who exhibit a high level of player performance for the year, including enthusiasm and commitment to the sport; a willingness to improve their knowledge and ability; superior individual skill, discipline and potential; traits of team spirit, fairness and sportsmanship; and characteristics of being a worthy role model to their peers.

The 2019 recipients were Hattie Shand and Fred Gray, both members of the Adelaide Hockey Club. I take this opportunity to once again congratulate them on their significant achievements and to wish them well in their future sporting careers, which certainly appear to be very promising. Indeed, I congratulate all of this year's award winners for their accomplishments and I have no doubt Hockey SA will continue its important work to ensure they each continue to fulfil their potential.

FOOD LABELLING

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:43): On 14 September, the Nationals announced their intent to lobby the federal government—of which that party is a junior member—to ban the terms 'milk', 'meat' and 'seafood' from being used for alternative and plant-based products such as, for example, soy milk, almond milk, so-called 'fake meat' or indeed 'faux fish'. Under existing rules, when the term 'milk' is used on its own, it is inferred to mean cow's milk. If the milk is from another species or another source, it is labelled with an additional descriptor; for example, goat's milk, soy milk or rice milk.

It is unclear what the Nationals are actually trying to achieve here. Ostensibly, it is something to do with supporting farmers or avoiding confusion, but they seem to have got themselves as worked up as Chidi Anagonye of *The Good Place* when deciding whether or not the almond milk should go in the coffee or whether that is the worst possible choice he could make. It is as if the Nationals have not realised that farmers and producers do not produce almonds or grain in the country, and it makes one wonder, when they do their supermarket shop or their farmers' market produce shop, how consumers will navigate this typical normal task, given the names of the many other products that could surely be considered similarly misleading.

Exhibit A: peanut butter. The Dairy Board in our history in this state lobbied for that to be referred to as peanut paste, yet here we are today, 2019, with peanut butter on the shelves.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: It's always been peanut paste.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I grew up in New South Wales—it was always peanut butter. Coconut milk, coconut cream, heads of cabbage—sure, they are cabbage, but why have they got heads? Beefsteak tomatoes: what is in a beefsteak tomato? Butternut pumpkins: there is butter, there are nuts, there are pumpkins! Hamburgers, but not a bit of pork or ham to be seen! Surely, when one gets to the lady finger bananas, that is where it will all come undone!

What about coconut butter, what about shea butter, what about moisturising cream? Should we go for the non-food aisles? What about the butterfly? Will it really hit this point of being quite ridiculous? I think this is ridiculous, and it is easy to have a bit of laugh, and I am here today to milk the folly of the Nationals because I think that when most of us hear this news—and the real reason I want to talk about this—we will be baffled as to how this is a priority for the National Party.

I believe the joke here is on us when we have the pressing threats of climate change and drought plaguing our farming community, yet all they want to do is clamp down on the almond, soy and grain producers of our country regions. But, to rub salt into the wound—not to put butter on it—we have since heard the news that our former federal drought envoy, the illustrious Barnaby Joyce, would simply text in his drought reports to the then federal prime minister.

I have been pondering whether those texts consisted of the words, 'From a front bar, this drought is making me thirsty,' as he travelled from front bar to front bar, costing taxpayers \$675,000 to do so in expenses, spending less than three weeks on the ground in drought-affected communities outside his electorate, while our federal drought envoy. That is \$675,000 for nine months on the job and an allocation of two staff members to conduct his work at an estimated cost of \$200,000.

According to the travel records he lodged with the Independent Parliamentary Expenses Authority, Barnaby Joyce made four short trips to drought-ravaged Queensland during the time he spent in this role—about a week spent on the ground. The first was for a daytrip to Longreach, Bedourie and St George, for which a private charter cost more than \$15,000; the second, a chartered daytrip to Charleville for delivery of hay bales by the rapid relief team cost \$5,600; the third, an overnight trip to Gympie, also by charter, cost \$5,300; and the fourth, an overnight trip to Rockhampton in March 2019. Joyce made two trips to Tasmania—not a single trip to South Australia. I think the joke that is being played by the National Party here is on us.

HOLDFAST BAY CITIZENSHIP CEREMONY

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:48): On Monday night, I had the privilege of representing the member for Croydon, the Labor leader Peter Malinauskas, at the City of Holdfast Bay citizenship ceremony. During my address to the 75 soon-to-be Australian citizens, I asked them for a favour. I asked each and every person in the room on Monday night to never forget the stories that brought them to that room, and the reason they were choosing to become an Australian citizen.

It is our stories that are handed down through generations that remind us of the struggles and the sacrifices made to enable us to enjoy what surrounds us today and, hopefully, tomorrow. It is the stories we carry with us in this chamber and the stories every South Australian carries with them that have shaped who we are.

While our stories have helped shape who we are, our new citizens should be able to rely on a strong and bold government to provide the tools they and all South Australians need to build South Australia. As the member for Dunstan, Premier Steven Marshall, stated in his first parliament speech in 2010:

State governments should be focused on service delivery and be designed to keep decision-making as close to the people affected as possible. People should feel that their state government is there to look after them, to educate their children, attend to the sick, police their communities, build their infrastructure and help the vulnerable within their society.

A wise person once said to me, 'Be careful what you say in your first speech. You are laying the foundation of the legacy that you hope to leave behind.' They are very wise words. The member for Dunstan, the Premier of this state, from his first speech to his election pledge, asked voters to put their faith in him to deliver the services that support people, that will look after them, our children, our sick and the vulnerable.

When will the Premier acknowledge that he has not kept his word? When will the Premier acknowledge that he has let down the most vulnerable people in our community, by admitting that South Australia having the highest unemployment rate of 7.3 per cent—the highest unemployment rate in this country—is a problem? The member for Dunstan, Premier Steven Marshall, promised more jobs. Instead, he is delivering the highest unemployment rate in Australia.

What vision is there on the horizon? What legacy is this government putting in place to turn around these numbers? Where are the infrastructure projects? Where are the public services to deliver to those people who choose to call South Australia their home? What tools are those opposite leaving so South Australians can build South Australia?

We are all seeing cuts, closures and privatisations. We are seeing increased fees, and we are seeing the privatisation of our public trams and trains. That is why South Australians are trading in the comfort of their chair or their couch at night-time to spend it with politicians in a crowded room. They are giving up the comfort of their couch to cram into a hall to listen to politicians about why the Liberal government is privatising our trams and trains and how wrong you have got your land tax policy.

It is not tens of people, it is hundreds of South Australians giving up their weeknights. It is former Liberal voters, it is mums, dads and young South Australians, and they are all saying the same thing: this is not what the Liberals promised in opposition. I am sure many South Australians will again be sending the same message to the member for Dunstan on 13 October on the steps of Parliament House at the privatisation rally. I call on the Premier to reflect on his first speech and to reflect on the words that he used. I quote:

I am here to fight for the role of state government and to demonstrate that it is not the system that is broken but the people running it.

Premier, yes, the system is not broken: it is the people running it.

INTERCULTURAL FUTURES

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:53): Over recent months, I have been pleased to work with Ms Alexandra McGee, the project coordinator at Welcome Australia, on a program called Intercultural Futures. I have attended two forums as part of that program, on Saturday 18 May and Saturday 14 September at The Welcome Centre in Bowden. As I think many of us know, Welcoming Australia exists to cultivate a culture of welcome and create a future where people of all backgrounds have equal opportunity to belong, contribute and thrive.

The Intercultural Futures program is aimed at developing leadership skills and capacity in young leaders, furthering social cohesion in South Australia and showcasing this state as a destination of choice for people from overseas looking to make their home here. It encourages perspectives from First Nation people and those from recent refugee and migrant backgrounds.

The program hosts a group of participants from a wide range of backgrounds, including nations within Europe, Africa and Asia and, I am not sure, possibly also South America. The group meets on one Saturday and one Sunday every month and attends workshops that are designed to develop practical skills and knowledge that will help members of the group to build the confidence to pursue leadership positions in their communities and in the general South Australian community, as well as in their chosen fields of education and employment.

The program facilitates training in self-awareness, team building and team working, public speaking, writing, acquitting grants and many other topics. The participants have attended workshops held by mentors from Aboriginal, Chinese, Italian, Anglo, Greek, Korean and Iranian communities, among others. Speakers and trainers from a range of backgrounds are invited, including business and education and even from politics.

In that vein, I have been pleased, on two occasions, as I said, to provide some background to my leadership experience, certainly through sport and through the sheep industry but also in developing the specific areas of focus that I have been able to provide within the parliament, particularly in relation to suicide prevention and surrogacy legislation. I must say that, at both forums but specifically at the most recent one, there was great interest in that work.

I think there is a great potential for those social issues that have long been the subject of stigma across the broader Australian community, particularly in a lot of the newer communities, to be discussed more fervently. I am very confident that the leadership that these young people display will go on to assist them not only in maintaining their culture but also in providing particular leadership skills within the broader South Australian community.

On that note, I must say that there is a young man whom I know—I think he is from an Iranian background—who is involved as a coproprietor of a pizza shop that I occasionally frequent, who actually was surprised to see me turn up as a speaker. He described me as, 'He's my client!' That young man has shown great potential. He has really appreciated the support that Alexandra McGee and this program have provided to him, and he is planning a major event within his own community.

I commend the work of Welcoming Australia in this particular area of the Intercultural Futures program and the way in which they are assisting people to belong, contribute and thrive in our South Australian community.

*Motions***GAYLE'S LAW**

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. C. Bonaros:

That the regulations made under the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010 concerning remote area attendance made on 16 May 2019 and laid on the table of this council on 4 June 2019, be disallowed.

(Continued from 19 June 2019)

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (15:59): I stand to speak today on the Hon. Connie Bonaros's motion of disallowance. I thank the Hon. Connie Bonaros for all her endeavours on this matter and support her disallowance on these regulations. I note the presence of representatives from the ANMFSA here today whose members are at the coalface and stand to be most impacted by these regulations.

The alarming circumstances surrounding the death of Gayle Woodford raised the very serious question of: are we doing enough to keep our nurses safe, specifically remote area practitioners and health professionals? To understand this issue we have to appreciate the circumstances that gave rise to Gayle's Law. These were: Gayle was in a remote location responding to an emergency call in a public space; she would have been required to make a risk assessment in accordance with her employer's safety policies; and she was assaulted and killed by a third party.

This incident led to the introduction of legislation that was predicated on the requirement of a second responder to attend after-hours call-outs with health practitioners, predominately nurses. As put by the Hon. Stephen Wade, whilst in opposition, and I quote:

The bill requires health practitioners in remote areas to be accompanied by a second person when responding to after-hours or emergency call-outs. The presence of a second person should reduce the risk of a personal attack...

For this model to work, we need to ensure that we recruit and maintain a network of second responders throughout the remote areas. When called for an after-hours or unscheduled emergency call, health practitioners will need to assess the risk involved in the situation, deciding whether their service needs to be provided immediately or whether it can be provided during normal hours. If deemed to be an emergency, the practitioner will rendezvous with a second responder at an agreed location to accompany him or her to the site of the emergency. The second responder will remain with them until the call-out is finished.

This commitment was reflected in the legislation, commonly known as Gayle's Law, as a means by which in some way we could afford protection and security to help professionals in remote and isolated environments. The regulations, however, and in particular clause 11D, do not reflect the intentions of the legislation and seek to dilute the requirements of a two-person responder provision whereupon a health practitioner can attend an after-hours call-out alone following a risk assessment being undertaken by the individual. This is contrary to the intent of the legislation.

Whilst provisions envisaged in Gayle's Law could never eliminate all risk, it would certainly go a long way towards providing a safer and more secure process, as anticipated in the legislation. I am fortified by the views expressed by the AMA, which stated, and I quote:

...the safety of health practitioners must override any other priority. As such they strongly support legislation that requires that a second responder be required in all circumstances, as initially intended by the family of Mrs Woodford. These members urge that legislation must protect and be unequivocally seen to protect, the healthcare professionals who agree to work in geographically remote areas, often in extreme conditions, and that having a second responder present in all circumstances be a categorical requirement in minimising the risk to their safety and wellbeing.

There were representations also made, which echoed these sentiments, by the nurses union as well as the Woodford family and SASMOA. The concern with the current regulations is that health practitioners are afforded no additional support or security and are placed in a situation where they are required to make a risk assessment at a time of urgency in a pressured manner. It is placing an inordinate amount of pressure and stress on a health professional who is already in an urgent emergency situation.

It would appear that the regulations have been drafted with the consideration of resourcing and funding issues being of paramount importance. This could be the only explanation as to why we

are presented with a diluted policy requirement for regulation in comparison to the requirement that two persons attend as promulgated in the legislation.

Limitations of funding have been the primary consideration of organisations and agencies that have presented submissions in previous inquiries, and rightly so when you are dealing with limited funding and resources. The issue of resourcing and funding of agencies and organisations that provide vital services in remote locations should not be a consideration in drafting regulations. It should be addressed as a structural and strategic decision made by government to provide additional support for agencies to meet the commitments as anticipated by Gayle's Law. It should not take away from their already limited funding and resources.

The reality is that these regulations, as currently structured, would not have prevented Gayle's rape and death. The intentions of Gayle's Law were to reduce harm and deaths for remote health professionals and, to this end, the model promulgated by the act would go a long way towards that. The intention of this government should be to ensure that adequate resources are provided to enable agencies and organisations to make that law a reality. For this reason, these regulations should be disallowed.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.J. Stephens.

WORLD MENTAL HEALTH DAY

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (16:06): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that 10 October is World Mental Health Day;
2. Recognises the importance of this day in raising awareness and understanding about mental health;
3. Recognises the challenges and perceptions surrounding mental health illness in Australia;
4. Encourages everyone to look at mental health in a more positive way with an effort to reduce stigma; and
5. Encourages everyone to look for ways for more people to seek the help and support they deserve.

World Mental Health Day is fast approaching and it has caused me to reflect on the way that we as a society approach this very serious and complex problem and, more specifically, how we as policymakers aim to put measures in place to, firstly, end the stigma and, secondly, to ensure that we have sufficient programs and services in place to help those who seek support.

This is a day for mental health awareness, education and advocacy. It is a day to focus on how we, as a community, recognise the roles we can play in creating a healthier society. The theme 'Do you see what I see?' challenges the perceptions associated with mental illness in an effort to reduce stigma and to ensure the availability of support and services for people with mental health concerns.

As members of parliament, one of the roles we play is to assist, through our ability to investigate and legislate, to ensure that adequate supports and programs are in place for those who seek help. Why? Because the figures in South Australia are alarming. In 2017, the then Labor government released the South Australian Mental Health Strategic Plan 2017-2022. It found the following:

- mental illnesses are the third leading cause of disease burden in South Australia behind cardiovascular disease and cancer;
- in any 12-month period, one in five—that is over 280,000 South Australians—aged 16 to 85 are experiencing a diagnosable mental illness such as anxiety, depression or mood disorders and/or substance use disorders;
- that around 45 per cent of South Australians experience a diagnosable mental illness at some time in their life; and
- that the remaining 55 per cent of South Australians who do not experience mental illness are likely to care for someone who does.

The report also estimates that approximately 53,000 South Australians experience severe mental illness in any 12-month period, either episodic or chronic, often with substantial effects on ability to function in society and at home, and are in great need of care and support. Many people with severe mental illnesses require support from specialist mental health and other services in South Australia in addition to primary care services.

The report also highlighted that those who have greater exposure and vulnerability to risk factors, including social, economic and environmental circumstances, are known to be at higher risk of developing mental health illness. In fact, it is most prevalent in our youth, with 50 per cent of South Australians first becoming mentally unwell by the age of 14 and 75 per cent by the age of 24.

Mental health has the ability to have a substantial impact on personal, social and economic aspects of the lives of individuals, their friends, families and the community. It is well-recognised that mental illness is among the greatest causes of disability, diminished quality of life and reduced productivity in our community. I note the substantial work that has been undertaken for mental health reform at both a national and state level over the past two decades. That revolves around planning and service provision to prevent, maintain and improve mental health and wellbeing.

The previous Labor government had a clear vision for South Australia to become internationally recognised as a resilient, compassionate and connected community that takes a whole-of-person, whole-of-life, whole-of-government and whole-of-community approach to building, sustaining and strengthening the mental health and wellbeing of South Australians.

However, post March 2018, things appear to have taken a turn, with recent emergency department statistics revealing that one in four mental health patients presenting at the RAH and The QEH in 2019 are waiting more than 24 hours in emergency departments. That is a stark comparison to the 7 per cent we were presenting just two years ago. It is what mental health advocates predicted earlier this year when the Marshall government made the decision to reduce 25 per cent of funding. UnitingSA, Centacare, Life Without Barriers, Neami, Skylight, Catherine House, Grow SA and Diamond House clubhouse all warned that the cut would lead to increased emergency department waiting times, making ramping worse.

We need to act. We need to be investing more time and resources, not less, and not just directly via health services, because determinants of mental health and mental illness include not only the ability to manage our thoughts, emotions, behaviours and interactions with others but also social determinants such as financial and housing security, social supports, living standards, working conditions and early-in-life care and support. For example, the World Health Organization has acknowledged that:

Gender specific risk factors for common mental disorders that disproportionately affect women include gender based violence, socio-economic disadvantage, low income and income inequality, low or subordinate social status and rank and unremitting responsibility for the care of others.

As a government, we have the ability to address these barriers. We need to act now to ensure there are adequate rehabilitation and support services, housing and accommodation assistance, and various day and group programs, all focused on preventing people's mental health from deteriorating and leading to hospitalisation.

We need to put people at the heart of strategies, policies and planning for mental health services and programs, and heed the call for greater integration across multiple service sectors and providers to ensure that people receive the care and services they need and do not fall through cracks in the system.

We need to provide greater clarity and simplicity for people experiencing mental health issues, their families and their carers, with supports provided through a service continuum involving hospital, community and home-based support. With this in mind, I bring to the attention of members in this place that on World Mental Health Day you will be tasked to see beyond the stigma and be asked that you make a #MentalHealthPromise. I ask that you consider increased support services as part of your promise.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins.

DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (16:15): I move:

That the regulations made under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 concerning development assessment, made on 27 June 2019 and laid on the table of this council on 2 July 2019, be disallowed.

I move this disallowance motion but I first want to acknowledge that the Development Assessment Regulations, tabled in this chamber on 2 July, form an important part of the state's transition to our new planning system.

In accordance with provisions in the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, the Development Assessment Regulations prescribe the processes through which development applications will be assessed under the state's new planning rules. As the Labor opposition has previously indicated, much of the policy intent contained in the regulations is desirable. For instance, the shadow minister for planning, the member for Light, in the other place, has already indicated that setting time limits for development assessment processes is desirable.

Residents, landlords and businesses should not have relatively simple development applications held up because of inefficient bureaucratic processes. It should be acknowledged that many councils already have exemplary records in processing development applications quickly, but there exists an inconsistency across the local government sector which can be improved through the establishment of maximum assessment time periods.

It should be remembered that the act made provision for 'deemed planning consent' whereby a development application can be approved once the applicable maximum development assessment time period has been exceeded. But as with any piece of legislation, the devil is in the detail—in this case, the regulatory detail.

Consultation with councils and planning practitioners has revealed unease about the inadequacy of some of the time frames set down for performance assessed development applications under the Development Assessment Regulations. Under the deemed planning consent model, there is concern that some development applications may be refused because of inadequate information having been submitted by a proponent prior to the expiration of the relevant assessment time period.

In these circumstances, more assessment time could result in the planning authority and proponent reaching a mutually agreeable development application and subsequently achieving development approval. In this light, Labor believes it would be prudent if the development assessment time periods were reviewed in consultation with councils and planning practitioners. Planning practitioners have also expressed concerns about the Development Assessment Regulations' extension to accredited professional land surveyors the authority to provide planning consent for deemed-to-satisfy land divisions.

Many planners have expressed significant doubt about the independence of private certifiers in the planning system. It is feared that a conflict of interest may arise for the land surveyor in this instance, given their service to the client—a development proponent—and their obligations as a planning authority. Concern has particularly arisen amidst evidence of the shortcomings of private certification in the building industry where private certifiers throughout Australia have approved apartment buildings with dangerous and flammable cladding, as well as other features also found not to be compliant with the Building Code of Australia.

The Labor opposition is moving this disallowance motion because we believe further consideration and consultation needs to be undertaken with the parliament, councils and planning professionals about how elements of the Development Assessment Regulations can be improved to facilitate the approval of appropriate developments. I commend the motion to the council.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins.

LAND TAX

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:20): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that the state government's land tax aggregation policy is hurting investor confidence in the property market in South Australia;
2. Acknowledges the growing backlash over land tax changes that will see increases in rents across the state hurting small business and residential tenants alike;
3. Notes that, if implemented as proposed, the land tax aggregation changes would have a very negative effect on the property market in South Australia; and
4. Calls on the state government to abandon its land tax aggregation policy.

I rise to speak on this motion regarding the Marshall government's draconian and widely condemned land tax reform.

'Truth is not the truth.' That infamous statement came out of the mouth of former New York mayor and lawyer Rudy Giuliani in defending his Pinocchio-esque client President Donald Trump over the Russia investigation by Robert S. Mueller. It earned the distinction of 2018's most notable quote by Yale Law School librarian Fred Shapiro. Every year he picks 10 quotes to add to his list of 12,000 that he says represent 'the spirit of the times'. To quote Shapiro:

I think perhaps the most striking development in our current zeitgeist is a dramatic decline in respect for truth in politics, and this quote fits nicely into that narrative. I thought it was a very representative quote of our times.

To accurately reflect this phenomenon, *The Washington Post* Fact Checker has introduced a new category, the Bottomless Pinocchio, a dubious distinction awarded to politicians who repeat a false claim so many times that they are, in effect, engaging in campaigns of disinformation. Here is another one: 'alternative facts', a term invented by another Trumpeter, Kellyanne Conway, to explain away the President's former press secretary Sean Spicer's validation in uttering what were blatant falsehoods.

However, we could easily apply them in the lexicon of tales coming from the Marshall government since its 2018 election manifesto, which included land tax cuts. The 100 per cent who paid it through their teeth rejoiced. Eight days before the poll Mr Marshall said:

These amendments will assist small to medium businesses operating out of their own premises, as well as benefitting hardworking people who have investments in residential property which have appreciated over time and those whose superannuation includes property holdings.

However, from the Bottomless Pinocchio that is Treasury and Finance we have seen a land tax reform package that has already had three vicissitudes since it was dropped on budget day.

On budget day we were told that lifting the tax-free thresholds and cuts of the marginal rate of 3.7 per cent (then the highest in the country) to 2.9 per cent (still near the top) over a minuscule seven years would benefit several thousand of those hardworking people Mr Marshall spoke about. The government's tax take would come down to about \$40 million, taking a bullet for those hardworking people saving for their retirement. Can you believe such stupendous generosity from our taxman?

Yet there lurked a thing called aggregation, lumping multiple properties held in trust setups in one lot because they were created by 'tax cheats, tax avoiders, rorters', as the Treasurer labelled them, a loophole. Never mind that what they had done was proper and legal and done for various reasons, like insulating assets or creating nest eggs for their retirement so they did not need to sponge off taxpayers. Scour that 2018 election manifesto and you will not find that critical alternative fact of a word, 'aggregation', in any mention of their land tax reform—nothing, nil, nought, zilch, zippo.

Coming to a rate notice near you, revaluations to market value of every piece of dirt, bricks and mortar in our state by that other arm of government, the Valuer-General. What incredible serendipity if you were collecting taxes, of course. That is when it dawned upon those in the frame that the truth was not the truth. After denying they got it wrong by some of the best business brains in the state, the Treasurer conceded that paltry \$40 million was going to be more like \$118 million—a Powerball.

For those hardworking people, or 'tax cheats' as the Treasurer liked to call them, who have investments in residential property which have appreciated over time, and those whose superannuation includes property holdings, they suddenly found they were going to get hammered, some to near oblivion.

So when the condemnation reached such a crescendo that it would shatter a chandelier, the Treasurer reached into his bag of tricks and pulled out another one: an immediate reduction of the top rate to 2.4 per cent, or equal to the average rate of all mainland states, that was going to benefit 92 per cent of property investors—some 47,000 of them, we have been told.

But there is another alternative fact where the truth is not quite the truth. If that figure is to be believed, which we cannot at this stage, among the 8 per cent left swinging in the gallows for the greater good are actually a large proportion of the very mum-and-dad investors Mr Marshall claimed he wanted to help. I ask, what is wrong with giving a 100 per cent reduction, like they were led to believe going to the last election? That was the very same election where the Liberals failed to mention that dirty word, 'aggregation', even once.

Since the announcement by the Treasurer of his land tax overhaul, there continues to be widespread community condemnation. The Treasurer keeps rolling out his hypothetical example of someone with seven properties worth \$4 million—a figure, mind you, that initially started at around \$2.5 million or \$3 million, as he keeps changing it—and asking whether it is fair that they pay no tax at all. I will ask again: can you tell us how many are in that category? Everyone I have come across tells me they pay all kinds of taxes on their investments.

One media commentator I have heard appeared to be insulting of the term 'mum-and-dad investors' as if they were pretending to be battlers. The definition can also mean unsophisticated investors who do not have investment skills and have either relied on the advice of others or plonked their hard-earned savings into bricks and mortar, thinking it was the safer investment option. ABS statistics tell us they are predominantly nurses, police officers, Defence personnel, tradies, middle-income office workers, public servants and blue-collar workers (or to use that old-fashioned term, labourers).

It is impossible to have investor confidence when state and federal governments retrospectively change the goalposts on a whim. In the case of property trusts, which the Treasurer and his bureaucrats consider 'bottom of the harbour' type tax evasion, people pay a lot to set them up and stay compliant. As he points out, they have aggregated them in other states, where the rates are much lower and the threshold is higher. Why do we need to follow them anyway?

My phone has not stopped ringing and emails flow constantly into the SA-Best office from people worried sick about what is being proposed. I am certain that other MPs and members of the government are receiving them, although I had to scratch my head in amazement at Labor's land tax forum this week when a Hartley elector claimed the local member and Speaker Vincent Tarzia told him he had not received any complaints about this policy.

Most of those at the Marche Club were his constituents and many said that they had voiced their concerns to their local member. After the meeting I was approached by some who were genuinely distressed. An elderly woman, who had scrimped and saved all her life to try to get ahead, was in tears, wondering why Mr Lucas was doing this to people like her, who have always done the right thing. Also there was Mr Tony Polito, who is now in his late 80s. His English is passable, but he does find it hard to articulate himself and therefore he can frustrate an audience trying to get his message across, but I can do that for him today.

Tony is a kind, generous and respectful gentleman; I have known him since I was a child. Like my family, he came from Calabria, with no education but with high hopes that he could make it in the Lucky Country. His only skill was cutting hair, and he established his barber shop on Henley Beach Road at Torrensville, where he became quite a popular figure among the locals. Tony and his wife also worked other jobs.

Over the years they put every cent they earned into building a portfolio of modest rental properties that were to see them through their retirement years. This was their superannuation. They still do most of the maintenance and cleaning work on them. With his limited English, Tony entered the civic service as a councillor, first on the Thebarton council and then West Torrens.

After more than 20 years, he has defied his detractors, including my good friend and former mayor and Speaker, John Trainer, and is still there. He has been a Liberal voter all his life, but he says this aggregation business is going to kill him and his wife financially and emotionally. Even if he

does sell off, the capital gains taxes will cripple him. He says that he came here with nothing and could die the same way. I also want to share some excerpts from the pile of correspondence my office has received. I seek leave to table their contents in full for the benefit of those who read *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I will table those at the end of my speech, and they will be there for the benefit of those who read *Hansard*, including the government and its Treasury bureaucrats so they can appreciate the unease and uncertainty they are causing. Let us start with 61-year-old, self-funded retiree John Majeric. He says:

We dodged a bullet with the recent Federal election with regards to the impact on the proposed policies on property, just to be smashed by the state Liberal Party with the Lucas land tax reform—it's unbelievable and troubling.

I have eight properties (banks own more than 60%, so I'm paying a lot of interest, but just keeping my head above with rental income). Currently, I pay approximately \$20,000 in land tax, but the new rules will force this to \$110,000. This burden, plus the interest bill, would mean I would be making a loss. I would be forced to sell my properties.

Cheryl Graham's family built up several small rental shops, held in trusts since the 1960s to give each family fair income. She says:

Land tax this year is estimated to be \$110,140. With the proposed new changes to land tax, the next year will be approximately \$263,660 (that is if there is no addition to the site values). None of these land tax charges can be passed on to tenants in outgoing, etc. We still have to pay land tax, even if the area is not tenanted. We have no choice but to sell all but one property here in South Australia and invest in several other states to enable family to obtain an income.

Then there is Graeme Mac, who worked hard as a carpenter and builder for his portfolio of five properties. He says he will be taxed out, making his holdings unviable, and is thinking of moving to Queensland. He makes a good point:

Once governments start taxing in multiples where does it all stop? Just imagine if shares were taxed in multiples, nobody would buy shares anymore and the world economy would stop dead in its tracks. (An apocalypse.)

This from Lou Pargaliti, the son of Italian migrants who settled here after World War I. Typically, like other Europeans, they worked many menial, unskilled jobs to be where they are today:

Our story can be echoed by thousands of people like us but this Land tax issue is unfair and retrospective. We committed ourselves under one set of rules and now the Government wants to change the rules.

Prominent builder John Culshaw has written to the Treasurer with a solution he says is a winner—no response yet. I will table the modelling he has done that he says still enables the government to get additional revenue without much pain. Phil Craven of Oakford Homes believes it would send more builders to the wall. He says:

We have started looking at selling assets with a plan to invest interstate.

Real estate lawyer Tony Britten Jones writes about one of his clients, who will not be able to pay their interest bill, breaching bank covenants and facing an annual loss of \$27,000. If Alex was in Victoria, she would pay more than \$50,000 less than in South Australia. He concludes:

What is it about the SA Liberals. Stephen Marshall, courtesy of this poorly thought through tax grab, could be set to join that sad line of SA Liberal Premiers one-term wonders.

Marissa Schulze runs a mortgage broking business. She employs 20 people and has thousands of clients in every electorate. She spoke at the Labor forum this week. She is concerned aggregation will impact on property values by forcing investors to sell, driving away investment and resulting in a drop in retail spending and rising rents for low income households. She says:

The average rental return for an Investment Property in metro SA is just under 4%. For land holders that own in excess of \$1.3Mill of property the SA Government is proposing to take between 73-93% of their rental income just for land tax. On top of this, they have to pay interest on their investment loan as well as council rates, maintenance, insurance etc. This will make holding property in South Australia at this level or above unsustainable.

It is understandable if the SA Government wishes to change the land tax aggregation rules for properties purchased in the future. However, to enforce these aggregation changes on local South Australians who purchased

property with good intentions and complied with the legislation at the time of the purchase seems unfair and unnecessary.

Robert Formato wrote to his local Liberal member, Matt Cowdrey. He sent me a copy:

I now feel sick to the stomach knowing my tirelessly hard work investing in SA property for some 35 years may come crushing down to an end in one foul swoop with your proposed changes.

My calculation shows my land tax bill could escalate from approx. \$11,000 to \$65,000 (approx. 600%) which is unsustainable with the income the properties generate. How can we allow a land tax bill to be greater than what the investment brings in? This is a very real potential aspect that the government fail to consider.

This is not a fairer land tax system that the SA State Government claims, and I am deeply offended and angry that the government is choosing to ignore/obscure the impact it will have on mum and dad investors like myself. We may be a minority but that does not mean the government should ignore us.

Ian and Marjorie Stewart say they are facing a tax hike of \$81,624, making their holdings unsustainable. They recently sold some properties for their children, incurring a capital gains tax of \$1.4 million. As you can see, the Stewarts are paying their way and contributing to our economy. They say:

So overall, we feel quite let down by your Governments decision to increase this Tax, particularly as you were voted in on the often quoted saying 'We are a party of lower taxes in South Australia'.

Lastly, here is a letter to a real estate agent from commercial real estate experts Colliers International, with a real-life example that they claim will result in a 2,801 per cent increase in land tax:

These proposed changes will have a significant impact on owners, tenants, property values, investment returns and the South Australian economy in general.

I have not seen any real stories yet from the Treasurer, just his hypotheticals and the figure he claims will benefit from a cut, but even the modelling he has provided from PricewaterhouseCoopers has a rider that revaluations have not been taken into consideration. The pressure coming from the community, of course, forced the government's hand, and they recently had to not only bring forward their rate reduction but went further by dropping it to 2.4 per cent, while also imposing other conditions on trusts. It still has not quelled the fires of discontent.

Business SA released its position paper on 22 August, asking the government to delay its changes because of the uncertainties from the revaluation initiative and the impact it could have on a wide range of business owners. The Adelaide city council agrees. So, too, other experts, like respected economist Darryl Gobbett from the Centre for Economic Studies. Here is some of what he had to say on Leon Byner's FIVEaa talk program on 10 September. He said that mum-and-dad investors are going to be worse off. Here is what he had to say:

Well, Mr Lucas and Mr Marshall are saying that this...one of the biggest changes we've seen and we're bringing into line with what's happening in the other states, I'd still make the point that our threshold where the 2.4% is going to cut in is still well below what you see in New South Wales and Victoria...if you're in Victoria that threshold really doesn't cut in till \$3 million of value, whereas here it's going to cut in, if the schedules remain the same, around about sort of \$1.04 million...same in New South Wales, that schedule cuts in at 2%, so we're still well above their top rates; that cuts in at \$4.2 million...

I think it's a bit strange to say that this is going to provide relief because there needs to be something done, and you'll hear this probably from your other speakers too, there needs to be something done for really what are the mums and dads investors because they're still paying some of the highest land tax rates...in Australia.

The other point I'd make is that the scales are supposed to be indexed to the Valuer-General's numbers. It'll be interesting to see how that happens, but if we look at what they call the median price...the median price for a house in South Australia is now \$480,000...that's from Real Estate Institute and other groups...So, this new scale of \$450,000 above which land tax will be payable I think you're going to find a lot of people with these changes are actually going to slip straight into that higher rate, but you know they're going to start paying land tax anyway because of what's happening to land prices here...but I'd also make the point, when the Valuer-General looks at it, is that values are going up because interest rates are coming down...it's not because rents are going up...

I'd still make the point, as we've made a couple of times, that the scales and the rates in those scales are highly inappropriate in an environment of very low interest rates and therefore high valuations because it doesn't reflect the cashflow that people are getting off these properties. You know, often with residential properties the rental yields are often no more than four, four and a half per cent...people are still going to be paying away perhaps in the order of one and a half to two per cent on those properties, so probably keeping no more than half the rent that they are getting.

So said the Centre for Economic Studies' Darryl Gobbett on the radio. Real estate agent Frank Azzollini reports that his investment market has dropped off to zero inquiries since the announcements and that the drop to 2.4 per cent has made no difference at all to investor sentiment, despite what the Treasurer and the Premier have been saying.

The Marshall government is giving South Australians the frightening reminder that the two most certain things in life are death and taxes. So let's go back to truth is not truth, the Bottomless Pinocchio and alternative facts. They promised no new taxes. Privatisation was not on the agenda. Farmers at Paskeville told me yesterday that several Liberal MPs, including one who is now a minister, swore on their hearts and hoped to die that they would not support the mining bill. Only four have, and good on them for sticking to their guns.

This land tax plan will be a double-edged battleaxe and an unexpected hit to the business sector and households already struggling with power bills, which have not really gone down, low wages growth and a retail sector described by the owners of David Jones as being in a recession. Add to that the highest unemployment rate in the nation, and the highest we have had in three years. Add on to that the recent BDO South Australian State Business Survey results, which show business confidence in South Australia has plummeted to its lowest level in nearly five years. It should serve as a stark wake-up call to the Liberal government.

The pain is already rippling through the community, as forecast. This move looms as the Premier's and Mr Lucas's reincarnation of Bill Shorten's disastrous retiree tax and the assault on negative gearing, yet they maintain a defiant and arrogant stance in the face of the enormous backlash against them. Everyone is prepared and willing to pay taxes, but they must be fair and equitable. Governments cannot shift the goalposts when it suits them and not without proper modelling and/or going through a consultation process let alone going to an election without flagging such intent.

I have filed this motion that calls on the government to rethink and abandon its land tax aggregation policy. When the bill does arrive, I will be moving for it to be deferred and for a select parliament committee to conduct an inquiry. I thank my Labor colleagues for saying they will support this. I hope others in this chamber at least follow convention and support it no matter what their position is. I commend the motion to the chamber.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.J. Stephens.

Bills

HEALTH CARE (HEALTH ACCESS ZONES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:48): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Health Care Act 2008. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:49): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Health Care (Health Access Zones) Amendment Bill 2019 is a simple bill in that it seeks to establish health access zones to provide protection for abortion care in our state. It is not a new concept. In fact, as a state we stand alone now with Western Australia as being the only Australian jurisdictions yet to have such abortion and reproductive health care safe access zones.

Queensland's safe access zones commenced in December 2018 and they stand at a 150-metre buffer with a \$2,611 or one-year imprisonment penalty. New South Wales' safe access zones commenced in June 2018, again with 150 metres and a first offence providing a penalty of \$5,500 or six months' imprisonment or both, or a subsequent offence demanding an \$11,000 or 12 months' imprisonment or both penalty. In the Northern Territory they have had safe access zones since July 2017, again 150 metres with some \$15,500 or 12 months' imprisonment as a penalty. Victoria's safe access zones commenced in July 2016, again 150 metres with a \$19,342.80 penalty or 12 months' imprisonment.

The ACT commenced in March 2016 with not less than 50 metres, but I note that there is one specific facility that their law covers and one specific set of circumstances. The prohibited behaviour brings a penalty of some \$4,000 and publication of visual data has a penalty of \$8,000 or six months' imprisonment or both. Tasmania has had safe access zones since February 2014, a 150-metre buffer with a 12-month imprisonment penalty or a \$12,225 fine or both. As you can see, we lag behind in South Australia; however, that does not mean that we cannot have, I think, the best safe access zones in the nation sometime soon.

This debate is a timely one because, as we know, the South Australian Law Reform Institute is currently waiting to present, for the edification of parliament and for the information of those members who will soon vote on legislation, a report on abortion law reform in this state. Originally, that debate was commenced with a bill that I still have on the *Notice Paper* before this place which not only seeks to decriminalise abortion but to provide for safe access zones.

The bill before us today is very similar, with the provision of that particular safe access zone model, with the addition that while a 150-metre buffer zone may be declared or enshrined with regard to the Woodville Pregnancy Advisory Centre that that distance may be extended by *Gazette* of the minister where an additional buffer zone is required, similar to the ACT experience.

The bill is quite simple: it provides for health access zones; it provides that under 48C the minister may declare premises to be protected premises; under 48D that certain behaviour be prohibited in those health access zones, colloquially known as safe access zones but in this bill health access zones; and 48E provides that a police officer may direct a person to leave the health access zone.

It is a very simple bill but, as I say, it is a timely one because we will soon debate law reform with regard to abortion in this state, and yet we still do not have safe access zones in this state to protect those who seek abortion care. This bill will support women's reproductive health choices by ensuring that patients who seek to access health services that provide abortion can do so without harassment, without intimidation, without fear and without obstruction.

The member for Hurtle Vale and I have worked together to prepare and cosponsor this piece of legislation, and she moved the same bill in the other place just this morning. Of course, we have done so with the support of many other members in this place and the other place, as well as the fine work of the South Australian Abortion Action Coalition.

This bill will protect patients and clinicians alike. The staff who work in reproductive support services deserve a safe workplace. Currently, that is not guaranteed. An important factor to consider as well, as we consider this, is that this bill may not be the perfect bill. Soon we will have that SALRI report. Certainly, many submissions have been made, including that by the Law Society, the Human Rights Law Centre and many other, no doubt, quite credible organisations that may inform the final version of this bill, but what is important is that we provide that safe access before the heightened situation of a debate about abortion begins.

It is also timely because today is the first day of an event that takes place in South Australia and across the globe twice a year. The event is called 40 Days for Life, which seems innocuous, but 40 Days for Life is a global movement designed to close down reproductive health care across the globe. Here in South Australia that aim and that effort is no different. Protesters were outside places such as the Pregnancy Advisory Centre at Woodville, and across the country and across the globe, until safe access zones put that buffer of protection for patients and staff alike.

In this coming 40 days and in the 40 days around Lent, they protest with placards, with harassment, with intimidating behaviour, impeding not just patient access to health care but providing a difficult workplace for healthcare providers doing a difficult job, who deserve the support of parliament. I hope that through this bill they will get it. I put in a freedom of information request for complaints made to the Charles Sturt council with regard to the 40 Days for Life and other similar protests.

The Hon. F. Pangallo: And you didn't get it.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I did indeed get it, very quickly. It was one of the quickest FOIs I have ever got in my time as a parliamentarian. I suspect some people at council would like to see a

bill like this passed with great haste. That freedom of information request, which provided information for the last few years from the City of Charles Sturt about the activities of those protesters outside the Woodville clinic, is enlightening reading. One of the website complaints that was made on 1 October 2014 reads:

I recently attended the pregnancy advisory centre in your council area...as support for a family member of mine. Upon arrival to this location there was a small group of protesters across the road from the facility clearly marking their intention of being there with their signage. I found this absolutely appalling and disgustingly judgemental by these people. I understand everyone had their right to protest but there was a lot of women from all age groups and backgrounds attending this facility and the look on some peoples faces especially the young women visiting this service was horrific. These people are entitled to their own beliefs but I do not believe council should let them stay where they are. They are making a difficult situation even more difficult for these young women and the people supporting and attending with them not to mention the staff who are subject to their stares and belittling comments as well.

A further revelation is some correspondence to the Charles Sturt council, which I think may be from February 2015, which goes on to report to the council's permit officer. It states:

I write in relation to our recent conversations about the presence and location of the protestors (kerbside crusaders) outside the Pregnancy Advisory Centre...

And it goes on to give the address:

My understanding of the permit conditions are that the protestors remain within the erected bollards and not to approach or engage with people attending the Pregnancy Advisory Centre. I am mindful of the resources required by the South Australian Police and the City of Charles Sturt in the monitoring of compliance with permit conditions and hence I do not report every breach.

In the last two weeks Pregnancy Advisory Centre has responded to a complaint to the Premier's department about the protesters' presence, responded to the distress experienced by attending ambulance officers who were filmed on a mobile telephone while leaving the site and staff has provided clients with support who have reported being verbally harassed and intimidated when entering the premises. The content of the verbal tirade is incorrect and seditious. Domiciliary Care who own the Pregnancy Advisory Centre building have previously reported a male person blowing a trumpet creating a noise hazard and people have wandered to the rear of the complex to peer into the back doors of the Pregnancy Advisory Centre.

The protestors attend twice each year for 40 days and are present in smaller numbers every week throughout the remainder of the year, so there is always a presence. The issues cited above are not new, however I have a responsibility for the safety and wellbeing of clients, staff and other professionals attending the service at any time.

I feel the responsible approach is to lodge a complaint about the behaviour of the protestors. I also seek your consideration about the conditions of a future permit request in light of persistent breaches of permit conditions over many years with no observable repercussions.

Maintaining safe access to abortion services is a concern for women, service providers, police and governments and is not isolated to Adelaide. The death of a security guard outside a Melbourne abortion service prompted what is known as an 'exclusion zone'. Other states in Australia have since imposed by law a minimum exclusion zone for protestors to be 150 metres from the service to enable clients attending unhindered access.

The South Australian Police has advised me that the protestors are the responsibility of the local council and I request your consideration for a 150 metre exclusion zone as an interim measure in response to persistent and consistent permit breaches.

A further revelation under FOI is a summary made on 8 March 2016, coincidentally International Women's Day, thanking the person from the council for the meeting and then going on to say:

I am keen to reiterate that I appreciate the support you have previously provided over many years and are currently providing to clients, health professionals and staff attending the Pregnancy Advisory Centre in relation to the Prayer Group 40 day vigil adjacent the premises...

As you have requested below is a summary of concerns that have been raised and incidents that have occurred during the current vigil and previous vigil in late 2014: This is not exhaustive and highlights the main concerns:

- inappropriate name calling 'child killer', 'going to the devil's advocate' as reported to staff by clients
- PAC staff frequently respond to clients who experience distress (frustration, tearfulness and anger) when having been approached by members of the prayer group
- A support person felt exceptionally distraught when approached by the prayer group; he stated, 'I don't know what I would have done if I had not spoken to you (the counsellor) today' raising PAC's concerns for the safety of the others and the prayer group when they chose to engage

- Filming ambulances leaving the premises and previously posting on a website: Ambulance officers expressed their anguish at being filmed...
- People seen standing at the rear of the property to look in the back doors to the building
- Frequent positioning themselves outside of the erected perimeter requiring monitoring by council

As you can see, despite the council's best efforts, the protesters continue to flout the permit conditions and continue to harass staff and patients alike. I note that many instances of the correspondence cover pictures which look to me to be intimidating and harassing and threatening and certainly not what one would expect when one goes to seek health care in this state.

A further piece of correspondence, dated June 2017, is from a local resident. A complaint to the Pregnancy Advisory Centre was made by this local Woodville resident. As a woman was walking her infant in a pusher at approximately 2.30 that afternoon on Tuesday 27 June, she was unable to get past this group of four people who were protesting outside the Pregnancy Advisory Centre on the footpath.

She did not have her phone with her, so she came into the centre to seek advice as she has previously made complaints to the council about these protesters impeding her and was asked if she could take photos the next time she encounters this. It does not seem to matter whether or not somebody is accessing health care, or indeed that they have had a baby and they live in the local neighbourhood; these protesters see fit not to respect their rights.

Everyone has a right to present their views, and this bill does not impede that. Indeed, while a patient's ability to freely access health services without fear of intimidation or harassment is, of course, an important consideration, I believe it is balanced here with the freedom of communication that is implied in the Commonwealth Constitution.

However, any implied freedom is not absolute. It is permissible for legislation to impose restrictions or burdens on that implied freedom where the purpose of the law is legitimate—as I believe this one is—and that law is appropriate and adapted to advance that legitimate purpose. That is a summary of the current WA health department's consulting on their soon to be announced safe access zones in that state.

I also note that the Law Society, on balance, has assessed and provided feedback to the current SALRI debate, and I draw members' attention to its feedback on safe access zones. There will be a balance between freedom of communication but also the right to access health care in this state without harassment and without intimidation—that is also a human right; the right to access health care is a fundamental human right—and they are not mutually exclusive.

I note that members may have concerns about those particular conflicting rights, and should there be amendments to tighten up any parts of the language of the bill I look forward to those contributions. I hope they will soon be informed by the SALRI report to provide some of that definitive work.

Again, I look forward to this bill's passage in a speedy and considerate manner to ensure that we protect the safety of those patients who currently run a gauntlet of protesters to access health care in our state. We have a fine tradition of accessible health care, particularly with regard to abortion in this state, despite our criminalised laws, and public provision at very minimal if not zero cost is an important part of our proud tradition there. However, when it comes to debating these laws we know that all those traditions will count for nothing and will not give those patients accessing our quality healthcare system the protection they deserve and that we should be giving them.

Right now, this very day, the New South Wales parliament is debating the decriminalisation of abortion. In that debate we have seen extraordinary measures taken. We have seen protesters loudly protesting on the steps of Parliament House as they have done here, and these are the places they should hold those protests. That freedom to protest should be confined to the steps of parliament or to our public spaces and parks designed for such a purpose, and not impede those who are simply accessing health care at an extraordinarily difficult time of their life.

They deserve our support and they deserve to be protected. I hope this parliament will ensure that protection is enshrined before we move much further with the decriminalisation of abortion debate. With those words, I commend the bill to the council.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.J. Stephens.

Motions

LYMPHOEDEMA SERVICES

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:09): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges that this year's state budget failed to make provision for a garment subsidy scheme and dedicated treatment services for lymphoedema sufferers within SA Health;
2. Notes that South Australia continues to be the only jurisdiction without a garment subsidy scheme;
3. Recognises that lymphoedema sufferers in South Australia are disadvantaged compared with sufferers in other jurisdictions; and
4. Calls on the state government to implement a garment subsidy scheme and provide dedicated treatment services for all lymphoedema sufferers as a matter of urgency.

I once again speak on issues surrounding lymphoedema sufferers in South Australia, specifically the lack of a garment subsidy scheme and the lack of dedicated treatment services within SA Health. It is the fourth time that I have spoken about these issues in this place. Can I assure members that I will continue to speak on these issues and advocate on behalf of lymphoedema sufferers until the changes they are seeking become a reality.

Regrettably, as I have stated, this year's state budget failed to make any provisions for a garment subsidy scheme and/or dedicated treatment services for lymphoedema sufferers. There is absolutely nothing in the budget for lymphoedema sufferers. They remain disadvantaged when compared with sufferers in other jurisdiction. The fact that South Australia remains the only, and indeed the last, jurisdiction in Australia that has neither a garment subsidy scheme nor dedicated support services for sufferers is completely and utterly intolerable.

It is a travesty that the Labor opposition did nothing about this while they were in government for 16 years. The failure to make provision for a garment subsidy scheme and dedicated treatment services in the budget comes despite a business case that was made and completed on the issue, and, as I understand, despite the lobbying of many of the government's own backbench.

There was widespread support for a garment subsidy scheme and better services, and a personal plea to the health minister from the President and Vice-President of the Lymphoedema Support Group of South Australia (LSGSA), Monique Bareham and Alison Neilson, at the round table I convened on 10 May, which the minister kindly attended and alluded to earlier today in response to a question asked in this place.

During my speech on the Appropriation Bill, I detailed at length the stories of Monique, President of the LSGSA, and Lachlan. Today, I am going to continue with the story of Alison Neilson, Vice-President of the LSGSA. It is hoped that by making these stories public and personalising the plight of sufferers, the Marshall Liberal government will be moved to act. Here is part of Alison's story:

At thirty-six years of age I was diagnosed with an aggressive form of breast cancer. I was living on the Mornington Peninsula in Victoria, married with stepsons, working as an osteopath and running my own private practice.

My breast cancer treatment required two surgeries, four cycles of chemotherapy, six weeks of radiotherapy as well as three weekly injections for a year. Breast cancer changed my life, I had to close my business and ended up working from home to manage my treatment related fatigue, with greatly reduced work capacity.

After two years my left arm began to swell and feel heavier and with the help of my breast care nurse and general practitioner...I was referred to a trained lymphoedema therapist and diagnosed with lymphoedema. Due to my own clinical role I was aware of the early signs of lymphoedema and was looking out for it as it had the potential to end my career.

My lymphoedema therapist advised I limit the number of patients I treated each week to avoid worsening my lymphoedema symptoms. My therapist measured, organised and fitted my compression garments and organised several manual lymphatic drainage treatments.

My lymphoedema therapist also let me know that I could claim a rebate for my compression sleeves through Medicare. This was important as my work capacity and income were at least 50% less than prior to breast cancer treatment.

At this time my marriage also ended and I chose to return to South Australia to be closer to my family and reduce living costs.

Returning to South Australia was helpful in terms of increased family support (both emotional and financial). I devoted my time and energy into re-establishing myself professionally. It took a while for me to find another lymphoedema therapist and I needed more intensive therapy to get back under control.

I soon realised there were quite a few differences between the two states with regard to lymphoedema services and that is why I initially contacted the Lymphoedema Support Group of SA (LSGSA).

My general practitioner in Victoria was aware of lymphoedema. In South Australia, many GPs are not educated about lymphoedema and do not know where to send lymphoedema patients as there are no established referral pathways.

I work as an osteopath in two locations, in Norwood and in medical rooms in Ardrossan, a town on the Yorke Peninsula. At Ardrossan, the practice GPs will send lymphoedema patients to me, as they know I can explain some aspects of lymphoedema self-management and give patients the details of the private lymphoedema services in Adelaide.

As lymphoedema does not have an item number (a Federal issue), it is also difficult to obtain accurate estimates of the number of South Australians with lymphoedema, making it a hidden problem. Because I live in South Australia, I cannot access a Medicare rebate for my compression sleeves. My private health cover does not cover the cost either. My health fund only rebates \$150 annually for massage therapy for my lymphoedema massage, it is gone in two visits. I have lymphoedema treatments once or twice each month, and I book two to three months in advance to ensure I can receive treatments when I need them. As it is warmer and more humid in South Australia in summer, my lymphoedema symptoms are worse, and that means I need more frequent treatment.

In Victoria I received information about the lifelong risk of developing lymphoedema from my breast cancer treatment of having lymph nodes surgically removed and radiotherapy. In South Australia, the LSGSA hears from many consumers who are unaware of the lifelong increased risk of developing lymphoedema after breast cancer treatment.

Alison's story encapsulates the disadvantage South Australian sufferers are faced with in this state when compared with other states and territories because of the lack of a dedicated treatment service and the lack of a garment subsidy scheme in a very real, heart-rending and personal way. Alison detailed her poignant story directly to minister Wade at the round table and finished off with the following words:

Minister Wade our lymphoedema community has been doing it tough for long enough. It is time that South Australia has lymphoedema referral pathways to let lymphoedema patients know that they matter and to minimise their pain and suffering.

I could not agree more with Alison's words. The South Australian lymphoedema community has done it tough for way too long, and it must change.

The Australasian Lymphology Association position statement on monitoring for the early detection of breast cancer related lymphoedema recommends three main points:

- persons undergoing breast cancer treatment should be made aware of the risks of lymphoedema, given risk-reduction information and local lymphoedema service information;
- pre-treatment measurements should occur on both arms and be repeated at three to six monthly intervals for the first two years of post treatment;
- examination of the limbs and lymphoedema symptoms should be addressed at each review.

We have a responsibility to educate our GPs on the signs of lymphoedema so that they can better inform patients in their care. In their position statement on the use of compression garments in the management of lymphoedema, the ALA recommends:

- compression garments are an essential treatment modality for the management of lymphoedema;
- six-monthly replacement of garments to maintain adequate compression;
- therapists who are prescribing compression garments for lymphoedema management should have an appropriate level of training.

The current situation really make South Australian lymphoedema sufferers second-class citizens and disadvantaged because they chose to live in SA.

I have written to both minister Wade and the federal Minister for Health, Greg Hunt, about these issues and I am awaiting replies from both. It angers me that South Australia continues to be the only jurisdiction in Australia without a dedicated garment subsidy scheme. It is completely unacceptable that lymphoedema sufferers in this state are discriminated against and disadvantaged merely because of the state in which they live. As a result of the lack of available support in South Australia, many of these sufferers cannot afford the necessary treatment to relieve their symptoms.

I know from speaking to many of the sufferers that, rather than replace their garments on a six-monthly (or even less) cycle as is recommended, they go above and beyond in trying to extend the life of these garments, simply by virtue of the fact that they cannot afford to replace them.

While I note that prior to the federal election the Coalition government announced \$10 million in funding over the next five years to provide a national compression garment scheme for lymphoedema, as alluded to by the minister today, it appears to only offer assistance to those suffering lymphoedema after breast cancer.

We in SA-Best certainly welcome the announcement. However, the absence of any details surrounding the funding is extremely frustrating, not only for us but of course, more importantly, for those people who are impacted by this condition. While approximately 20 per cent of breast cancer sufferers will develop lymphoedema as a result of removed or damaged lymph nodes, the condition also affects men after treatments for conditions including cancer. Head and neck surgeries and other tissue damage can also trigger lymphoedema.

The Australasian Lymphology Association estimates that one in every 6,000 people is living with primary lymphoedema as a result of a congenital condition. However, the \$10 million of federal funding that was announced appears, again, to only assist breast cancer survivors who later develop lymphoedema. Lymphoedema sufferers in our state deserve a better quality of life and better support, the same as sufferers in other states.

I note, again in reference to the minister's answers to questions on this issue today, the establishment of an advisory group, which I understand he said will commence next week. With respect, I do not accept the parameters of the commonwealth funding commitments referred to, because as we know only too well the commonwealth has made it clear that that funding is in relation to breast cancer sufferers and, as I have already highlighted, this goes way beyond the scope of just those who have had or are going through breast cancer.

I also do not accept the state government passing the buck onto the feds on this issue when every other Australian jurisdiction has managed to fund a scheme. I say to the minister that he needs to find a way to do the same. Once again, I am calling on the Marshall government to implement a garment subsidy scheme, and to do so swiftly to benefit all South Australians living with lymphoedema, and to provide dedicated services as a matter of urgency.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon T.J. Stephens.

Bills

GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS MANAGEMENT (DESIGNATION OF AREAS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (17:22): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Genetically Modified Crops Management Act 2004. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (17:23): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

In 2017, I introduced a bill to extend the moratorium on the cultivation of genetically modified crops in the whole of the state until 1 September 2025. Without this bill, the moratorium would have expired

automatically on 1 September this year, thanks to an obscure legislative provision that means that regulations automatically expire after 10 years unless they are remade before expiry.

The Greens' bill passed both houses with the support of the then Labor government and the Hon. John Darley, who was supportive of the principle that the decision to retain or lift the moratorium should rest with the parliament. This is what I understood my bill would do: secure the extension of the moratorium by putting it into legislation so that any decision to lift the moratorium could only be done with the support of both houses of parliament, again by legislation. This is what the parliament understood it was doing when it supported my bill back in 2017, so it came as a surprise to hear last month that the government was proposing to lift the moratorium.

The surprise was not that that was their policy—because they have backflipped on their longstanding policy of supporting the moratorium—the surprise was that they were going to lift the moratorium by passing new regulations, not by bringing a bill to parliament. Perhaps they knew that they might not have the numbers in parliament to get a bill passed through both houses, so instead they found a loophole in the drafting of the 2017 amendment act that they could exploit. Rather than testing the will of the parliament by presenting an amendment bill, they have gone down a sneaky path of changing the scope of the regulations whilst leaving in place the moratorium expiry date agreed by parliament.

The government has announced its intention to change the designated area that the moratorium covers by deleting references to 'the whole of the state' and replacing them with the words 'Kangaroo Island'. My first reaction was that this cannot be legal. The parliament has decided that the moratorium on growing GM crops should apply across South Australia and not expire until the year 2025, unless and until the parliament decides otherwise. Personally, I would be surprised if the government's proposed regulations are not challenged in court. I think there is an arguable case that the proposed government regulations would be ultra vires (beyond power).

Regardless of the legal technicalities, the government's move is sneaky and cynical and it treats the parliament with contempt. What added insult to this injury is that the government did not even have the decency to wait for the Legislative Council's select committee on the genetically modified crops moratorium to finish its work and report on its findings before announcing their decision. Members will recall that this select committee was agreed to by the council on the motion of the Hon. John Darley. The committee has finished taking evidence and is now considering its report and recommendations, and I expect that it will report very soon.

However, the government's contempt for this parliament knows no bounds as it thumbs its nose at parliamentary inquiries and cannot even wait for a few weeks for the committee to report. It is not just contemptuous of parliament, it is also contemptuous of all those organisations, individuals and community groups who take the trouble to write submissions and come into parliament to tell their elected representatives what they think. The government's clear message to the community is, 'Don't waste your time talking to your elected representatives. Don't bother putting hours of work into comprehensive submissions. We don't give a stuff about what you think because we are the government and it's our way or the highway.'

To make matters worse, the government has said that its draft regulations will have a start date of 1 December 2019. I believe they have chosen that date very carefully because, under the Subordinate Legislation Act, regulations must be tabled in parliament and are subject to disallowance by either house. The deadline for tabling regulations in parliament is within six sitting days of their being made. What that means is that if the government introduces regulations on 1 December it will not need to table them in parliament until the first or second sitting week in February 2020. In that case, disallowance would not be considered until perhaps March, which is just a month or so before the canola planting season.

Even if the government tabled the regulations immediately upon being made, if they are made on 1 December, at the very first opportunity, there will still be no time for the Legislative Council to consider a disallowance motion unless they were tabled on 3 December, with notice of disallowance being given a few minutes later and the parliament sitting for the whole of the optional sitting week. That is a very unlikely scenario.

Of course, the government could choose to gazette the regulations next month or in November, with the scheduled commencement date of 1 December. That would give the parliament time to consider disallowance before the end of the year, but it does not remedy the primary flaw in this whole process, which is that the government is seeking to undermine, by executive action, the clear will of the parliament. If the government believes the moratorium should be lifted, it should bring a bill to parliament so that all 69 members of parliament can debate it.

In addition, the government, whilst it has its proposed regulations out for public consultation, has no intention of taking into account any submissions that are made that do not agree with the government. In the online version of *The Advertiser*—it will be in tomorrow's paper, but it is in the online version now—there is a section which refers to minister Whetstone:

He said while the government's six-week statutory consultation period was still ongoing, it was the government's intention to lift the moratorium in time for the next cropping season.

If that is in fact what the minister has said, it shows that they do not care about their own consultation, let alone the work of the parliamentary committee that is still ongoing. It will come as no surprise to members that the Greens will be moving to disallow these regulations, if necessary, whether that be before the end of this year or more likely at the start of next year.

In the meantime, I have introduced this bill today to effectively reinstate the status quo as agreed by parliament back in 2017; that is, the moratorium stays over the whole of South Australia until the whole of the state parliament decides otherwise. The whole parliament put the moratorium in place until 2025 and it should be a decision of the whole parliament if that is to change.

The Greens' view on this is well-known. We think the moratorium should remain because there is clear evidence that it is the best result for South Australia, and we are not alone in this view. I have already had 800 South Australians sign my online petition to retain the moratorium in just the last few days. To be crystal clear, if the government proceeds with the regulations set, as they say they will, we will move to disallow them, whenever that might be, but what we are not prepared to do is to allow this issue to create more uncertainty in the community. That is the government's agenda, not ours.

Farmers need certainty about what they are allowed or not allowed to grow next year. To lift the moratorium for mainland South Australia via regulations with a pending vote of disallowance potentially months away provides no certainty for anyone. On the back of these government regulations, some farmers may be lulled into a false sense of security that, after 1 December this year, they can start legally planning to plant genetically modified canola.

Some farmers may even sign contracts with the multinational agrichemical giants who control GM technology. Farmers might start buying GM seeds ready for next season. Imagine their shock if they discover that the parliament has subsequently disallowed the regulations and now they cannot sow those seeds. They would rightly be angry, and their anger should be directed at the state Liberal government that set up this uncertainty and made farmers the pawns in a political game.

We need to give the farmers certainty about whether or not the moratorium will be lifted and the best way to do that is by putting the status quo into legislation. So this bill today does what my 2017 bill was intended to do, to secure in legislation the extension of the current moratorium to 1 December 2025 throughout the whole of South Australia. Let's have that debate now, have it this year, rather than in several months' time. This is the best way to provide security for farmers.

Most people do not understand legislative process, and that is not usually a problem because they do not need to in most cases, but the problem for farmers here is that government regulations can be disallowed, then they can be reintroduced, then they can be disallowed again, then they can be reintroduced and then they can be disallowed again, and that process can go on for years. The effect on farmers who rely on the government regulations will be that their crops will potentially be legal for part of the year and illegal for other parts of the year. It is a legal nightmare and something we should avoid at all costs.

The Greens have always maintained our strong support for the continuation of the moratorium on GM crops for the entire state of South Australia. I will not set out all the reasons now because I have done that many times before, but they do include the legislated criteria of marketing

advantage and economic benefit. We know that the world is demanding cleaner, greener and more natural food, and, statewide, the South Australian moratorium positions us well for the future.

We also know that in those states, where both GM and non-GM canola is grown, the GM crops attract a lower price at the silo. This is positive proof that the market favours non-GM. The market will pay you more per tonne for non-GM canola than it will pay you for genetically modified varieties.

As a member of the select committee into GM crops, I intend to speak in detail about these issues when that report is ultimately tabled. I will go through the evidence that has been heard and the reasons why maintaining the moratorium is the right outcome for South Australia. Today, what I am asking members to do, especially those who supported my 2017 bill, is to again support this 2019 bill.

Of course not everyone was here in 2017, so I would call on our colleagues and I would especially invite our colleagues in SA-Best to continue the legacy of the former leader, Nick Xenophon, who was a great supporter of keeping South Australia GM free. Nick Xenophon, along with the Australian Democrats' the Hon. Sandra Kanck and myself worked together. We introduced a number of bills and motions over the years and I would hope that SA-Best will keep that tradition going.

Finally, I would make a plea to all members, regardless of your position on the moratorium, to at least support this bill because it is the only way we can be sure the parliament will have the final say. In fact, even if you do not support the moratorium, you can still support this bill because that will help create certainty for the farming community by insisting that the matter be determined by parliament, not by disallowable regulations. If you vote for this bill, it will avoid the legal dilemma that otherwise faces farmers over the summer period: what seed should they buy and will they be legally allowed to plant it next year? Farmers deserve certainty and this bill is the way to give them that certainty.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.J. Stephens.

Motions

CLIMATE CHANGE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. M.C. Parnell:

That this council—

1. Recognises that global average temperature, atmospheric greenhouse gases and ocean acidity are already at dangerous levels;
2. Notes that around the world, climate change impacts are already causing loss of life and destroying vital ecosystems;
3. Declares that we are facing a climate emergency; and
4. Commits to restoring a safe climate by transforming the economy to zero net emissions.

(Continued from 11 September 2019.)

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (17:35): I rise on behalf of the Labor opposition to indicate our strong support for this motion. I put on the record today Labor's strong support for recognising that in this state and in this country, and indeed on the planet, we are facing undeniably a climate emergency. The truth is that we have known for decades that climate change is real and has the potential to cause catastrophic damage to our planet. We know that it is anthropogenic (caused by humans) and it is our activities that are having this impact on the planet.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change was formed in 1988, a year that saw, among other things, fires in the Amazon rainforest that shocked the world. It is a sad reality that we are being shocked all over again more than 30 years later. We really should have been awake to what was happening many, many years earlier than what we are seeing now.

We are absolutely in a worse place today in terms of changing our behaviour than we could have been if we had acted 10 or 15 years ago. As I noted, the Amazon is burning all over again. The

fires were partly started by land clearing activities but were exacerbated by their devastating impact on the environment of setting pristine rainforest alight in Brazil and other parts of South America, and also around the world.

Global average temperatures continue to skyrocket. In 2018 it was the fourth hottest year on record by global average temperature, behind 2017, 2015, 2016 and just ahead of 2014. Ice is melting at alarming rates in Greenland, the Arctic and the Antarctic, contributing to significant rates of sea level rise. I understand there have been at least two funerals now for glaciers that have disappeared in the Northern Hemisphere.

These challenges alone are enough to demand a response from our governments but the impact on our community calls us now, if not previously, to immediate action. Estimates suggest that some 85 per cent of Australia's population lives within 50 kilometres of our country's coastline. Their homes, their property and indeed the lives of much of our population are at risk from rising sea levels and that is even before we start to think about calculating the cost to replace public infrastructure that will be under water.

We know too well the devastating impact of bushfires and natural disasters in our country that continue to cause pain across our state and, indeed, other states. All indications suggest that climate change will lead to—and perhaps is already leading to—far more dangerous fire conditions for extended periods way outside of the normal seasons where we expect to experience these catastrophes.

Again, this is not news, and neither should be the causes of this climate emergency. However, under this Federal Liberal government, Australia's National Greenhouse Gas Inventory has frequently shown our greenhouse gas emissions are increasing and, despite the assurances of three successive Liberal prime ministers to the contrary, the facts speak otherwise. Our greenhouse gas emissions have been increasing year on year. I just cannot believe federal ministers and federal prime ministers when they tell us that they are taking climate change seriously. Their actions confound me and I certainly do not understand how they believe they are taking climate change seriously at all.

The most recent quarterly update of the National Greenhouse Gas Inventory showed our national emissions have risen to their highest rate since 2012-13. Australia's emissions have hit the highest level in seven years. All indications are that our country will fail to meet our targets under the Paris climate agreement of 26 per cent emissions reduction by 2030, despite Prime Minister Scott Morrison consistently telling us all that we are on track to meet them. That is transparently false and unreal. Even that target, which, as I said, we are on track to miss, is far too low if we are desirous of making real changes to the trajectory of climate change. Because we have left it so late, we now have to make even bigger cuts than we otherwise would have done.

The UN Climate Action Summit in New York, which the Prime Minister has decided not to attend despite being in the country, has focused on achieving net zero emissions by 2050. Yet, under the Liberal Party and the Nationals at the federal level, Australia has no plan to achieve anything near that rate. Scientists, experts and officials from around the world, and indeed in our own Public Service, have laid out the facts of the climate emergency, have laid out policy options to decarbonise our economy, but they have not been heard by the national government of this country.

It is clear that we need to end our country's reliance on fossil fuels, continue to transition to renewable energy and support workers in those industries throughout this transition—a just transition. We need to continue this transition to low emissions in the transport sector by looking at electric passenger vehicles. We must invest in modernising and evolving our public transport network to drive these changes and not rely on privatisation to do it, because it simply will not. We need to hold our country's biggest polluters to account and ensure they are taking effective measures to curb their impact on the planet.

I am very proud that the former state Labor government of which I was a member was working hard to create a low-carbon economy and to ensure South Australia was leading the way in taking action on the climate emergency. I am very pleased to see the current state government working further and taking some leadership in terms of the hydrogen economy, which was announced this week.

I am also very proud that the federal Labor Party has consistently adopted ambitious climate policies and emissions reduction targets and is now reviewing those policies to ensure they reflect the best available science. That should be a continuous and continuing process, because science changes. The science is telling us they underestimated the rate of change in terms of global warming and that we now need to move harder and faster than we did before.

State and national governments must take a leadership role in addressing the climate emergency, but as we can see here, our states, our federal government, but also around the world, are dragging their heels. Some of them are flat out refusing to take the necessary action, and our federal LNP government is one of them.

That is why it has been so heartening to see people holding governments to account around the world this week and demanding action on this crisis. When thousands of South Australians join millions around the world in striking for climate action, it becomes more critical than ever that we listen. I hope all of us in this place can reflect on the incredible leadership shown by the students who organised last week's climate strike and the nearly 400,000 people who attended.

I have to say I find it offensive to hear some federal MPs, politicians, ministers, leaders of the government, and also their state counterparts, chastise young people for taking this climate action and say they should be in school. When I was in school, I was given a day off to watch The Queen drive past and wave. That was okay, according to these people who think that children should be staying in school. It is okay for me to have a day off to go and watch The Queen drive by, but not okay for young people to stand up and defend what they think they need to defend for this planet and for their future on it.

The federal government just continues to lie to us about this climate change issue that they are supposedly addressing so wonderfully. It is no surprise that young people in this country can see straight through those lies and have taken it upon themselves to advocate for true leadership. Nowhere is that more evident than when our Prime Minister skipped the New York climate summit to spend time checking out a new McDonald's drive-through system. It was a state-of-the-art, electronic drive-through system that our Prime Minister saw as being the most valuable use of his time in the United States, instead of going to New York and participating in the climate summit. Or indeed when the Deputy Prime Minister said that students should go on strike on a weekend when they do not have school. I do not know how you can go on strike and withdraw your labour or your studies when school is actually not doing the job of educating you.

But maybe students would not have had to go on strike on Friday if the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister had bothered to do their jobs and lead this country in the direction it needs to be led in terms of reducing our emissions. On the question of this motion we have before us, I think many members have received some heartfelt emails from our constituents in our state describing the impact of climate change on their lives—emails from young people, emails from activists, emails from farmers, emails from a broad cross-section of our community.

We, on the Labor side, of course, and many others in this chamber, are listening to these calls from our community and we are also listening to the scientists and the experts who have been aware of these issues for so long but have been ignored. We support recognising the situation for what it is and I thank the honourable member for bringing this motion to the chamber's attention. We are talking about a climate emergency. For the reasons that I have outlined, and many others, I indicate that the Labor team will be supporting the Hon. Mr Parnell's motion and I look forward to its speedy passage.

There being a disturbance in the strangers' gallery:

The PRESIDENT: There is no clapping in the gallery. I will clear the gallery if there are any further disturbances. Members have a right to speak. This is not a participatory sport. The Hon. Ms Pnevmatikos.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (17:46): I rise to speak on the Hon. Mark Parnell's climate emergency declaration in South Australia motion and to indicate my strong support for the motion. This motion goes some way towards recognising that the effects of climate change are being experienced globally and that there is a real sense of urgency. This declaration requires us to

prepare, adopt and build resilience against climate change for the most vulnerable and create systemic change in our policies and our state governance structures to ensure a healthy future for generations to come.

Over the past few weeks, we have seen the incredible power of collective action from the School Strike 4 Climate movement, not only overseas and interstate but in South Australia. On 20 September, community members from all over the state and country participated in the climate strikes. I walked with more than 10,000 people, led by schoolchildren and students, at the Adelaide event. The strike was not only to push for general action on climate change but to express concerns in relation to fossil fuel dependence, renewable energy options and transitional job creation in new industries.

I was proud to walk in solidarity with the school climate strikers. Students were highly criticised for taking the afternoon off school to strike. Unsurprisingly, the greatest disapproval came from the Morrison government. Acting leader, minister McCormick, denounced the strikes saying, 'These sorts of rallies should be held on the weekend when it doesn't actually disrupt schools.' Somehow minister McCormick has seemed to miss the whole point of the school climate strike. The ability to strike and take political action is a fundamental democratic right in our society available to all, irrespective of age.

Greta Thunberg began the school strikes in August 2018. On Monday, when addressing the UN climate summit, she said:

You have stolen my dreams and my childhood with your empty words and yet I am one of the lucky ones. People are suffering. People are dying. Entire ecosystems are collapsing. We are in the beginning of a mass extinction and all you can talk about is money and fairytales of eternal economic growth. How dare you!

As the leader of the international School Strike 4 Climate movement, Greta has not been able to avoid criticism. Not only has she been condemned for leaving class to strike but she has been demeaned because of her mental health. In response to the criticisms, she talked openly about living with Asperger's. The personal attacks towards Greta Thunberg and her mental health are unacceptable.

Monday also marked the beginning of the United Nations 2019 climate summit. The summit will see countries commit to a list of demands, including the ban of new coal power stations, reducing fossil fuel subsidies and increasing national targets for countries to become carbon neutral by 2050. Although invited to attend Australia was asked not to speak, along with several other coal-supporting economies such as the US and Japan. The United Nations Secretary-General, Antonio Guterres, stated that only leaders with a clear climate action plan would be asked to speak, as the cost of inaction is too high.

Despite being in the US visiting, our Prime Minister has actively ignored the call from other political parties, activists and Australian climate strikers to attend the summit in New York, which seriously questions the bona fides of the federal government's commitment to climate change solutions.

Unlike the federal government, our state has been able to make great strides in climate-friendly activities. Although we are still trailing behind Tasmania with their 95 per cent use of renewable energy, South Australia recorded 50 per cent renewable energy use in 2018. With strong policies and initiatives from the previous Labor government, out of all the states and territories we had the largest increase to renewable resources with 7.4 per cent.

Although these numbers are a promising indicator of a growing trend, progress is not happening at a fast enough rate, nor does it mean that we will not be affected by the climate crisis. The Australian Climate Commission predicts that without effective adaptation to the worsening climate over the next decade South Australia will see heat-related deaths double, a decline in rainfall so large that it is more than likely to dry up the southern Murray-Darling Basin, and our sea levels will rise, leading to flooding that is projected to displace over 25,000 people.

Earlier in the week, the Red Cross revealed that South Australians are extremely underprepared for natural disasters. Monday marked the start of the Red Cross annual Disaster Preparedness Week. Red Cross acknowledges the reality that natural disasters are becoming more frequent and more severe. It is obvious that South Australians are underprepared for the effects of

climate change. We must create a South Australia that is adaptable to a changing climate and act to prevent further degradation of our environment.

I thank the Hon. Mark Parnell for initiating this motion. This motion is the first step to acknowledging that we are living with a climate crisis. Although this declaration should have been made years ago, it is of the utmost importance that we support this motion. It is an essential step forward to achieve greater acceptance of sustainable energy methods and encourage climate-conscious decisions within our parliament. We cannot ignore the strikes any more. Quite frankly, it is sad that the adults are behaving like children and the children are behaving as adults and taking the lead. It is about time we started listening to the young of our state.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (17:52): I rise today in support of the Hon. Mark Parnell's motion calling for a climate emergency. On 3 July this year, I spoke about how I had been converted from a climate sceptic to a person who believed in climate change. Whilst I had been presented with information on climate change over the years, the impetus to my new outlook was watching a panel of scientific experts on a Q&A special on the ABC. In recent times, I have had even more exposure to this subject, perhaps due to the world's media focusing more of their attention on the matter.

Last Friday, we had the second School Strike 4 Climate in Adelaide, where we saw thousands of people converge on Victoria Square and Parliament House to protest about the lack of action being taken by governments all over on climate change. The real difference in the strikes is that they were organised by children, who were furious that the world we have brought them into may forever be ruined if we do not take action now.

Some of this passion was demonstrated yesterday by young climate activist Greta Thunberg, who took world leaders to task over inaction on climate change. Greta spoke passionately and angrily about the matter at the United Nations climate summit, where she was invited to appear as a panellist. The response to Greta's speech was alarming. The President of the United States of America decided to respond with sarcasm by calling her 'a very happy young girl looking forward to a bright and wonderful future.' I see this essentially as arguably the most powerful person in the world bullying a child, and it is not behaviour that I condone.

Also concerning is our Prime Minister's warning against imposing 'needless anxiety' on our children. This statement indicates the Prime Minister does not understand the issue or the urgency in which it needs to be tackled. For an issue to mobilise hundreds of thousands of people around the world to protest about it clearly demonstrates it is a matter that people feel very strongly about. The fact that this action is led by children speaks volumes as to how important they believe this matter to be, and I am heartened by their actions.

It is up to us as elected members of our community to take action and to listen to what people are saying. Expert scientists and the evidence provided on climate change cannot be wrong. Hundreds of thousands of people completely disillusioned with their leaders cannot be wrong. I want to send a strong message to say that I have heard what the people and our children have been saying. As such, I support the motion.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:55): I, too, rise to speak in support of the Hon. Mark Parnell's motion. Like other members here, last Friday I took part, along with thousands of students, in the global School Strike 4 Climate. The movement, as has already been mentioned, was founded by inspirational young woman Greta Thunberg 13 months ago.

Greta, the teenage climate activist from Sweden who delivered a much-watched speech at the United Nations on Monday, has been celebrated for her activism on climate change, including galvanising the worldwide youth-led protests of the last week. But she has also become a lightning rod, drawing attacks by television and social media commentators.

Most of us know who Greta is by now, and she has been mentioned several times today, but a year ago she was one young person alone exercising her democratic right to protest in Stockholm. Just yesterday, I read an online post by Greta, predominantly aimed at her critics. When she first told her parents about her intention to protest, they were not supportive of her intentions at all. In fact, she defied their advice.

A year later, she has motivated a global movement of millions of people, young and old, determined to make world leaders notice. How proud her parents must be now, and what a valuable lesson she has taught them and all of us about fighting for what you believe in. Throughout history, we have seen some fiercely intelligent, powerful and inspirational women who have been pioneers for women's rights and racial equality, and have defined the worlds of science, mathematics, aviation and literature.

So many women have undeniably changed the world for the better. Greta Thunberg is among these young women, putting us to shame in the areas of environmental protection and global warming and showing us what it means to be a role model. Greta gave a blistering speech, as has been referred to, at the United Nations summit, criticising world leaders for their 'betrayal' of young people through a lack of action on the climate crisis.

I think the science of climate change and the effect it is having on our environment, our wildlife, our oceans and on our neighbours in the Pacific speaks for itself. Instead, I want to touch on some of the language used in recent days to demean, belittle and discredit Greta and her message—the reason why she posted the social media comment I alluded to earlier. Former Labor flunky turned One Nation politician Mark Latham has said on his Facebook page, 'We're grown-ups here, we don't take lectures from a girl from Sweden who is screaming hysterically about the end of the planet.' Mark Latham is many things, but given his spats over the years, particularly directed at women, including Rosie Batty, he is anything but grown-up.

In his quote, Latham claims Thunberg is 'screaming hysterically'. The hallmark behaviour of a hysteric—overly emotional, out of control and irrational—was uniquely characteristic of women and linked directly to their anatomy. Hysteria today is no longer an accepted medical diagnosis, but the word lives on as a colloquial way to deem someone out of control and irrational. It is a cheap shot, and I call out Mark Latham for using that language in reference to Greta Thunberg, or any woman, indeed. He seems to be erroneously equating forcefulness as hysteria in women, and we have been shushed, scolded and silenced throughout history.

Greta Thunberg is intelligent, articulate and thoughtful, and she is not going to be silenced by the likes of Mark Latham. I have no doubt that she will achieve more in her lifetime to fight for the inaction over climate change than Mark Latham could ever hope to achieve. She is already known the world over and has become so in just one year. Mark Latham, on the other hand, had to ride on Pauline Hanson's coat-tails in order to get elected to the New South Wales Legislative Council.

Then there is the Fox News guest who labelled Greta as 'a mentally ill Swedish child, exploited by her parents'. The America Autism Society has come out in support of Thunberg, who is on the spectrum, and have said:

To intentionally demean any person, regardless of neurodiversity, is both cruel and wrong. Certainly some might disagree with Ms Thunberg on policy issues, but it is shameful to issue a derogatory statement to a youth advocate.

Julia Bascom, Executive Director of the Autistic Self Advocacy Network, has said:

It is absolutely unconscionable to attack someone for their disability, especially when that person is a child...History is full of autistic people and people with other cognitive disabilities who were and are compelling credible activists and leaders. Greta is a part of that tradition, and our community is lucky to have her, period.

It is absolutely unconscionable to attack someone for any disability or any other condition they may have, but especially so when that person is a child.

Greta Thunberg has been mocked online by President Trump, as has been alluded to, but she has fought back with intelligence and wit, embracing his words on her Twitter page. The Murdoch mouthpiece, *The Australian*, has also run a series of pieces attacking Thunberg, calling her a threat, calling her a child of the climate cult. Our Prime Minister has responded to Greta's impassioned speech and her impassioned pleas by declaring that the climate change debate is subjecting Australian children to needless anxiety. He has said:

I want children growing up in Australia to feel positive about their future, and I think it is important we give them that confidence that they will not only have a wonderful country and positive environment to live in, that they will also have an economy to live in as well, and I don't want our children to have anxieties about these issues.

Well, guess what, Mr Prime Minister: they do feel worried about this issue—they feel worried enough to strike across the world, as they did last Friday, and they are justified in their concerns and they are, as has been referred to, exercising their democratic right to express those concerns.

I support Greta Thunberg in her efforts to mobilise a critical mass of people to effect change and get politicians like us to sit up and take notice. I have and I am listening; I am listening to the countless individuals who have contacted me in recent weeks and days expressing their support for this motion and urging me to do the same. I am so pleased at the number of young individuals that list includes who, like Greta, are looking to us, in fact pleading with us, to protect their futures and that of their children by demanding climate action now.

In closing, I, too, would like to thank the Hon. Mark Parnell not only for introducing this motion but also of course for his years of ongoing efforts in terms of raising awareness on these most important issues and urging us to follow suit in this place. I commend him for the motion.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (18:04): I rise to strongly support and commend the Hon. Mark Parnell's motion. We can all see the evidence of climate change and the impact it is having, not only on our lives but on other communities around the world. Just the other day, I heard a report about a group that was mourning the death of Switzerland's melting glacier Pizol, a local chaplain calling on God's help to tackle the enormous challenge of climate change.

A total of 500 glaciers have disappeared in Switzerland since 1850. The ice caps are melting, the seas are rising, and forest fires in the Amazon, regarded as the lungs of the world, are causing environmental damage. Farmers are lighting fires to clear tracts of land in Indonesia and other parts of South-East Asia. Africa has its problems. We have seen the damage being done by an over-reliance on fossil fuels like coal in developing economies like China, India and South America as well as South-East Asia. The powerhouse governments of the world need to do something. Talk is not enough. We are having talkfests in the United Nations right now. There is no point in talking if you do not do it.

Dr Bjorn Lomborg, one of *Time* magazine's 100 most influential people and a visiting professor at the Copenhagen Business School, wrote an article published in *The Weekend Australian* last week, in which he said:

After 30 years of failed climate policy, more of the same is not the answer. Since the 1992 Rio de Janeiro Earth Summit, our use of renewable energy has increased by only 1.1 percentage points—from meeting 13.1 per cent of the world's energy needs in 1992 to 14.2 per cent today. Most nations are failing to deliver on carbon cut undertakings already made—yet politicians will be feted in New York for making new, empty promises.

...despite all the rhetoric about the importance of global warming, we are not ramping up this spending. On the sidelines of the 2015 Paris climate summit, more than 20 world leaders made a promise to double green energy research and development by 2020.

Spending has inched up from \$US16bn in 2015 to only \$US17bn last year. This is a broken promise that matters...

Sadly, growth policies, adaptation, green R&D and an optimal CO₂ tax are not what we will be hearing from the climate summit in New York.

But after 30 years of pursuing the wrong solution to climate change, we need to change the script.

They have been talking and talking, setting emission targets for a long time now, and it is no wonder a new generation is fed up and we are seeing the rise of young climate activists like Greta Thunberg. Here in our country last week, hundreds of thousands of students went on strike to send us a message that they want action to save the world and guarantee the futures of generations that follow.

David Attenborough has taken issue with Australia for the lack of policy direction, the complacency and the ignorance that exists in Canberra while places like the Great Barrier Reef are at risk. It did not take long for the right to come out swinging against him, probably the greatest environmentalist of our generation, who has done more to open our eyes to climate catastrophes and protecting what we have than anyone else.

Greta Thunberg is following in his footsteps. Just 16, she is extremely articulate, informed and passionate. She has told world leaders they have stolen her dreams and childhood. Already, the right-wingers are priming their knives to cut her down and what they perceive as a climate cult. Being

the bully he is, President Trump took a cynical swipe at Greta in one of his dopey, boorish tweets, sarcastically wishing her a bright and wonderful future. For what reason would he need to pick on a kid, considering the far more serious matters currently swirling around him?

I am particularly impressed by Greta, an extremely intelligent child who has overcome the challenges of Asperger's syndrome. She calls it a superpower rather than a disability, and I could not agree with her more. My own son Connor also has Asperger's syndrome and he, too, believes what he has is a gift, and it is, and we are blessed. I hope Greta is not going to be targeted by social media trolls and right-wing commentators looking for sacrificial lambs in this debate. I hope she sails her solar and wind-powered yacht to Australia, stopping along the way in China to deliver them a strong message too, because the world unfortunately seems reluctant to send strong messages to them because of the trade and economic conflicts.

Greta is the Malala Yousafzai of the climate change movement. The children of the climate change revolution are here now, wanting to be heard. They are our future leaders, so I am confident that our world will be in good hands. In the meantime, I would like to conclude with an impassioned and informed email I received overnight from constituent Joanne Baulderstone, a mother of two and a biologist with 30 years' experience in working in natural environments, who says that the trajectory of our climate is quite terrifying. She puts it in proper perspective in asking me and the parliament to support the Hon. Mark Parnell's motion and to do something after talking about it. She says:

Quite frankly, I can't see a positive future for my family, my community, or the world, if we in Australia, and countries over the globe, can't do the following as stated in the recent United in Science report:

And I will quote from it:

Only immediate and all-inclusive action encompassing: deep decarbonization complemented by ambitious policy measures, protection and enhancement of carbon sinks and biodiversity, and efforts to remove CO₂ from the atmosphere, will enable us to meet the Paris Agreement.

She goes on to say:

I will point out a few examples of my thoughts and observations that lead me to feel so strongly about this, and particularly publicly recognising and declaring that it is an Emergency situation we are all in:

- This year in the Adelaide region we have had the driest seven months since 1970, and in July only received half the rainfall that we normally get...

And these are Bureau of Meteorology figures. It continues:

Regardless of whether this is caused by climate change will not (and I'd argue it is, or at the very least is an example of what will happen more and more in the future), this has followed a dry 2018/19 summer, and the sudden death in April this year of many mature native eucalypts in our local area—iconic Stringybarks of the high rainfall areas of the Mount Lofty Ranges. I wonder how many more will die this summer after not having had the winter rainfall that they have evolved to survive from. Only time will tell.

- I saw man land on the moon when I was six months old. I wasn't aware of the effort it took to make that moon landing happen until recently, and at 50 years of age, imagine that what is needed now, to prevent the Earth becoming inhospitable, is akin to that dedication shown back then, and more so. Will enough happen, so that those alive in the future will look back and think wow, they achieved their goals and we are amazed at their efforts? Or will we have another 50 years of knowing what we needed to do, but didn't do it? Only time will tell.
- I'm unlikely to live another 50 years, but my boys hopefully will. I have imagined what their lives will be like in Australia under different climate scenarios. Have you? I have imagined what they will remember me for, and whether they will be proud of me. Only time will tell.
- If the earth was scaled down to fit in the palm of our hand, we'd be amazed at it, and do everything we possibly could to look after it and everything on it. We need to do that for our own life-sized Earth. Why on Earth, would we not care for and look after it? Why irreversibly destroy it? It's beyond belief! If for no other reason than 'we humans live on it and it's our own home', will we decide to have a sustainable Earth, and take action globally to make that happen, or not? Only time will tell.
- We are all part of the one planet. Boundaries don't matter to the way climate changes. What we do in Australia does matter, on many levels. As Armstrong said, 'We've got to save the earth—looking back at Earth from the moon, the earth so small, a small oasis; and we need to look after it.' Only time will tell if we do.

She says that she wakes up every day to:

...feel the dread of another day with not enough action. Another day with carbon spewing out into our atmosphere, and more sun's rays entering and becoming trapped within it. More ecosystems messed up, and less time to fix it all. What's happening is so obvious, the solutions there, so why can't we just get on with it asap?

This is science, not opinion. The only opinion is whether we think life on earth (or how much of it) is worth saving.

As I said, it is quite a moving email that I received last night and I thought it was prudent of me to share it with the parliament. She finishes off:

It's time to set politics aside and do what's right for humankind. Our children's very existence is being threatened and our actions today will set in motion what kind of future they will inherit. We are the last generation that can successfully mitigate the worst effects of this climate emergency.

There is nothing like hearing something like that from real people. I could not agree more with Joanne. I commend this motion to the Legislative Council.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (18:15): I rise in support of the crucial motion put before this place by my colleague the Hon. Mark Parnell. We have heard countless reasons in this place to begin acting on climate change, including the findings of last year's report from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). That is why it is timely for us as a council to show the South Australian parliament's support for recognising that global average temperature, atmospheric greenhouse gases and ocean acidity are already at dangerous levels; to note that, around the world, climate change is impacting and already causing loss of life and destroying vital ecosystems; and to recognise that we are facing a climate emergency and commit to restoring a safe climate by transforming our economy to zero net emissions.

I echo the congratulations that other members have made of the students who led the global climate strike that many of us participated in last Friday 20 September. Those of us who were there in attendance watched in absolute awe as well over 15,000, possibly 17,000 to 18,000, marched from Victoria Square to the steps of this Parliament House. King William Street was completely full from start to finish, from parliament to the square. The young marshals diligently shifted that crowd as it spread from North Terrace all the way down Grenfell Street and all the way to the square. The global actions that we saw on the television and on the internet that day and night set a new narrative, a narrative of hope and solidarity for climate justice. We felt it on the day; I hope we see it here tonight.

For those who criticise young people for taking a day off school—and I note the Hon. Ian Hunter mentioned that he took a day off school to see The Queen; in my generation it was Lady Di, as we waved our wattle—there was no better place that they could be. Indeed, as the last climate strike showed, and one of my favourites was a local student who wrote, 'Even the introverts are out today', and I shared some of that sentiment. Another in this climate strike this past Friday had a beautiful placard that said the climate is hotter than her imaginary boyfriend. But the time for fairytales is over or we will not have a happy ending here.

I commend all the climate action groups and their supporters for raising their voices to all levels of government, including the state government and, of course, within their communities. I also want to acknowledge that South Australian local councils have added their voices to declaring a climate emergency, including the Town of Gawler, Adelaide Hills Council, Light Regional Council, the City of Port Lincoln, the City of Adelaide and, as of last night, the City of Burnside. There you go, John Darley; perhaps you had an effect.

I would like to remind those who organised with their community that I am confident of this motion tonight, particularly because it is preceded by their hard work and especially the work of those young people that we have heard comment on already this evening. However, some have called declaring a climate emergency somehow too emotive. Aside from actually calling a spade a spade, acknowledgement of a climate emergency calls for the very sense of urgency that is needed to address the threat of climate change.

Many, if not all, emergencies will already create casualties and damage before they are met with a response. This is especially the case when a response is unreasonably late. In such emergencies we need to take care of ourselves, to take moments to regain our composure and, at times, allow ourselves time to grieve. I know that many people feel held back at the moment by

despair and panic. This is not the time for panic. This is the time to keep our heads, to show our strength and fight to protect all that we can: not to hesitate, not to give up, not to despair. This is the time not to throw our hands up but to roll our sleeves up.

We have a duty to acknowledge the climate emergency and to respond. As a state we need to plan methodically, to act now and to move carefully but quickly. There is no planet B. We must have a plan. We need to speed up our actions and make sure that we reach zero net emissions as soon as practicable. We need to do our part, of course, to transition workers into cleaner, new industries and leave behind the remaining reserves of fossil fuels in the ground. With those fossil fuels in the ground, the fossil fools in our parliament should be left behind and consigned to the dustbin of history as well.

All political parties at all levels of government need to work together to address the threat of climate change and I am pleased tonight to add my voice in support of this motion. It is a necessary beginning step to show that we are united. I call on the council to support this motion. Let's roll up our sleeves. Our house is on fire. This is the time to act.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (18:21): I rise to make some comments in support of this motion. I move the amendments standing in my name:

Paragraph 1—

leave out 'already at dangerous levels' and insert 'increasing'

Leave out paragraph 3.

After paragraph 4 insert new paragraph as follows:

5. Recognises that governments need to take practical actions to reduce the risk of climate change including investing in renewable energy, coastal protection and adaptation, the hydrogen economy and carbon farming.

I thank the honourable member for bringing this important issue to the Legislative Council. The South Australian parliament passed the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act in 2007. It contains a target to reduce by 2050 greenhouse gas emissions by at least 60 per cent to an amount equal or to less than 40 per cent of 1990 levels.

The South Australian government is taking action on climate change, as evidenced by policy including continuing a net zero emissions target by 2050 and a commitment to a climate change strategy and key initiatives, including renewable energy, a hydrogen strategy and coastal protection, which I will talk about in a little bit more detail.

The Marshall Liberal government is focused on delivering practical environmental outcomes to mitigate climate change and to help South Australians, the economy and the environment adapt to its impacts. The South Australian government is supporting the transition of South Australia's electricity system towards ever-increasing levels of renewables.

We are delivering more climate resilient, ecologically vibrant and liveable places through initiatives such as Green Adelaide and the Greener Neighbourhoods program, investing to secure the future of our coastline and providing climate science and information. The government is also undertaking planning to mitigate risks to people, the environment and the economy as a result of more frequent heatwaves and extreme weather.

The Premier's Climate Change Council has been tasked to work with state government agencies and develop a whole-of-government climate change strategy and a blue carbon strategy for South Australia. These initiatives will identify key opportunities to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, store carbon and help South Australia adapt to a changing climate.

Just this week, Premier Steven Marshall released South Australia's Hydrogen Action Plan, including the commitment of \$1 million towards a landmark study to identify optimal locations for renewable hydrogen production and export infrastructure. This plan will help us deliver more reliable, more affordable and cleaner energy for our state, as well as bolstering our economy and presenting future job opportunities.

Nowhere else in the world is as well positioned as South Australia to produce, consume and export 100 per cent green hydrogen, which has huge potential to decarbonise significant industry

sectors. We have invested \$52.4 million to build the resilience of our coastal environments, establish the new Glenithorne National Park, and spent \$2 million on the Greener Neighbourhoods program, funding projects to keep our suburban streets cool and green.

We are collaborating with other governments to take global action on climate change. We have endorsed the Asia-Pacific Climate Leaders' Declaration, and South Australia is also a member of the Under2 Coalition steering group that is leading subregional action on climate change at the international level to keep temperature increases below 2° Celsius. South Australia is leading the way on renewable energy to help reduce the state's greenhouse gas emissions and to deliver affordable, reliable and secure energy to South Australians.

Around half the energy generated within the state already comes from renewable sources, and this is forecast to grow to around 73 per cent by 2020-21. Further, the government announced a \$100 million home battery scheme to support the installation of 40,000 home-based energy storage systems across South Australia. This is in addition to a further 50,000 home storage systems proposed under the Tesla virtual power plant.

We are also developing energy storage initiatives through the \$50 million Grid Scale Storage Fund and supporting a range of low-carbon transport and green hydrogen projects. Notwithstanding the state government's demonstrable support for renewable energy, gas generation will continue to play an integral part in our transition to a low-carbon future.

I would also like to add my thanks to those people who have contacted me. I apologise to those who I have not replied to. I am not sure if other honourable members are experiencing this, but our system has been eating emails. Sometimes they go through to a system which means we do not receive them, but they can rest assured that we are aware of these particular concerns and share them. Once again, I thank the Hon. Mark Parnell for placing this motion on the *Notice Paper*.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (18:25): In closing the debate, I would like to thank my Greens colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks; the SA-Best representatives, the Hon. Connie Bonaros and the Hon. Frank Pangallo; Advance SA's the Hon. John Darley; and the Hon. Ian Hunter and the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos from the Labor Party for their support. I would also like to thank the Hon. Michelle Lensink for her contribution, but I am disappointed at the position the Liberal Party has taken, as evidenced by the amendments.

What does give me great hope is that, clearly, the numbers on the floor of this chamber tonight will be supporting this motion. I am very confident that they will support the motion unamended. No member has said to me that they will support the Liberal Party amendments. These amendments seek to remove the most important words from this motion. Those words are, 'That this council...Declares that we are facing a climate emergency'. They are the keywords in this motion, and I will not accept their deletion from it.

I am disappointed that the Liberal Party is so scared of having to actually acknowledge that climate change is a climate emergency that they cannot bring themselves to recognise what scientists have been telling us and what activists have been saying and what the world is now recognising, and that is that we are in a climate emergency.

I originally had some more comprehensive comments. I was going to quote from Sir David Attenborough at 93, evidence he gave to the UK parliamentary committee. Other members have referred to his contribution. Of course, I was going to quote at some length from Greta Thunberg, but other members have done that, so I do not need to. I was going to refer to the Prime Minister's observations. Other members have done that.

What I will say is that the Prime Minister said that he believed our children needed to be given 'context and perspective'; they were his two words. It might come as a shock to the Prime Minister that our young people have plenty of both context and perspective. They understand the science, they understand the urgency and they understand that we are facing a climate emergency. Others have spoken about the complaints that all this talk of a climate emergency is creating anxiety. Guess what? There is a solution to anxiety: do something about it.

I am pleased that the Legislative Council is going to support this motion tonight. I will not go through all of the detail. I mentioned the Liberal amendments; it is in three parts. I do not accept any

of them, with the exception perhaps of the last part, but it is not part of my motion. If the Liberal government wants to come back with a motion recognising that we need to do more in relation to renewable energy, coast protection, hydrogen economy and carbon farming, bring another motion back and I reckon I will probably support that.

However, that is not in my motion. I want my motion tonight to pass unamended, and I am very pleased that the indications I have received so far are that that is exactly what the Legislative Council is going to do. This is a monumental day in Australian parliaments: the fact that this chamber will today declare that we are facing a climate emergency.

The PRESIDENT: Honourable members, there are three amendments, so I am going to put them in three separate questions. I will give you the three questions and then I will ask them, for the benefit of members since it is late in the day.

The three questions are that the amendment moved by the Minister for Human Services to paragraph 1 be agreed to. I understand from honourable members that that will not be agreed to by the chamber. The second one is that paragraph 3 as proposed to be struck out by the Minister for Human Services stand as part of the motion. Honourable members who want the Hon. Mr Parnell's motion to remain unamended will vote in the affirmative for that. The third question is that the new paragraph 5 as proposed to be inserted by the Minister for Human Services be so inserted. If I understand the will of the council, that will probably not succeed.

So if you are with the Hon. Mr Parnell, you vote no to the first question, yes to the second question and no to the third question. Does any honourable member require—if you are supporting the Hon. Mr Parnell, you vote no, yes, no, because the questions have to be put in the affirmative.

I put the first question that the amendment moved by the Minister for Human Services to paragraph 1 be agreed to.

Question resolved in the negative.

The PRESIDENT: I put the question that paragraph 3 as proposed to be struck out by the Minister for Human Services stand as part of the motion.

Question agreed to.

The PRESIDENT: I put the question that the new paragraph 5 as proposed to be inserted by the Minister for Human Services be so inserted.

Question resolved in the negative.

The PRESIDENT: I put the final question that the motion moved by the Hon. M.C. Parnell be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Sitting extended beyond 18:30 on motion of Hon. R.I. Lucas.

Bills

LANDSCAPE SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to amendments Nos 1, 3 to 13, 15 to 39, 45 and 46 made by the Legislative Council without any amendment and disagreed to amendments Nos 2, 14, 40 to 44, and 47 to 50 and to the suggested amendments Nos 1 to 5.

At 18:34 the council adjourned until Thursday 26 September 2019 at 14:15.