

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 17 March 2021

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins)** took the chair at 14:16 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. N.J. CENTOFANTI (14:17): I bring up the 26th report of the committee.

Report received.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I bring up the 27th report of the committee.

Report received and read.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I bring up the 28th report of the committee.

Report received and read.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

The PRESIDENT: I direct that the written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

Question Time

MULTICULTURAL GRANTS PROGRAM

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): My question is to the Assistant Minister for Multicultural Affairs. Has the assistant minister ever made remarks to a multicultural stakeholder that linked government grant funding to any form of support for the Liberal Party?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:23): I don't understand the question. Can the Leader of the Opposition please repeat it?

The PRESIDENT: I will ask you to explain further.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Has the Assistant Minister for Multicultural Affairs ever made remarks to any multicultural stakeholders that linked government grant funding in multicultural affairs to any form of support for the South Australian Liberal Party?

The Hon. J.S. LEE: No.

MULTICULTURAL GRANTS PROGRAM

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:24): My question is to the Assistant Minister for Multicultural Affairs.

1. Could the minister advise the house: what exactly is the process for determining grants in multicultural affairs?
2. Does the minister ever see the list of proposed grants before they are approved?
3. Does the assistant minister ever provide advice about proposed multicultural grants?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:24): I thank the honourable member for her question. In terms of the grants process, we have four different grants streams. The streams are Advance Together, Celebrate Together, Expand Together and Stronger Together. They are published on our website

and there are independent assessment panels to make, I suppose, assessments on the criteria of the grants, and it meets the guidelines that are approved by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet via the office of multicultural affairs.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary, the deputy leader.

MULTICULTURAL GRANTS PROGRAM

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:25): In terms of the minister's answer, does the minister in that process, where she referred to independent assessment and so on, ever see the list of proposed grants before they are approved? And does the assistant minister ever provide advice about proposed multicultural grants through that process?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:26): Just like any other grants by government, the minister or assistant minister representing the portfolio will sign off the recommendation by the assessment panel with the grants. Do I see the list? Of course I see the list. I see the list of recommendations by the assessment panel as to which organisations qualify for assistance and will fit the criteria of funding. Those guidelines have been followed accordingly, and I sign off on the recommendations by the assessment panel.

MULTICULTURAL GRANTS PROGRAM

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:26): Supplementary: for clarity, is the assistant minister saying that her role is simply to sign off—she doesn't ever provide advice about proposed multicultural grants?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:26): The assessment panel consists of a number of experts from the multicultural communities and, also, experts from the government departments do understand procurement processes and also understand the needs and aspirations of our multicultural communities. I do not need to provide advice to the recommendations, which are recommended by an expert panel.

The PRESIDENT: Final supplementary, deputy leader.

MULTICULTURAL GRANTS PROGRAM

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:27): The assistant minister is saying she doesn't need to provide advice. Can she confirm she never has provided advice? And has the assistant minister asked for potential grant applicants to send their proposals through to her directly?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:27): Every minister or assistant minister that is allocated with authority to look at grants would know that there is an area whereby priority funding can be reallocated. For example, last year we had the pandemic. Many of the Celebrate Together Grants, which are about organising major festivals and events, had to be returned to the department. In the estimates process, the Premier, as the Minister for Multicultural Affairs, already addressed that.

We are proud as a government that we will address the issues that are faced by the communities in terms of crisis in the pandemic. We will do everything possible to reallocate that funding to meet the needs of our vulnerable communities. We make no apologies for that. It is an area of grants that is returned to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, and it is for the purpose of helping multicultural communities to overcome any issues that are impacted by the COVID pandemic.

MULTICULTURAL GRANTS PROGRAM

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:29): Final supplementary: has the assistant minister asked for grant applications to be sent to her directly?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:29): A protocol has been set in departments and the cabinet to filter those return grants, and the money is used for the purpose and within the guidelines of the funding.

MULTICULTURAL GRANTS PROGRAM

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:29): My question is to the Assistant Minister for Multicultural Affairs. What conversations did the assistant minister have with stakeholders about multicultural grants at this year's Chinatown Lunar New Year event on 20 February?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:30): The conversations are always about what grants are available from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and the office of multicultural affairs in terms of helping the communities overcoming whatever issues are faced by them. Those are the consistent issues that multicultural community groups will bring to my attention. I am sure that in every other portfolio ministers or assistant ministers will actually meet with constituents when they have concerns to be brought to the attention of the government.

MULTICULTURAL GRANTS PROGRAM

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:30): Supplementary arising: the assistant minister has raised that she had some grants brought to her attention. Can she provide any reassurance to the chamber that she did not raise specific grant applications or conditions with those attendees?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:31): I need the honourable member to clarify her question. She is saying 'at the event', meaning the Chinatown street party events that I attended. I did not discuss any matters regarding grants at that specific event.

MULTICULTURAL GRANTS PROGRAM

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:31): Supplementary: maybe not at that specific event then, but what about other events? Have you discussed any specific grant applications and the conditions of those grants with attendees or other people who are applying for a grant?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:31): All the conditions and criteria of grants can be downloaded from a website via the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. Every grant that has been approved fits the guidelines of protocol of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:32): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer update the house on the details of the job figures released by the ABS this week?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:32): I am sure that all of us await, with bated breath, the fortnightly release of the Single Touch Payroll figure series by the Australian Bureau of Statistics as the most contemporaneous analysis of labour market figures in our state and in the nation. Only yesterday, the most recent fortnightly Single Touch Payroll figures were released for the nation by the independent Australian Bureau of Statistics.

I am pleased, and I am sure even Labor members in this chamber will be delighted, to hear these figures. These figures indicate that, in the most recent fortnight, which goes through to 27 February 2021, the growth in jobs in the states and territories shows that South Australia, pleasingly, leads the nation when compared to the low point of the pandemic, which was the middle of April, on 18 April.

When all the states are measured in terms of the growth of jobs from the low point of the pandemic, 18 April, through to the most recent figures of 27 February, there has been an 11.3 per cent growth in jobs in South Australia.

The next highest jurisdiction, the second one, is Western Australia, at 10.4 per cent, and the lowest of all the jurisdictions, without going through all of them, is Victoria, at 8.2 per cent. The highest is South Australia with an 11.3 per cent growth in jobs, and Victoria is the lowest at 8.2 per cent. The national figure is 9.0 per cent. So South Australia is a full 2.3 percentage points higher than the national figure.

More pleasingly, as I have indicated on previous occasions, are the measures of changes in employee wages, as measured. Again, as I have indicated, total wages or wage income going into households is a better measure in terms of the relative financial health and prosperity of households throughout the nation.

Again, pleasingly, South Australia is the second highest jurisdiction behind the very big household income increases in Western Australia. South Australia's growth, since the low point of the pandemic, is 9.8 per cent, and the low figure of all of those is Tasmania at 5.8 per cent—a full four percentage points higher than the low point of Tasmania. The Australian national figure is 7.8 per cent.

Summarising those numbers, as I have indicated previously they are important because, whilst the monthly labour force figures are a useful guide, by the time they are released they are sometimes three or four weeks out of date in terms of measuring the health of the economies, and they just measure the number of full-time and part-time jobs in the economy.

These numbers, as I said—in particular the wages number, which is the better indicator we believe—are an important indicator that slowly but significantly we are seeing economic recovery nationally, which is very important. We are also, more importantly, seeing South Australia either leading or the second highest state in terms of those two key indicators in terms of the grow back of jobs and economic growth in our state—and in our nation, frankly—post the pandemic.

REVIEW OF HARASSMENT IN THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENT WORKPLACE

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:36): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking you a question about the equal opportunity commissioner's report, Review of Harassment in the South Australian Parliament Workplace, tabled by you earlier this month.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Further to my previous question to you, the report makes a number of references and recommendations about parliament's standing orders. In particular, recommendation 3 recommends that the Standing Orders Committee undertakes a review of standing orders for gender neutrality and to ensure the orders do not impede women entering political life.

Today's InDaily is reporting that organisers of Adelaide's March 4 Justice rally, which attracted some 8,000 participants to Victoria Square on Monday, are calling on the parliament's Standing Orders Committee to publicly reveal whether it is considering the recommendations of the report.

That report also says that the rally's organising committee has called on you, Mr President, as Presiding Member of the committee, to make a public statement about what is being considered as part of the current review of the Parliament House standing orders. They have also asked you, Mr President, to disclose if you are considering the recommendations of the commission that I alluded to earlier.

My questions, Mr President, to you as President and Presiding Officer of the committee are:

1. Have you now had an opportunity to read the report in its entirety?
2. In light of the Equal Opportunity Commission's findings and recommendations, are you concerned that parliament's standing orders haven't been revised for more than 21 years?
3. Given that the standing orders haven't been changed in 21 years, and the committee has only met a handful of times during that period, what plans are there to make the considerations of the committee more transparent to the members of this place and to the public more generally?

The PRESIDENT (14:38): I thank the honourable member for her question. I would remind her that there is a convention in this place—a courtesy, perhaps—to advise the presiding member when a question is to be asked, but I respect the fact that that doesn't have to happen. The honourable member is aware that we have only very recently had a conversation about this matter outside the chamber. I won't say that I have read every word of the equal opportunity commissioner's report; however, I have read a great deal of it.

The Standing Orders Committee has met. It met late last year, as members will know. The members were invited to make submissions about changes to standing orders. I wouldn't say that the committee was at any stage overwhelmed with changes; however, we have met. We met last Friday to consider those limited suggestions, the ones that have been previously made to the

committee or forwarded to the Clerk, by the honourable member and some others. So some deliberation was taking place last Friday, and the committee will meet again in April.

I do not intend to offer to the chamber at this point or publicly the indication of where that goes because the members of the committee deserve the opportunity to look at the material that was presented to them last Friday.

As far as dealing with the organisers of the march, I am more than happy to meet with them if they would like to make contact with my office. My details are very publicly available. If they wish to do that I am very happy to meet with them, but I haven't had any contact from them other than being told of a media release in that regard.

REVIEW OF HARASSMENT IN THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENT WORKPLACE

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:40): Supplementary: so we can better understand, given that we are now to have a committee established to consider the implementation of the commission's recommendations, can you give us an indication of whether the inquiry you instigated will be paused or extended to cover those aspects of the report that specifically relate to standing orders?

The PRESIDENT (14:40): I thank the member for her supplementary. I will remind the honourable member that she did ask me in her previous question whether it was my intention to pause the proceedings of the Standing Orders Committee and that is not my intention. There is a motion that will be considered by this chamber at some stage relating to a joint select committee, but that is a determination for this chamber and that has not been done as yet.

There are also things that the Speaker and myself, with the two Clerks, have discussed about further ways forward to progress these issues where we specifically deal with the matters relating to the staff of the parliament, the staff employed by the parliament, rather than the staff employed by other agencies, the people employed by the Premier, the people employed by all the other departments that have people in this building, and indeed other organisations that have representatives in this building, particularly on sitting days.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:42): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS: Concerns have been expressed today from GPs that the rollout of the COVID-19 vaccine is leading to confusion and delays for general practice, including GPs in phase 1a of the rollout who work for respiratory clinics, including the head of the Immunisation Coalition, Dr Rod Pearce, being told by SA Health and the Royal Adelaide Hospital that they need to have a negative COVID test in the 24 hours prior to receiving a vaccine and GPs, including Dr Danny Byrne from Chandlers Hill Surgery, reporting that they will not have enough vaccine available to start bookings for the vaccine.

As of today, only one GP clinic has online bookings available and the initial rollout of phase 1b will have no participating GP clinics in the South-East of the state or the Lower Eyre Peninsula, meaning that locals would need to travel significant distances for the vaccine. My questions to the minister are:

1. Why has SA Health and the Royal Adelaide Hospital insisted that GPs, such as Dr Rod Pearce, must have a negative COVID test before they get vaccinated?
2. Does the minister have concerns with the rollout start of phase 1b, including limited availability in regional SA, and will he make hospital clinics available to people aged over 70 in those areas?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:44): I thank the honourable member for her question. I am advised that only quarantine workers in South Australia are required to have a nasal pharyngeal COVID-19 test 24 hours prior and return a negative test before receiving a vaccination.

Quarantine workers are given the opportunity to be vaccinated at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, which is part of CALHN. Quarantine workers are part of our surveillance testing regime. Those workers are required to have a COVID-19 test every seven days and daily saliva testing when working. With test results being returned in a timely manner, this has not impacted the time frame of the vaccine rollout.

In terms of other groups and the general population receiving a vaccination when it's their turn, a COVID-19 test 24 hours before the vaccine will not be required. Of course, if anyone has symptoms, even if they have the mildest of symptoms, they should get a test and wait for a negative result. In terms of the rollout to GPs, the rollout to GPs is coordinated by the commonwealth government.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding disability service jobs. Can the minister please provide an update on the Marshall Liberal government's commitment to deliver new traineeships across Adelaide and the regions?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:46): I thank the honourable member for her question. Indeed, in the 2020-21 state budget, the Marshall Liberal government announced \$32.9 million over four years to support 750 additional traineeship and apprenticeship places in government agencies and funded projects. This includes 175 places in disability services over the next two years, through a \$9.5 million commitment.

We announced on 12 March a recruitment drive to hire the first 85 of the 175 trainee disability services officers to deliver traineeships across Adelaide and the regions. This government-funded employment and training opportunity will equip people to move into employment opportunities in the growing disability market, which is expanding and diversifying in response to the demand driven by the NDIS.

This is on top of a range of other measures that have taken place in this space in South Australia. There is a national workforce strategy. The Health, Disability, Aged Care and Community Services Industry Skills Council is looking into local workforce insights to inform national work, given that a lot of the drivers are through the commonwealth government, which also released its Growing the NDIS Market and Workforce Strategy in 2019, which outlines its approach to NDIS market and workforce development.

We have seen that the number of participants in South Australia has greatly outstripped what the initial estimates were, in that under the old Disability SA there were some 16,000 what we refer to as participants. That has grown, not just doubled to the 32,000 as predicted but is up somewhere near the 38,000 participants mark, which clearly means that there is a great deal of demand for services in the sector.

The model that we are providing is that the trainees will be employed in our state government run accommodation services on the completion of their training. They will be able to work with whichever provider they choose to. I must say that the Minister for Innovation and Skills, who is a great enthusiast for apprenticeships and traineeships, pushes all of his cabinet colleagues in a range of areas to ensure that we are engaging people in this space.

There are a lot of opportunities. Some people who may be experiencing underemployment due to their particular industries suffering downturn during COVID are able to upskill and pivot to provide services in this area, and so we greatly encourage people who are interested in working in this field to apply.

NYRSTAR

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:49): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question on the topic of safety concerns at Nyrstar's Port Pirie lead smelter to the Treasurer in his role as Minister for Industrial Relations.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Last sitting week, I raised with the Treasurer the ongoing safety concerns held by workers at Nyrstar's lead smelter in Port Pirie following several serious incidents

and 'near misses'. I asked the Treasurer what action is being taken by Nyrstar and SafeWork SA in the wake of these incidents and if SafeWork SA are satisfied with the company safety procedures.

Since then, there has been another serious workplace incident at the lead smelter where a worker received, and is being treated for, serious burns, requiring his transport to the Royal Adelaide Hospital burns unit for that treatment. My understanding is that the latest incident is also currently under investigation. My questions to the minister are:

1. Is the minister satisfied that, despite at least two years of ongoing safety concerns, Nyrstar are doing all they can to improve worker safety at the lead smelter, given this latest instance as well?

2. Following yet another incident, will SafeWork SA and/or the government be taking further steps to ensure better worker safety at Nyrstar?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:50): I am sure the honourable member would join me and all members in indicating that all employers, including Nyrstar, can do better in terms of managing work health and safety issues. I am sure there are no employers in the state who would hold themselves out to be perfect with absolute guarantees. Those, however, where there has been a history of significant workplace incidents would appear to have more significant challenges which they need to meet.

In relation to the approach from SafeWork SA, I have taken the member's previous question, I think in the last sitting week, and sought advice from SafeWork SA as to what action they have taken, and I will update the request to SafeWork SA and provide a consolidated response to the member's two questions in relation to what actions they are taking. Suffice to say every serious workplace incident, such as the one to which the member has referred, is seriously investigated by SafeWork SA.

They may have already taken action of which they will be able to advise me when they provide a written response to the questions in relation to some of the previous incidents at Nyrstar. If that's the case, I am sure that will be part of the general response SafeWork SA provides to me so that I can share it with the honourable member and indeed all other members in the chamber.

MULTICULTURAL GRANTS PROGRAM

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:52): My question is to the Assistant Minister for Multicultural Affairs:

1. What conversations did the assistant minister have with multicultural groups prior to 28 February about applying for the Expand Together Grant that closed on that date?

2. What conversations did the assistant minister have with multicultural groups prior to 31 January about applying for Stronger Together Grant applications that closed on that date?

3. How are grants forwarded to successful grant applicants? Is it by electronic fund transfers or a cheque sent by the department to the association or any other means?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:53): I thank the member for the many questions and his interest in multicultural affairs. In terms of the grants process, as I already explained in my previous answers, it is administered by the office of multicultural affairs of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. It is up to the office, following the normal procedures of sending the contract documents to successful recipients.

The conversations that I have with many, many multicultural groups are all about what grants are available to help our multicultural communities to advance their organisations and to serve our community. Those grants guidelines are able to be downloaded and are available on the website of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. Honourable members can, you know, please take a closer look at those.

In terms of how the funding is distributed, I believe it is actually by electronic means but, again, these are operational matters for the office of multicultural affairs and departments to manage on a day-to-day basis. It is not an area where I as assistant minister, or any other minister, go down to all those details to find out whether a cheque is presented or whether it is by electronic means.

However, because we live in a very modern age and because of the fact that most people probably do not have a chequebook anymore, I suspect most of the funding will be done by electronic means in terms of grants.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.S. LEE: The Hon. Ian Hunter mentioned he has a chequebook.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.S. LEE: For those organisations that do not have online banking, perhaps they request the department to send them a cheque. I don't have that level of detail of operational matters.

ORGAN DONATION

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister update the council on organ donation in South Australia and whether the COVID pandemic has impacted on donations?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:55): I thank the honourable member for his question. COVID-19 has added a level of complexity to the national organ donation and transplantation program and directly impacted organ and tissue donation and transplantation numbers in 2020. The transport sector suspended some transplant programs at the height of the pandemic and the suspension of elective surgery also impacted the program.

Transplant teams have had to navigate the challenges facing hospitals, changing health system arrangements and COVID-19 restrictions, including flight reductions and border closures. Whilst donation and transplantation doctors and nurses worked tirelessly to limit the impact of COVID-19 on people waiting for a transplant, the 2020 Australian Donation and Transplant Activity Report published by the Organ and Tissue Authority reveals that the pandemic did have an impact and that Australia's organ donation and transplant rates did drop.

In 2020, South Australia recorded 43 donors, equating to 26 donors per million population. While this was down from our highest ever total of 52 recorded in 2019, it was higher than 2018, when there were 36 donors. Nationally there were 463 donors in 2020, equating to 18 donors per million population. That was 16 per cent lower than the 548 donors in 2019.

Organ donation is an important decision for individuals and their families, and families who are often dealing with very sudden and tragic situations somehow find the strength to respond with generosity and compassion. This act of generosity has a profound impact on those who receive a transplant as well as their families, friends and the community. I am incredibly grateful to all donor families for honouring the donation decision of someone they loved, particularly for making that difficult decision in a difficult year.

In terms of the organ donation program, South Australia has a strong tradition of public support for organ and tissue donation. South Australia continues to have the highest consent rate in the country at 67 per cent, well above the national consent rate of 58 per cent. We also have the highest rate of registration on the Australian Organ Donor Register at 71 per cent, with the national average at just 34 per cent. South Australia is the only remaining state in Australia to have driver's licence donor registration processes, and this is considered a major contributor to the high donation consent rates.

The most important factor influencing a family to agree to donate is to know that their loved one wanted to be a donor. Nationally, in 2020 almost 90 per cent of families agreed to donate when their family member was registered on the Australian Organ Donor Register. The importance of ongoing conversations and education about organ donation cannot be understated.

I want to acknowledge those who have given so much to so many, and thank all donor families for honouring the donation decisions of their loved ones. They have saved lives and their generosity has transformed lives. I also want to acknowledge the dedication and innovation of our donor nursing and medical specialists and transplant teams, who have been delivering this life-saving service in the most difficult of circumstances.

AFL MATCHES, ADELAIDE OVAL

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:59): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: It's brief, I promise you, this one.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: You're eating my time!

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Pangallo, proceed.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing about the AFL.

The PRESIDENT: Is leave granted for a brief explanation?

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: We are on the clock, Mr President! The AFL season kicks off tomorrow and the first game is here on the weekend between the Adelaide Crows and Geelong. My question to the minister is—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: —has SA Health given instructions to the AFL, the Stadium Management Authority and the two clubs on COVID safe rules that would restrict fans from standing or cheering—in fact, even booing—and are those rules the same as the AFL intends enforcing at other stadiums in Victoria and elsewhere where patrons must be seated at all times?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:01): I thank the member for both the brief question and the brief explanation. I actually thought the interjections took longer than the explanation. I must admit the question did worry me, though, because I am so intimate with sport that I almost had to think: what does AFL stand for? It reminds me of a comment by Nicola Spurrier earlier this year when she was being asked about SANFL fixtures and she said that she knew both the teams in Adelaide were greatly loved.

Back to the question. I must admit that I don't know the details of the current arrangements but my general understanding is that, in relation to the AFL, at the Stadium Management Authority they are subject to the specific management plan that the Stadium Management Authority has in place for all its events. My understanding is that it does require people to wear a mask when they are coming in and out of the stadium, when they are going to the facilities, and that includes both dining facilities and toilet facilities.

It would not surprise me if it required patrons to remain seated, in other words to, if you like, heckle from their seats, which is also a good tradition in this place as well—another stadium management plan. To be honest, I couldn't tell you whether that varies from other AFL matches and, to be frank, I am more than happy for South Australia to lead the way in the best response to COVID.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary, the Hon. Mr Pangallo.

AFL MATCHES, ADELAIDE OVAL

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:02): Can I ask that the minister clarify what the ruling is in regard to standing or being seated at the AFL matches to be played in Adelaide this year?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:03): I am more than happy to get the details for the honourable member. If it doesn't relate to a COVID management plan I will provide that information, but it may well be that the management plan itself explains that.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bonaros, a supplementary.

AFL MATCHES, ADELAIDE OVAL

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:03): While we are at it, can we also confirm whether patrons will be allowed to drink alcohol at their seats during the game?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:03): I am sure they are because I imagine I would be inundated with complaints otherwise. As I said, my understanding is that you can't stand on the—what is the expression? The bit behind the seats between—the cavity?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Is it the terrace? Okay, let's say it is the terrace, the bit between the seats and the facilities.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The minister should continue unaided, I think.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: My understanding is that you cannot stand there, drink, heckle or whatever. My understanding is that you need to go and drink and heckle from your seat.

MULTICULTURAL GRANTS PROGRAM

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:04): My question is to the Assistant Minister for Multicultural Affairs. Has the assistant minister ever told some community groups to forward the draft grant application to her or her staff directly? If yes, when was the last time that happened?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:04): I mentioned in my previous answers that we need to repurpose some of the grants that are unspent to help communities in need, and through that process it is part of the protocol that multicultural community groups will write to me directly and then for the department to go through the assessment process as per normal that will fulfil the criteria as per the guidelines for the grants. I have explained that.

The honourable member who is asking the question, as you know, can I congratulate him on when he launched the Vietnamese boat people monument, which many of the members in this house as well as the other place attended. He did a wonderful job. That money, that funding, those grants he knows full well came from the support of the Marshall Liberal government. When it comes to multicultural communities and the level of support—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is out of order.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: The level of support we give to the communities is something that we—not just the Marshall government but the previous government—have supported. He acknowledged that. The Hon. Tung Ngo at the ceremony acknowledged the bipartisan support and how important it is to have bipartisan support.

The honourable member knows full well when he needed the extra resources because of the COVID impact, because of the pandemic, because of the COVID safe guidelines, he needed to write me a letter. He did understand that process. We fully support what the community needs to do to run a COVID safe program.

MULTICULTURAL GRANTS PROGRAM

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:06): Supplementary: will the assistant minister therefore produce and table in parliament the document that describes the protocol that outlines that grant applications should be sent directly to the assistant minister?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:07): I will take that question on notice, because I believe those types of operational matters need to be consulted with the department and the office of multicultural affairs in terms of producing the protocol. But I will take that question on notice.

The PRESIDENT: Further supplementary, the Opposition Whip.

MULTICULTURAL GRANTS PROGRAM

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:07): Just for the sake of clarity, sir. I'm not after the operational details, I'm after the protocol the assistant minister mentioned in her response. Can she produce the document that outlines the protocol that allows grant applications to be sent directly to the assistant minister?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:07): In my previous answer I already said I would take that question on notice and seek further advice to table in this chamber. I will seek further advice.

SMALL BUSINESS GRANTS

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (15:07): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer indicate whether the Small Business Grants provided by this government attract any concessional tax treatment or not?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:08): I thank the honourable member for the question, because there have been one or two questions that have gone into Treasury and also to my office in relation to the tax treatment for the Small Business Grants. I think, to be fair, the overwhelming majority—I think the last number I saw was that the taxpayers have provided more than I think \$260 million worth of taxpayer-funded assistance to—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: How much?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I think it was about \$260 million—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Massive.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: A massive sum of money—to thousands of small businesses. The majority of those clearly were suffering and suffering badly, so they are not really overly concerned about the tax treatment, because they were suffering significant losses during that particular period. But clearly for a small number of businesses the tax treatment was important.

As a result of those queries I wrote to the federal Treasurer to see what the tax treatment was. In the normal circumstances all grants provided by governments are taxable under the commonwealth tax arrangements, but as I understood it there were very rare and isolated examples where they might be treated differently, so I sought clarification.

The federal Treasurer has confirmed, by way of correspondence to me in the last week or so, that the usual treatment for grants will be applied to the Small Business Grants Round 2 program that the government sought clarification on. That is, we had requested a non-assessable, non-exempt income treatment for the Small Business Grant round, which is evidently referred to by the acronym NANEI.

The commonwealth government and federal Treasury have confirmed that it will not be eligible for NANEI treatment and therefore will be assessed in the usual way. The advice was uploaded onto the Treasury website for those people who might have been interested in the tax treatment of the grant schemes.

TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT CAR PARK

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:10): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Treasurer, representing the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, about the former Department of Transport car park on the banks of the River Torrens at Walkerville.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: Anyone who has walked or cycled the River Torrens Linear Park Trail would be familiar with the old multistorey Department of Transport building on the banks of the River Torrens at Walkerville. The department left Walkerville years ago, and their office building was converted into apartments and a hotel and, I am reliably informed, an excellent coffee shop.

However, attached to the old Department of Transport building by footbridge across the River Torrens is a vast bitumen car park. This car park is roughly triangular in shape, surrounded by the River Torrens and the linear park on two sides and the O-Bahn on the third. According to satellite

images, the paved area looks to be around 7½ thousand square metres, and it's marked out for around 400 cars. The entire site, including the connecting driveway from Holton Court, is probably over 10,000 square metres.

I understand that this vast expanse of bitumen has been fenced off and unused ever since the department vacated their Walkerville headquarters a decade or so ago. It is not used by the new development, which has its own onsite car parking. My question of the minister is: why won't the government return this area back into the Torrens linear park for the benefit of the environment, the neighbourhood and all South Australians who enjoy this important bushland so close to the city centre?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:12): I am happy to refer the honourable member's question to the minister and bring back a reply, but I suspect that, in part, the minister might say that there's potentially some role for Treasury in relation to this issue. That is, I think I announced some two years ago that the government was probably doing a survey at the time of all surplus or unused land and properties in various departments and agencies.

If there are properties that are surplus and unused, if one puts a business hat on and if you have a lazy balance sheet and there are assets that can be recycled and regenerated into building new assets for the public benefit, that's the way business is operated, and the business of running the state should be no different.

The honourable member raises an additional element, and that is that it should be used for other purposes. I am sure the minister and the government can consider those uses as well, but in the alternative, if it has a value—and unused land in the Walkerville precinct may have some value, I suspect—the issue for the government is, as we look to regenerate the hospital assets, school assets and important social infrastructure, and indeed housing infrastructure right across the board, that using the capacity and the lazy balance sheet is one element of being able to find funding for important social infrastructure, which this government is clearly committed to in terms of the massive \$1.3 billion that we are spending on school infrastructure.

I have lost count of the amount of money my very hardworking colleague in health spends on infrastructure, but I'm sure it's a very large sum of money—soon to be even larger when we talk about the Women's and Children's Hospital in terms of potentially massive expenditure on the Women's and Children's Hospital. It is a very wideranging program he is embarking on in the interests of the people of South Australia at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and Flinders, Modbury, Lyell McEwin, Women's and Children's and regional hospitals. Everywhere one looks, the minister is busily regenerating the problems we have inherited from 16 years of Labor inactivity.

That is a very long answer to a very important question, but nevertheless it raises an important issue. I will refer it to the minister to see whether he can add to my comprehensive reply. He may well think that I have more than adequately covered it and that we are actually looking at various options, one of which might be the purpose that the member has raised. But he might take on notice that I have also canvassed that there might be other options for the potential use of the sale value of any particular surplus land the government has on its balance sheet.

HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION FUNDING

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:15): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Human Services regarding housing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: On radio this morning, the minister could not explain why her agency was unable to provide an extra \$50 or \$100 per week to a homeless family so they could afford a home, but they could spend \$1,350 per week for hotel accommodation. When answering a question in this place on 4 March about why the minister only spent \$4.4 million of the promised \$20 million for homelessness the minister said, and I quote:

There could have been one option taken which could have been to do what they do with the NDIS, which is to provide the funds to the client. They might determine that they wanted to spend that significant funding which goes into the system themselves on services that would assist them, but we have worked together through the alliance process.

My questions to the minister are: does the minister trust families enough to decide for themselves how to spend even a tiny amount of additional funding; and, if so, why couldn't this approach be trialled as an innovative new approach for targeted and select groups, such as single mums with four children who are costing the government thousands of dollars to live in unsuitable hotel accommodation?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:17): I thank the honourable member for his question, which gives me an opportunity to outline the many and varied programs that operate through the public system, the non-government sector, to assist people who are challenged in maintaining private rental or find themselves in a homelessness situation. I think the honourable member in his question has conflated a few of the different services—done a bit of a mashup—so I think it's worth outlining to the chamber the different parts of the spectrum, why they are there and how much we are expending on each of them.

To one of his points: he talked about the important reforms through the proposed alliance structure, for which the tenders have now closed and which I note the Australian Labor Party has at times been critical of in this chamber. The alliance process was something that the services themselves have sought. We spend some \$70 million on homelessness services, including the specialist domestic violence sector, every year in South Australia.

We have some 20,000 clients in that process, which equates to approximately \$3,500 per client per annum. That's where the comments are lifted in terms of my previous statements regarding the NDIS, which is funded on activities that—participants (as they are known in that system) are provided with a package of services which they choose which provider they wish to utilise through that system.

In terms of the homelessness reforms, we've got an existing structure which is quite extensive throughout South Australia. There's a large number of service providers which provide a range of services, whether it's meal services, case management, a range of support services. I note that a number of members, along with the Governor, the Premier and myself, attended the reopening of the Hutt St Centre, which is well known to many South Australians. They also provide some health services, including a royal district nurse, so those services already exist.

What I have been trying to explain to members of the Labor Party is that, rather than provide that funding directly to the clients, we have a range of services. I would be interested to know what the non-government service providers, which are the existing providers, think about the Labor Party suggesting that, instead of providing specialist services, they indeed get a cash grant.

The discussion on the radio this morning related to the emergency assistance program, which is, generally speaking, a short-term measure that is provided. One-third of those clients are actually domestic and family violence victims, so they usually access those programs via the specialist Women's Safety Services and the like. I think it's understandable that, if there is a situation where a family needs to flee from a violent situation, they would need to access emergency accommodation.

I might add, too, that the emergency accommodation program has operated for many, many years. It operated under Labor. It's not a cheap program; it costs us several million dollars a year. We have recognised that hotel accommodation is far from ideal and I think I have made those comments in this place many times, which is why, in that specialist DV space, we have increased crisis beds by 31 for families fleeing and nine for perpetrators.

If we look to the other cohorts who utilise the emergency accommodation system, generally they are short term. They need some sort of support between rentals, so those are generally approved on a short-term basis for those families. I think what I was at pains to try to explain this morning was that there already exists subsidies for people who are in private rental accommodation, particularly for people who are Centrelink recipients. Anybody who is in a public housing property or in the emergency system doesn't have access to that subsidy from the commonwealth government. What has been suggested is that we should, on top of that, be paying another subsidy in the private rental system.

We have always been aware that there are bottlenecks in our system and that is why the homelessness reforms are so important to improve the flow of people through that system. We are looking when they come online so that there will be a housing first option for people in the DV situation—we refer to it as a safety first situation—so that people can be housed and have those wraparound supports.

The alliances themselves will be provided with the funding to determine themselves how they expend that money. They may well look at brokerage programs. I'm aware that Anglicare also has a particular headlease arrangement as one of their suite of options. Going forward, we believe that the services that are provided to people who are currently in hotels/motels will be much more household-centred and be much more appropriate to people's needs.

Matters of Interest

GHAN KILBURN CITY FOOTBALL CLUB

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:24): I rise to speak today about one of our emerging CALD communities of Kilburn and Blair Athol to the north of our city and offer a reflection upon what makes this community a success and touch briefly upon some of its challenges. The arrival of people from such diverse places as Afghanistan, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Ghana and Liberia, to name a few, has brought great life, great cultural diversity and a sense of hope and solidarity to the Kilburn Blair Athol region.

I want to recognise the leaders in that community, by and large refugees themselves, who work tirelessly for the benefit of all. Some here will remember the postwar immigration boom that brought many thousands of people of different backgrounds and languages to the state and how their sport of soccer became an opportunity for community building, cultural and linguistic expression and unity. This was not without its problems, but the benefit to the state over time is beyond measure, a point which we would do well to keep in mind.

The Ghan Kilburn City Football Club began in 2012. The Kilburn Football and Cricket Club allowed Ghan to share the use of their oval, and the dream of a local soccer team became a reality. Under the guidance of local business leader Rahim Shah Zaidi and coach Desmond Tucker, the team found success, quickly rising from division 5 Sunday league to division 1 in 2019. The club grew from two adult men's teams to now fielding junior teams and a women's team.

Last year, the club's senior team won both the Sunday President's shield and the Champion of Champions shield, and its junior sides fared similarly well. One of the young women players has also been selected to play for Afghanistan in the Women's World Cup. There are over 150 players from countries of origin such as Afghanistan, Nepal, Iraq and various European nations, as well as Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Liberia, the Congo, Ghana, Zimbabwe, Togo, Australia and Indigenous Australia.

The development of Ghan Kilburn City has always been much more than simply about the soccer. Let me quote the club president, Mr Zaidi:

From the beginning we have been about serving the needs of the local community by seeking to create social cohesion and supporting the particular needs of the emerging immigrant communities.

The hand of friendship and support offered to us by Kilburn Football and Cricket Club since the beginning is a wonderful example of community building and solidarity that we wish to emulate. This is a success story that needs to continue.

Our experience tells us that the development of the club has been a remedy for social ills by providing a focus and an outlet for young people and a diversion away from antisocial behaviour. Our vision for the expansion of our youth academy and junior teams will continue this work and also support local families through social interaction, networking and other ad hoc supports.

It will come as no surprise then to note that the advent of Ghan soccer marked a significant decline in crime in the area, something Ghan and the community as a whole should be justly proud of. This wonderful community and its soccer club have been devastated in these past weeks by a penalty applied to Ghan by the amateur league's governing body over an incident at a preseason match a few weeks earlier.

No-one at Ghan is denying that the behaviour by all involved was not acceptable. No-one at Ghan is denying that some penalty was not appropriate. I am no expert, and I do not intend to criticise the league nor their decision at this time. What I do know, from speaking with people at the club, is that the extent of the penalty applied has been demoralising beyond words to the whole community, not just the players.

I cannot imagine how hard it has been for these people who came to this country in difficult circumstances, many fleeing war and conflict, many spending years—even decades—in resettlement camps, some being born there. I can imagine, however, that recovery from such trauma is an intergenerational project for many. It is just not easy.

In closing, I cannot but share in their frustration and ask legitimately if there simply was not some other way, whether, rather than wielding a very heavy stick, the hand of friendship and support to make sure that this kind of thing does not happen again might not have been a better and a more effective solution.

Time expired.

PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:29): I wish to speak today about an important community awareness program, Reach for the Facts, sponsored by the state government through ReturnToWorkSA. The use and misuse of prescription opioids within the South Australian community is a rising concern.

A number of stakeholders have come together to develop the community awareness program, aiming to raise awareness of the dangers of long-term use and misuse of prescription opioids and encourage and inquire into alternatives to opioids for safe and effective pain management. The Reach for the Facts community awareness campaign includes the website reachforthefacts.com.au and a number of other print, media and digital assets seen throughout South Australia.

Opioids can be a type of prescription medicine often provided for severe pain. Common types of prescription opioids include codeine, oxycodone, fentanyl and morphine. It is important to understand that prescription opioids work by depressing or slowing down the function of the central nervous system—that is, your brain and spinal cord—to relieve pain. As well as working on trying to reduce pain, they also affect other parts of your body.

Some 3.1 million Australians are prescribed opioids each and every year. Over the course of a year, 20 per cent of Australians over 45 years of age will be prescribed at least one opioid. The misuse of prescription opioids can result in an accidental overdose, hospitalisation and even death. While prescription opioids can be very effective in managing severe pain, like many medications they can also cause negative side effects and have unintended consequences.

In fact, 80 per cent of people who take prescription opioids for more than three months will have a negative side effect, which may include slower and shallower breathing and drowsiness. It is concerning that one in 10 people who misuse them become dependent. All opioids can be addictive and it is important to be aware of the risk of developing a dependence. Some people are more at risk than others of course, particularly if they have been taking them for a long time, have been taking high doses, if they are a smoker, have a history of mental illness or a family history of addiction.

I note that the first steps of dependency can begin in just five days. The likelihood of becoming dependent increases with every day that someone takes the medication, starting from the third day apparently. After the fifth day, the chances of becoming dependent increase significantly, I am told. Taking opioids over a period of time can lead to certain physical and psychological changes as well.

Just to highlight how important this is, 1,045 Australians died of an opioid overdose in 2016. That is a 62 percentage increase on the year 2007. Somewhat surprisingly, in 2016, prescription opioids were involved in more deaths and hospitalisations than heroin. Every day in Australia, prescription opioids are involved in nearly 150 hospitalisations and the death of three people.

For people who become dependent on prescription medications, early signs of dependency can be hard to spot. The Reach for the Facts website contains an easy questionnaire comprising four questions to give people some idea of how likely they are to be dependent. I encourage anyone who is interested to visit the website and complete this questionnaire.

It is also important to understand that prescription opioids affect everyone differently, but there are side effects commonly connected with this group of medicine. As I mentioned earlier, 80 per cent of people who take opioids for three or more months will experience a negative side effect. That said, prescription opioids can of course be an effective way to manage pain. However, whether you have a prescription opioid to help reduce acute severe pain or after an injury or surgery, or for chronic pain itself, it is important to know what they are and what to expect.

For anyone who has been prescribed opioids as part of their treatment, keeping in mind the ultimate goal is usually to reduce pain and improve day-to-day living, it is important to realise that taking opioids is only one way of managing pain and that they are unlikely to take away a person's pain completely although, if given in sufficient doses, of course they can.

Our bodies react differently to different drugs, so when opioids and other medications are combined, it can be unpredictable. It is important to be aware that mixing opioids with other prescription medication and over-the-counter medicines, illicit drugs or alcohol can also lead to other risks. Help and support are always available, however, whether for yourself or a loved one. If anyone has any questions or concerns about prescription opioids, speak to your doctor, pharmacist or trusted healthcare professional or, as I just mentioned a moment ago, please refer to the very helpful website.

SKYCITY ADELAIDE

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:33): SA-Best has today urged the state government to commit to an independent investigation into the Adelaide Casino operations of the SkyCity Entertainment Group for any evidence of criminal activity. I have written to the Commissioner for Consumer and Business Services, Mr Dini Soulio, requesting his office undertake the inquiry. My concerns have been sparked by legal action launched in the Supreme Court of South Australia by Chinese millionaire Mr Linong Ma against SkyCity Adelaide and junket operators Xiongming Xie and Fang Zhuangqian in relation to gambling sessions at the Casino in May 2019 during which Mr Ma allegedly won more than \$5 million.

In his statement of claim Mr Ma claims Mr Xie was arrested in Sydney in July 2019 and charged with 'having allegedly...threatened a man with a knife, demanded the transfer of a \$10 million property and stabbed the man almost to death'. Further, Mr Ma claims that when SkyCity transferred money to the Supreme Court it inquired 'whether or not Mr Xie was a dangerous and violent criminal', and 'had links with Asian triad criminal gangs'.

These claims deeply disturbed me and reinforced what SA-Best has long feared; that is, that criminal groups may be using our Casino, amongst others, to launder money and other illegal activities. Casinos around the world are notorious for being used by crime gangs like the mafia and the triads to launder their dirty money, and there are similar issues now being raised in relation to the Casino in Adelaide.

The state government and authorities are absolutely in denial if they think illegal activity does not take place at gambling establishments like those we have in Adelaide. One need look no further than the damning report released in New South Wales just last month that found Crown Resorts, the owner of casinos in Melbourne and Perth, is not suitable to hold a casino licence in that state, despite having already built a \$2.2 billion complex in Sydney's new Barangaroo precinct.

The Bergen report, undertaken by former Supreme Court judge Patricia Bergen, uncovered major flaws in the company's corporate governance, which facilitated money laundering and links with criminal gangs in Crown's operations in Victoria and Western Australia—alarming findings. The report recommended that junket operators be banned from dealing with casino operators in that state, that legislation be tightened to put the onus on casinos to prevent money laundering and that serious criminal elements, probably including international criminal organisations, had run hundreds of millions of dollars through casino accounts.

Those revelations have triggered royal commissions in Victoria and WA, both looking into Crown Resorts and its dealings with junket operators as well as claiming the scalps of the high-profile Crown Resorts CEO and a number of board members. It begs the question: what independent checks and balances does our state government have in place to ensure illegal activity is not occurring in South Australia, or does it simply take as gospel what Casino management tells it?

The state government's reluctance to investigate the Casino disturbs me greatly, particularly given the serious allegations of questionable junket operators frequenting the facility with their guests. It makes one wonder if the hundreds of millions of dollars a year the government receives from SkyCity Adelaide in taxes from its gambling operations have any influence at all.

I think the Treasurer needs to explain, in more detail than he has initially, why he is so reluctant to investigate SkyCity Adelaide. To pin that decision solely on the commissioner, who has apparently advised the government that an independent inquiry into the Casino is not necessary at this time, blatantly ignores his broader responsibilities to the taxpayers of South Australia.

There is now compelling evidence before the courts in South Australia alleging that questionable junket operators are also frequenting the Casino. Further, given the heightened scrutiny by regulators and interstate casino operators following the Bergen report, there are increased concerns that individuals and criminal groups who use casinos for nefarious means are turning their attention to casinos like those in Adelaide, believing they are not subject to the same level of scrutiny. What more does the Treasurer need in terms of proof before calling for an inquiry?

SOUTHERN LAUNCH

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:38): Today, I want to talk about rockets. Whether it is rockets sending cars to Mars or rockets sending satellites into space most people are fascinated by rockets, so when developers come along and offer us our own piece of rocket action by building a new launch facility in our state, people get very excited. However, there is one rocket project that also has some people very concerned, and that is the proposed development by Southern Launch.Space Pty Ltd.

The proponent seeks to construct an orbital launch complex on leased freehold land located at the southern tip of the Eyre Peninsula at Whalers Way, Sleaford. According to the proponents, the complex will facilitate the launch of domestic and international vehicles for the purpose of polar and sun synchronous orbit satellite insertion. The proposal specifically consists of a change in land use to accommodate an aerospace facility and the construction of buildings and infrastructure to support the launch site.

Back in 2019, it was declared a major development and it has since been determined that an EIS will need to be prepared. EIS is a two-edged sword. On the one hand, it is the only pathway for a formal environmental impact assessment but, on the other, the government gets to make the final decision, it is not bound by the zoning of the land, and decisions are not subject to any legal challenge or appeal.

One person who has written to me with concerns about this project is prominent South Australian environmentalist Andrew Black OAM. Andrew is an honorary research associate at the SA Museum, he is a past president of the Nature Conservation Society of South Australia, a past president of the SA Ornithological Association, and a former member of the Native Vegetation Council. Andrew Black wrote a submission to the environment minister last September, which he has shared with others in the conservation movement. He wrote, in part:

Dear Minister,

Please make certain that the proposed rocket site at Whalers Way does not proceed.

It is completely incomprehensible that such an idea could be countenanced.

We have some very special places and some very special biodiversity in [South Australia] and they must be protected against damaging exploitation. They are our heritage and our children's inheritance, our capital resources. This State has a proud history but it is at risk from needlessly damaging developments. Amongst our resources is a world renowned rocket range at Woomera. Why should we contemplate another in such a fragile environment as southern Eyre Peninsula? In my own field of expertise, I raise the plight of several conservation dependent birds at Whalers Way which demand that their status must not be further threatened.

The Southern Emu-wren occurs in three disjunct populations in [South Australia], each a separate subspecies. The Mount Lofty Ranges subspecies is endangered and perilously so. Its future depends on continuing conservation effort. The Eyre Peninsula subspecies is also endangered but its future is a little more secure, providing that its habitat is not further reduced or degraded. That means that Whalers Way must be protected.

Andrew Black then goes on to talk about the white-bellied whipbird which occurs only in South Australia. Apparently it is extinct in Victoria and very possibly it is extinct in Ngarkat Conservation Park, and there are only very small populations remaining.

He talks also about the white-bellied sea eagle and the osprey that occur in small, ecologically distinct endangered and demonstrably declining populations in South Australia. He says that Southern Eyre Peninsula is critical to maintaining the presence of both these magnificent raptors in our state.

I have also received similar concerns from Ann Prescott, the famous South Australian botanist, and I have also had communications with a number of conservation groups such as the Nature Conservation Society and Birds SA.

According to the guidelines that were produced for the environmental impact statement, the proponent has to prepare a number of specialist reports, including a fauna and flora assessment and management plan which, in turn, would include a native vegetation clearance data report. But, interestingly, when you go through the documentation it tells us that the land is subject to a native vegetation heritage agreement, so this land is supposed to be protected by a legally-binding covenant between the owner and the government that ensures the land is protected in perpetuity and that the vegetation is not cleared. It is noted on the certificate of title, that is how important this is.

I also noted that the land is zoned for coastal conservation and that should also provide a barrier to vegetation clearance. In conclusion, the question for this generation is whether or not we are prepared to let species or subspecies go extinct because we are unable to stop or reverse the insatiable appetite of developers to clear what little remains of our remnant native vegetation. If it is a choice between launching rockets or protecting biodiversity, I vote for biodiversity.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:43): Today, I rise to speak about International Women's Day. This year, the campaign theme for International Women's Day is Choose to Challenge. A challenged world is an alert world, and from challenge comes change—and many women have done so through rallies and speaking out to the media.

I am pleased to share in parliament today that it was a great honour to represent the Marshall Liberal government at four International Women's Day events this year. Coming out of a COVID pandemic year we ought to be so grateful that we live in one of the safest places in the world that allows us to have gatherings and to celebrate such important events.

I would like to place my special thanks and congratulations on the public record to acknowledge four organisations that have put together significant COVID safe events and invited me to be their special guest to celebrate International Women's Day, particularly to highlight the work of women from migrant and refugee backgrounds.

The first event was held on 2 March. As always, it was a great privilege to join the Australian Migrant Resource Centre as a guest speaker for their International Women's Day forum, with the title 'Women working together for change'. My heartfelt congratulations to AMRC deputy chairperson, Ms Elizabeth Ho; CEO, Ms Eugenia Tsoulis OAM; board members and the hardworking AMRC team; Commissioner for Children and Young People, Helen Connolly; all the panel speakers, including Tanya Hosch, the 2021 South Australian of the Year; and other distinguished guests and participants for their wonderful contributions to the event and for raising important issues confronting women and for celebrating women from diverse backgrounds.

The second event I attended was on 5 March. It was the UNAA-SA International Women's Day breakfast. In a normal year, as we know, it is the biggest in the country. Unfortunately, due to COVID-19, the annual event became an online event to support the fundraising efforts of UN Women Australia. The United Nations Association of Australia SA President, Ms Lidia Moretti, generously

hosted a small number of guests at her home to join the virtual morning tea gathering. Sincere thanks to the wonderful Lidia Moretti for hosting us at her beautiful home. The event was a great opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to support the UN's women initiatives.

The third event I would like to highlight was proudly presented by Radio Italiana 531. They managed to have their International Women's Day celebration on Monday 8 March, which is the actual day of International Women's Day. It was fantastic to celebrate the achievements of women in the Italian community in South Australia. We were joined by inspiring and courageous guest speakers, including SAPOL Brevet Sergeant Ada Scalzi, mental health and domestic violence diversion court prosecutor, and Signorina Lara Di Fabio, a lawyer and recognised as a rising star in South Australia in the Doyle's Guide 2019 lawyer ranking.

I pay tribute to Maria Maglieri, as well as the deputy chair of SAMAC, Toni Cocchiario, for being there as well. I would like to thank Eleonora Finioia, the production manager, together with Clementina Maione, Josie Belperio and Radio Italiana's International Women's Day Committee for this very successful event.

The last event I attended was organised by the Non-Resident Nepali Association in conjunction with the Nepalese community and which was held on Wednesday 10 March. This forum was used as a meaningful fundraising event that aimed to deliver an inspiring message, with all proceedings supporting the menstruation campaign in Nepal through the social enterprise Pad2Go.

The special guest speakers were the founders of TABOO. Ms Isobel Marshall, the 2021 Young Australian of the Year, shared her remarkable story of addressing period poverty and a social enterprise founded with her partner, Ms Eloise Hall, who was not able to join us on that day but her speech was very inspiring. We would like to acknowledge special thanks to NRNA state coordinator, Mr Nabin Panth, and particularly to acknowledge Mrs Manju Khadka, the state coordinator of the NRNA women's forum, Ms Santoshi Gautam and Ms Dolkar Gurung and the committee for their outstanding work.

Congratulations to all the organisations for celebrating women's achievements and how far women have come and for recognising how much work we still have to do to achieve equality status and full participation in our modern society.

MARCH 4 JUSTICE

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:48): On Monday, I joined many of my caucus colleagues and thousands of women and men in Victoria Square to protest for equality and to demand an end to sexual violence, discrimination, harassment and abuse against women. There were at least 8,000 to 10,000 people there and the atmosphere was electric. There were many very inspiring speakers, and I would just like to go through some of the comments from the speakers:

Evil thrives in silence. Behaviour unspoken, behaviour ignored is behaviour endorsed. The start of the solution is quite simple—making noise.

That was sexual survivor and Australian of the Year, Grace Tame. Next:

We are all here today not because we want to be here but because we have to be here. We fundamentally recognise the system is broken, the glass ceiling is still in place and there are significant failings in the power structures within our institutions.

That was alleged rape survivor, Brittany Higgins. Then:

Every single woman who is here today is here because she knows and she has experienced the pain and suffering that comes from being treated unfairly.

That was barrister Claire O'Connor SC. Lastly:

I am furious that women are being treated so badly in 2021...young women who face harassment every day, and older women who are tired and furious that we are still fighting this fight.

That was national founder Janine Hendry. There were a number of other speakers, including Abbey Kendall, Director of the Working Women's Centre South Australia, and their message was quite powerful. There were a number of demands that the national March 4 Justice rallies were making. The national demands are:

1. Fully independent investigations into all cases of gender violence.
2. Implement the Australian Human Rights Commission's Respect@Work 2020 recommendations.
3. Lift public funding for gendered violence prevention.
4. Enact a federal gender equality act.

South Australians had their own demands as well, as follows:

1. Put the onus on employers to prevent sexual harassment and discrimination at work.
2. Establish and implement the code of conduct for members of the South Australian parliament.
3. Review the way that sexual assault crimes are reported, investigated and prosecuted in South Australia.
4. Fully implement the recommendations of the South Australian equal opportunity commissioner's review of harassment in parliament.

There were 100,000 people who marched throughout Australia, and their message is a powerful and simple one: enough is enough. We will no longer tolerate any form of harassment or discrimination, and any political party who ignores this message does so at its own peril.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:51): Today, I want to speak about the critical issue of ambulance ramping in South Australia. It does not matter where you go at the moment or what television channel you watch—you can go to a sporting club, you can go to a pub or, God forbid, you might actually go to a critical ambulance incident or a hospital yourself—you will find out that there is currently a lack of ambulance resources within SA Health to address the critical needs of the community in a suitable time frame. The result of which, I am deeply concerned, could actually lead to someone dying in the back of one of those ambulances while they wait for treatment.

As recently as Monday, a 98-year-old person took a bad fall and required the assistance of an ambulance. The person's case was escalated after three hours because no ambulance was dispatched to their location to treat that 98-year-old person who had fallen and was suffering from their injuries. After the case was upgraded, the 98-year-old person was taken to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and ramped. After receiving no medical attention inside The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the 98 year old was remobilised to the Calvary hospital, but they were refused access.

The 98-year-old patient was then remobilised again and ramped a second time at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The 98-year-old patient was remobilised for a third time and sent to the Modbury Hospital and finally attended to by hospital staff at 8 o'clock that evening. This is undoubtedly a terrible situation. The 98-year-old person would have been suffering from severe trauma and injury from their fall, yet they were taken to four hospitals: they were refused access at one hospital, ramped at two hospitals and waited a total of 10 hours to have their medical needs attended to inside a hospital. That is unacceptable. The minister should hang his head in shame over a result like that.

I have been personally contacted by several very worried constituents who have experienced ramping firsthand at the South Australian metropolitan hospital system. A person named Mark recently contacted my office because his elderly father fell over and suffered severe head trauma, resulting in a painful recovery and several skin grafts to repair the damage from the fall. Severe as his father's fall and head trauma was, Mark and his father had to wait almost four hours in the back of an ambulance at the Flinders hospital before the father could receive medical treatment inside the hospital. After the fall, Mark's father spent a whole week inside the hospital, receiving treatment.

The fact is that Steven Marshall has done a good job at following the advice of Professor Nicola Spurrier and, indeed, other health officials during COVID, but he has been nowhere when it comes to fixing ramping at our major hospitals. When Steven Marshall is not reading from a script he is forced to stand on his own two feet, and he is nowhere to be seen.

Someone needs to step up and fix the issue of ramping. It cannot be continually left alone as we wait and watch dozens of ambulances, and sometimes more than that, waiting outside hospitals while tens of people are not seen every single week. South Australians are dying to get into the back of ambulances, literally, while waiting for admission to hospitals. Mental health patients are waiting without help, and this is adding to the issue of the ramping crisis.

Ramping has worsened under the Marshall government. It has doubled since the Liberals were elected. They are ignoring the pleas from our hardworking paramedics, nurses and doctors by literally blaming them for the crisis that is on their doorstep. If something is not done, more people will die. The Marshall government must fix the ramping crisis, it must meet with the relevant unions and it must solve the issue that is clogging up our hospital system and may literally lead to more deaths.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. D.G.E. Hood): I was loathe to interrupt the member during his matter of interest, but I remind members that we should refer to members of the other place by the seat which they represent and not by their name. Time having expired to make statements on matters of interest, I call on the business of the day.

Motions

OFFICE OF THE VALUER-GENERAL

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:56): I move:

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on—
 - (a) the scope of operations of the Office of the Valuer-General in respect of state government and local government valuations for property taxation purposes;
 - (b) the scope of operations of the Valuer-General in respect of valuations for stamp duty, acquisition, disposal and other purposes required by government;
 - (c) the extent of compliance by the Valuer-General in respect of the Valuation of Land Act 1971 (SA);
 - (d) the extent of knowledge required by the Valuer-General to satisfy the legislative requirements of the various rating authorities;
 - (e) the standard of policy formulation and direction by the Valuer-General provided to Land Services SA to satisfy their contractual obligations with the SA government;
 - (f) the relationship between the Valuer-General's revaluation initiative of all properties in South Australia as announced in the 2016-17 state budget and the general valuation of all properties in the state which occurs each year;
 - (g) the effectiveness of the decision to privatise the valuation services of the state from 2016-17, including productivity gains/losses as a result of the privatisation;
 - (h) the efficiency in the process of objections to valuations and appeals to the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal; and
 - (i) any other relevant matter.
2. That standing order 389 be so far suspended as to enable the chairperson of the committee to have a deliberative vote only.
3. That during the period of any declaration of a major emergency made under section 23 of the Emergency Management Act 2004, or any declaration of a public health emergency made under section 87 of the South Australian Public Health Act 2011, members of the committee may participate in the proceedings by way of telephone or videoconference, or other electronic means, and shall be deemed to be present and counted for purposes of a quorum, subject to such means of participation remaining effective and not disadvantaging any member.
4. That this council permits the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it sees fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being presented to the council.
5. That standing order 396 be suspended to enable strangers to be admitted when the select committee is examining witnesses unless the committee otherwise resolves, but they shall be excluded when the committee is deliberating.

I move this motion today following concerns expressed to me by members of the public and my own experience with the Office of the Valuer-General about services provided by that office that have deteriorated significantly over the last five years, and more particularly over the most recent two years. Briefly, I intend to outline some of these issues.

In July 2015, the Valuer-General made a poor policy decision in respect of the valuations and recording of living units within about 250 retirement villages in South Australia, which resulted in an increase in water and sewerage rates in the order of 770 per cent. Whilst attempts were made to convince the Valuer-General of the problem caused by their decision, the matter was finally corrected following a recommendation of a joint select committee inquiry to reverse the Valuer-General's decision, which was commissioned by the government in 2019 and is due to be implemented as from 1 July 2021.

In 2016-17, the Valuer-General embarked on a revaluation initiative, which was described in the 2016-17 budget papers as a rolling five-yearly revaluation of the state. It included updating valuations of industrial and commercial properties that had not been updated properly for approximately 16 years. According to the then Valuer-General, the first phase of the plan was delayed in year one due to the commercialisation of the rating and taxing valuations, otherwise known as the sale of the lands titles office and valuations to Land Services SA.

Year two of the plan was completed, with valuations in the local government areas of Unley, Walkerville and Adelaide Plains. Valuation increases in the commercial areas of Unley increased by up to 166 per cent over the previous valuations. The remaining areas of the state were deferred a number of times and will be completed by 30 June 2021, with effect for rating purposes from the 2021-22 financial year.

In 2014, the then Valuer-General implemented a valuation policy that gave a valuation concession to large-scale dryland farming properties in the peri-urban areas of the state that had been severely impacted by the development of housing, commercial properties and vineyards immediately adjacent to their dryland farming properties. In November 2020, the Valuer-General revised the policy, which reversed the original policy and gave the benefit to housing, commercial and vineyards. Complaints were raised with the Valuer-General from the agricultural sector, which resulted in the Valuer-General offering a solution to the problem that was completely impractical.

Back in 1981, the then Liberal government amended the Valuation of Land Act to allow for actual use valuations in South Australia. This provision included the principal place of residence of an owner and land used for the business of primary production and required the Valuer-General to disregard any potential this land had for subdivision or some higher use other than what the land was currently used for.

The current Valuer-General revised the implementation policy associated with actual use valuations in 2019 and introduced new interpretations of the provision of the act that were never intended and had, and are having, an adverse impact on the valuations of land for which the legislation was intended initially. The revised policy now provides erroneous direction to the private sector consortium Land Services SA, which is under contractual arrangements to provide valuations for rating and taxing purposes to the Valuer-General.

In respect of the matter of objections to the Valuer-General's valuations, the Valuer-General has been advising owners that the processing of objections will take about 12 weeks to finalise. The Valuer-General advises that the processing time will now take six weeks, bearing in mind that recent experience has shown that, if an owner objects to their valuation, it takes three weeks for the objection paper to proceed from the Office of the Valuer-General to Land Services SA, which is resident in the same building.

The Valuer-General advised the Budget and Finance Committee of parliament that their target for rating and taxing valuations was 90 per cent of current market based on current market sales evidence or adjusted asking price evidence. In South Australia, the Valuer-General reviews approximately 900,000 valuations each year. Most properties are not inspected, other than those that have recently been sold or are on the market for sale.

The court in the matter of Commissioner of Succession Duties (SA) v Executor Trustee and Agency Co of SA Ltd held that, where valuations are made for revenue purposes, any doubt should

be resolved on a conservative basis, as opposed to acquisition purposes, which should be resolved using a more liberal approach. However, in practice there is evidence to show that the Valuer-General's valuations are often way above 90 per cent of current market sales evidence and in some cases over 100 per cent. Similarly, when valuations are contested in SACAT, the Valuer-General defends valuations using gross actual sales evidence where the original target is set at 90 per cent of current sales evidence.

These examples above are reasons for moving for a select committee of inquiry so that, at the end of the day, South Australians can be assured that the Office of the Valuer-General operates consistently and in an effective manner. I urge all members to support the motion.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

WALKER, MR M.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:03): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the passing of Mr Murray Walker, OBE;
2. Acknowledges his achievements in the broadcasting of motorsport worldwide;
3. Acknowledges his enthusiastic support and promotion of South Australia, in particular motorsport events, including the Australian Formula One Grand Prix between 1985-95 and as a Roving Ambassador for the V8 Supercars; and
4. Conveys its sincerest condolences to his wife, Elizabeth, and family in the UK on his passing.

'And the Australian Grand Prix is go'. With those words to a worldwide audience of about 200 or 300 million, Murray Walker put Adelaide well and truly on the international map on a balmy Sunday afternoon on 3 November 1985 and so began his indelible love affair with this city and its street circuit, which Murray regarded as the best anywhere in the world.

Murray Walker OBE died in a nursing home in Britain last Saturday, the voice of Formula One falling silent after 97 fabulous and eventful years. It was truly a fulfilling life, and Murray often remarked how fortunate he was to be able to live and work in his passion of motor racing, as a broadcaster, writer and raconteur, for more than 53 years.

This week, the deserved tributes have been flowing thick and faster than a grid of Ferrari Testarossas. 'Legend', 'icon', 'great', 'national treasure', 'inimitable', 'incomparable', 'immortal', 'one of a kind', every epithet imaginable has been used to describe this unique, humble and gifted, gentle man who had no hesitation in taking the micky out of himself. He is in the pantheon of the very best sports commentators to breathe into a microphone—no argument on that score. His trademark shrilling voice of excitement at the start of a race or in describing a high-octane bingle embroiling warring drivers involved was loved the world over.

Australian writer and broadcaster Clive James, who drove on the Adelaide street circuit in a celebrity race, described him this way, 'In his quieter moments, he sounds like his trousers are on fire.' To many broadcasters, making a blunder here and there would be embarrassingly intolerable. Yet, for Murray, his slip-ups were part of the package that made him such a popular figure and no doubt helped Formula One achieve the enormous TV success that shaped the sport's future. He once said, 'I don't make mistakes. I make prophecies which immediately turn out to be wrong.'

He would describe his bloopers as Murrayisms and often dined out on them in speeches in his retirement years. Here are a few snippets, and I can assure you there are enough to fill a TV show certain to have you rolling in stitches of laughter:

Unless I am very much mistaken. And I am very much mistaken.

That one became his signature tune, the title of a book that sold more than half a million copies, along with stacks of T-shirts he happily signed at one of the Adelaide Formula One races. Then there are classics like:

The lead car is unique, except for the one behind it which is identical.

Or:

There's nothing wrong with the car, except that it's on fire.

And:

And now, excuse me while I interrupt myself.

Either the car is stationary, or it's on the move.

He delivered a subtle gem while describing the coloured light sequence at the start of the first Adelaide race, 'That's the international race starter who starts them all.'

Perhaps Murray might have really been having us on all along, pretending to make those bloopers when they were deliberately chosen to propagate the narrative. He was a talented and colourful advertising writer in his previous career, working his way up to be a partner in an international company, Masius.

Graeme Murray Walker OBE was born in Birmingham in 1923. His love of motor sport, especially motorcycle racing, came from his father, Graham, who won many races for the famous Norton company and who was also a commentator. Murray briefly raced bikes until he found the wireless broadcast box a much safer option than tackling the deadly Isle of Man track.

He served in World War II as a tank commander. During a gloomy rain-interrupted Grand Prix at Germany's famed Nurburgring, he dryly told a journalist, while gazing out over the Eifel forests, 'Do you know? I can remember driving across there in a tank.' That was during the bloody battle of the Reichswald in 1945.

Murray once told me motorcycle racing was his true love. He was skilled at any type he put his voice to, including trucks, speedboats, motocross and speedway. He covered more than 350 Grand Prix, 200 Isle of Man TT and senior Manx motorcycling events. Yelling above the noisy din of turbocharged Formula One cars and screaming motorcycles for decades caused him hearing damage but that distinctive tone in his voice rarely wavered. Murray said:

People used to ask me: 'Did you get nervous?' I'd say: 'No, I didn't get nervous, but I certainly got excited.' It's a fast-moving, dramatic, colorful, dangerous sport and your job is to communicate to people sitting at home watching their televisions. And if you can't get excited about what's going on, then you certainly can't expect them to. It was a passion for me, and it genuinely came from the heart.

By the time Adelaide had its first serve of Murray, he had already partnered up with British Formula One champion and renowned womaniser James Hunt. Hunt was Murray's foil or, perhaps, the fool he suffered gladly in their time together. One of the stories from the broadcasting box was Murray excusing Hunt's absence from the microphone to temporarily check out what was going on outside. In fact, Hunt was taking a smoko break, puffing on a joint, which Murray frowned upon but tolerated.

However, until Hunt's death at the young age of 45, they were friends and a formidable partnership that generated some classic exchanges like this one. Murray, 'There is a fiery glow coming from the back of the Ferrari!' to which James Hunt wryly replied, 'No, Murray, that's his rear safety light.'

I was lucky to join Murray once in the Adelaide Channel 9 broadcast box in 1986 when I was Grand Prix editor for the afternoon tabloid *The News* and moonlighting as a pit-side reporter for 5DN. I was amazed at his prowess in being able to keep talking non-stop for nearly two hours whilst standing and without much information being at hand for him to supplement his commentary. TV coverage was still evolving. Murray did not have the benefit of computer touchscreens spitting out all sorts of data and information or graphics of placings and lap times being flashed up on the screen like they are today.

The knowledge was in his head. He did the timekeeping, the interviewing, the commentating, while another journalist, Mike Doodson, provided him with the lap scoring. That is hard, pressure-laden work when you have to keep hundreds of millions of viewers glued to their screens, craving for updates.

That same year, I commissioned Murray to write a regular column and a feature ranking the best 10 drivers of his lifetime for *The News Jubilee Grand Prix* magazine, which I edited. Murray prewarned me that it was an impossible task, yet he duly sent his copy on time, crisp, well written and self-deprecating as usual. The opening paragraphs read:

I've done a few difficult things in my time, such as commentating on a motorcycle race for Chinese riders in Macau for one! Before I am waylaid in some Adelaide street by an Andrea de Cesaris fan—

and just to explain that reference, de Cesaris was nicknamed de Crasheris because, much to Murray's annoyance, he kept getting in the way and crashing into other drivers—

I had better start off by making it absolutely clear there is in fact no way anyone can incontestably rank drivers who have competed over an 80 year period—for that's how long grands prix have been held.

Well, he did. Murray gave me 17, not the 10 I asked for, which he said had the X factor and that he could not split. His number one was his childhood hero, the Italian Tazio Nuvolari, and at two, Argentinian Juan Manuel Fangio, who came to Adelaide for the 1986 race. Murray was worshipped by race fans, often ribbed but always highly respected by the stars of Formula One. Here are just some of the tributes, firstly, from reigning world champion Lewis Hamilton:

I remember growing up hearing your voice over the races. You made the sport so much more exciting and captivating.

Three-time world champion Sir Jackie Stewart:

He was very good at making mistakes. He made wonderful mistakes. He so much enjoyed the realisation of his error, he was such a character.

A mistake didn't mean anything wrong for Murray. It was something else to make a joke of.

He also had a popular partnership with former Grand Prix driver Martin Brundle, who paid tribute on social media. 'Wonderful man in every respect,' said Brundle, 'national treasure, communications genius, Formula One legend.'

One of Murray's most famous and moving moments was calling British driver Damon Hill crossing the finish line of the 1996 Japanese Grand Prix to win a coveted world championship cruelly denied him the previous two seasons. 'I've got to stop now because I've got a lump in my throat,' Murray explained. Hill remembered him this way:

He could emote the events that happened in our sport. The shocking moments and the dramatic moments all have Murray's reaction to them, and he made those events stick in your mind forever. And he allowed himself not to be the know-it-all commentator, but the fan who, at times, got overexcited.

However, Murray also instinctively knew when the occasion called for a serious and measured tone, like the horrific crash that claimed the life of one of his friends, Brazilian triple world champion Ayrton Senna, on a black weekend at Imola in 1994, where another driver, Roland Ratzenberger, had died the previous day.

Ironically, it was what he described as a 'hideous and unforgivable' mistake in a race in 2000 that made Murray pull the pin on his own illustrious career. At the start of the Brazilian race the pole sitter, Michael Schumacher, in a Ferrari, went off. Murray said it was Schumacher's teammate, Rubens Barrichello, who was 11 places behind him on the grid. Murray would later say, 'My brain wouldn't let me accept it was Schumacher.'

He copped a vicious blast in a British tabloid and went to his boss at ITV to call it a day. Rather than accede to the harsh attacks, the boss decided to send him on a farewell tour of all the tracks the following year. 'As a result, 2001 was an absolutely magical year for me,' Murray recalled.

I last did a long sit-down interview with him about his extraordinary life and career for *Today Tonight* in 2013. I was enthralled by his depth of knowledge and his humour and candour. Murray raved about the Adelaide street circuit, and when we had the Grand Prix here he made a point of walking it to get a feel for its twists and turns and also an appreciation of the city he so much enjoyed.

When the V8s roared the city back to life, the organisers invited him back to be an ambassador for the event and the city. He revelled in it, of course, and did a sterling job promoting to the world what we had here.

Even in his final year, Murray still had a special place in his generous heart for Adelaide. He came out with all tank guns blazing in a message of support for the V8 supercars race when Premier Steven Marshall killed off one of the most watched and popular motorsport events in the Southern

Hemisphere. Murray, thank you for your invaluable contributions. You will not be forgotten in this state.

Murray is survived by his wife of more than 60 years, Elizabeth. We extend our sincerest condolences to her and to their families. I must end my tribute with a 'Murrayism' about Murray:

That's history. I say history because it happened in the past.

I commend this motion to the chamber.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENT WORKPLACE

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (16:19): I move:

That this council—

1. Commits itself to leading cultural change within the parliamentary workplace;
2. Welcomes the recommendations made in the Equal Opportunity Commission's Review of Harassment in the South Australian Parliament Workplace;
3. Declares that sexual and discriminatory harassment will not be tolerated in the parliamentary workplace; and
4. Takes the necessary action to implement Our Watch's Workplace Equality and Respect Standards.

The motion I put to our chamber today symbolises our version of the March 4 Justice movement. In this parliament patriarchal structures continue to flourish and the voices of women remain unheard.

For years, the calls for help from women who have walked these hallways have been ignored, silenced and swept under the carpet or, worse, met with empty rhetoric and broken promises of change. The toxic culture in this workplace has been brewing since its establishment. This toxic culture means that issues that heavily affect women, such as discrimination, harassment and abuse, are never properly addressed.

This behaviour has not gone unnoticed. The public's attention is on us, and they recognise that this parliament has failed to address issues within our own workplace. They will hold us to account. Women supporting the movement know that our behaviour in here does not just hurt us in this place, it hurts half of the population. The public expects us to uphold the same standards we have for them, and we are failing them.

How can we legislate and require workplaces to uphold standards and practices when we do not hold the same standards for ourselves? The double standards are untenable. This parliament has never been an accepting or safe workplace for women. Any changes implemented have been hard fought for. Nothing has been given to us women on a plate. This motion signals that we, the women of this place, are collectively over it.

Whether we work as members, as staffers, within catering, building services, Hansard, the clerks' office, research offices, or wherever within this building, all women must be treated with respect and be able to come to work without fear. We are over the misogynistic behaviour and the obvious power imbalance between men and women and note that it actively perpetuates the inappropriate behaviour that we are all witness to.

I acknowledge the Deputy Premier from the other place for introducing a motion to address the implementation of the recommendations through a committee. The motion will create checks and balances for the implementation of the recommendations. It is not enough, we need systemic change to the social attitudes of people in this place. We must do more.

It should not be the responsibility of the public to tell us what is wrong with our workplace. We should be leading the social change; instead, we are lagging behind. Our movement in this place is strengthening and we will continue to fight for equality, not just in this place but in all workplaces.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

GENDERED VIOLENCE PREVENTION

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:24): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the thousands of people who attended the March 4 Justice in South Australia on 15 March 2021;
2. Condemns all forms of gendered violence;
3. Calls for an end to gendered violence in all workplaces, including in our parliaments;
4. Calls for the full implementation of all 16 recommendations made in the Equal Opportunity Commission's Review of Harassment in the South Australian Parliament Workplace;
5. Calls for a review of the way that sexual assault crimes are reported, investigated and prosecuted in South Australia;
6. Calls for fully independent investigations into all cases of gendered violence and timely referrals to appropriate authorities with full public accountability for findings;
7. Calls for the full implementation of the 55 recommendations in the Australian Human Rights Commission's Respect@Work report of the National Inquiry into Sexual Harassment in Australian Workplaces 2020;
8. Calls upon the state government to increase funding for gendered violence prevention to world's best practice; and
9. Calls upon the state government to enact gender equality legislation to promote gender equality.

It was a great honour and privilege to march alongside almost 8,000 people at the March 4 Justice event held in Adelaide on Monday. I did so because I knew I would be in very good company amongst schoolchildren, survivors (women and men) and many of my parliamentary colleagues, who have had enough.

I have been to a few rallies over the years but none quite like this. If you ever wanted to be heard, to be understood, to speak to or hear from people who knew how you felt, then this was certainly the place to be on Monday. As I said at the rally, that was not the day to hear from politicians, because I think we as a collective have failed us all for long enough. The rally was the day we heard from a sea of women, many of whom have remained silent for too long, that enough is enough. What we did on Monday was lay the foundations for future generations.

We heard from a number of prominent local women. The event kicked off with a Welcome to Country by proud Kurna Aboriginal woman Rosemary Wanganeen. We heard from Dr Afsaneh Moradi, who spoke of her own experience of sexual harassment as a newly arrived Iranian doctor in Australia. We heard from barrister and human rights activist Claire O'Connor, who told the crowd:

Every single women woman who is here today is here because she knows and she has experienced the pain and suffering that comes from being treated unfairly. We have had enough. Enough is enough.

We heard from the founder of the SA Aboriginal Action Group, Ms Janette Milera, who focused on gendered violence against Indigenous women. We heard from Ms Abbey Kendall, Director of the Working Women's Centre SA, who spoke of the dire need for a feminist survivor, worker-led, re-education campaign and told all of us, 'If you aren't with us, get out of the way.' We were lucky enough to have musical director and performer Victoria Falconer-Prichard, amongst others, to MC the event and bring it all together.

I think it is really important to note that two weeks ago the organisers of SA's March 4 Justice were going about their ordinary lives, just as the rest of us do, before coming together to organise an event in SA that would coincide with similar events in all jurisdictions, because like many of us they were fed up, they had had enough. In their words, the march showed there is a deep anger in South Australia and nationally about gender inequality, widespread incidents of sexual harassment and gendered violence in our workplaces and society, and they said, 'We will keep fighting until we see real measurable change.'

Before I continue I would like to thank sincerely the coordinators of that committee. I would like to thank Jessica Carr, Dr Samantha Battams, Ms Raelene Linden, Ms Tanysha Bolger and others who I will not name but thank for their extraordinary efforts and extraordinary work. I think we all wish we could hold an event that could get a few hundred people there, let alone 8,000, in a matter of days and have the impact that this event had. This group of women certainly achieved that.

This motion speaks to a petition which I am sure many members are familiar with. It speaks to the terms of that petition in terms of the sorts of actions that we would like to see implemented in South Australia and nationally. It states that we must call:

...for the full implementation of all 16 recommendations made in the Equal Opportunity Commission's Review of Harassment in the South Australian Parliament Workplace...

I note that that is an ongoing discussion here that we will obviously have a lot to say about. The reality is, we have to review how sexual assault crimes are dealt with in this place. It also calls for a review of how sexual assault crimes are reported, investigated and prosecuted in South Australia.

It calls for full, independent investigation into all cases of gendered violence, timely referrals to appropriate authorities and full public accountability for findings. It calls for the full implementation of the 55 recommendations made in the Australian Human Rights Commission's Respect@Work report of the National Inquiry into Sexual Harassment in Australian Workplaces 2020. It calls for the lifting of public funding for gendered violence prevention to world's best practice. It calls for the enactment of a gender equality act in South Australia to promote gender equality, including a gender equity audit of parliamentary practices. There is a similar call for the same to be done federally.

It calls for no perpetrators as policymakers or lawmakers, who the organisers say should be stood down. It calls for the ratification of the International Labour Organization's convention on Eliminating Violence and Harassment in the World of Work. It calls for an independent review into the prevalence of gendered violence in parliament, to be conducted by the federal Sex Discrimination Commissioner. It calls to strengthen the Sex Discrimination Act so that parliamentarians and judges are no longer excluded from accountability for sexual harassment and discrimination committed in the course of their employment as public officers.

I am really proud that when we dealt with our Equal Opportunity Act here recently, we moved to implement measures that were aimed along very similar lines of ensuring that, to the best of our abilities so far, members of parliament and members of the judiciary will no longer be able to hide behind exemptions that apply under our Equal Opportunity Act.

It calls for the creation of a code of conduct for all MPs that includes the prevention of gendered violence in houses of parliament and associated workplaces. Again, that is something that is being reiterated at the federal level. It calls for mandatory gendered violence and sexual harassment training of all federal MPs and their staff on an annual basis. Again, this is something that we need to be looking at right here in our own backyard.

There is so much that we need to do, and we need to do it urgently. I think none of us are under any illusion that this is going to go away. As I said, the march on Monday certainly laid a foundation for where we expect things to go for real, measurable change to take place. I think we have reached a turning point, a tipping point, whatever you want to call it, where simply carrying on with the same standards of practice is no longer going to be accepted.

There are a number of women who, through this process, have found their voice and who have decided that, after decades, they are not going to remain silent anymore. They expect and should demand that things change for themselves, for their kids and for their grandkids. One thing that I was really touched by on Monday was the number of older women who were at the rally. As we know, there are lots of women who have put up with really bad behaviour in their workplaces and in their everyday lives for a very long time, and they have done so in silence.

Dr Moradi was a perfect example of coming from a background where you are taught as a young child to not talk back to men. You are taught to respect all the men in your life. You are taught not to speak up when things go wrong. You are certainly not encouraged to speak out on issues of sexual harassment. But Dr Moradi found her voice, and through the march she found the courage, for the first time, to speak out about the sexual harassment that she faced as a newcomer to Australia—about coming to a new country as a GP and going to your first job, and one of the first things that you are confronted with is sexual harassment by someone in your workplace.

Given the cultural diversity that she came from, I am sure it was absolutely an extraordinary challenge for her. I think we know now that the more people speak out on these issues the braver we all become and the more likely we all are to speak out about issues that we know are not

acceptable—about behaviour that we know is not acceptable, behaviour that we know happens under our noses and that we walk past, because we are taught to put our heads down and keep walking. We are taught not to speak out, and that has a huge ramification not only on us but for younger women coming through the ranks. I am really heartened by the younger women who are coming through the ranks who are saying, 'Well, I'm not going to let the same happen to me.'

As I said, we do have a lot of work to do in this space, and there is certainly more that I would like to say to this motion, which I will not say today. I would urge all those honourable members who are thinking about it, when I do conclude my remarks, to add their voice to this contribution and let all women, and men, know that we stand in solidarity with them and that we support their fight. With those words, I seek leave to conclude my remarks on this most important motion.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

REVIEW OF HARASSMENT IN THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENT WORKPLACE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.A. Franks:

That this council notes the report by the Equal Opportunity Commission to the houses of the South Australian Parliament, entitled Review of Harassment in the South Australian Parliament Workplace, dated February 2021.

(Continued from 3 March 2021.)

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:36): I rise to conclude my comments noting the report on the instances of sexual harassment in this parliament that has been presented to us by the acting equal opportunity commissioner of this state. I rise to speak about sexual harassment, specifically the sexual and discriminatory harassment that exists here in our own system of governance. It is a scourge that a lot of people would rather pretend does not exist, insisting instead that these institutions such as ours of power and privilege are somehow immune from such things.

Acting Commissioner Emily Strickland has said in the introduction to her report, 'The fact that political institutions are far from immune from unacceptable, unlawful behaviours is disturbing.' It is quite disturbing. It is not surprising—absolutely not surprising. From the findings of the equal opportunity commissioner and its review of harassment in our South Australian parliamentary workplace—this workplace—we know that it simply is not true.

In fact, you would be hard-pressed to find a single woman working in this workplace, where our laws are made and codified daily, who has not experienced some sort of sexual harassment or sexism in her lifetime. For those who then experience it in this very place at such a rate is not just disappointing, it is certainly not surprising, it is indeed to our shame.

The women in this workplace have become so adapted to the presence of sexual harassment that they have learnt not to be surprised or shocked by it, only disappointed, as they have stated in the report. We thought, no doubt, aspiring to be in this place—whether it is a politician, a staff member, or anyone who works in this building in the various work roles that we have here—that perhaps a place designated to form the law might somehow be different. It has, of course, been shown to not be different. In fact, it has possibly been shown to be far from different, but indeed one of the last vestiges where the shame of sexual harassment is kept far too secret.

It has been quite a bad start to the political year, with the federal government's own handling of alleged sexual harassment, both the historical and the more recent, being so poorly managed, and with our own Prime Minister, the leader of this nation, demonstrating himself to be completely lacking in either empathy for the women of Australia or, potentially, respect for the women and girls of Australia in his response on Monday to the tens of thousands of those marching against misogyny, those women and girls, and men and boys, who marched this Monday. The words of the Prime Minister in response to that protest were to feign admiration that at least in this country we were not going to be shot.

As we march for justice and as we march for an end to violence and sexual harassment, those words that we were lucky we would not be met by bullets show that the Prime Minister has a lot more to do in terms of his empathy training. Are we supposed to feel grateful for not being shot? Are we supposed to be grateful that at least we were allowed to march against misogyny and disdain on Monday and that our own government would not kill us for the privilege? Of course, that is exactly

what we are made to feel. We are made to feel that we should be showing gratitude—gratitude for the benevolent sexism that allows us to speak even if it concurrently mocks and trivialises almost everything we say.

I point to the federal parliament because, as supported by the findings of this South Australian report, it would be an act of great hubris indeed to pretend that our own hallowed halls are any less filled with contemptible acts of sexism and harassment than other parliaments, and we must remember that as we consider our next steps. We have an opportunity in South Australia to become national leaders in regard to tackling institutional parliamentary misogyny, but we know that, with any pathway to reform, admitting we actually have a problem and owning that problem is the first step.

What this report covers is not pleasant, but it is a catalyst for change and a change that I hope we look back on in coming years with some pride. It is a report that has already started to have a domino effect, as we see the federal Sex Discrimination Commissioner, Kate Jenkins, take a similar challenge and shine a torchlight of transparency on the federal parliament, as we have now done in South Australia.

Something else that I would like to urge consideration on as we reflect upon this report is what is lost if we refuse to act. In the narrative of rape culture and sexual harassment, we hear so much about the futures, the potential, of 'promising young men', their promise often excusing their perpetrating. They are men with the world at their feet, men destined for greatness, men who were on the pathway to be the Prime Minister—men, men, men and always men whose glittering destinies are protected with the ferocity of those guarding the crown jewels.

Why do we not fiercely protect the futures of young women in the same way? How many young women have had a capacity for greatness and how many young women's trajectories have not been nurtured quite so delicately, if at all? When reports of harassment have been met with directives to 'just ignore it' or 'not to cause a fuss' or 'that's just what this workplace looks like' or 'if you can't stand the heat then get out of the kitchen', or any number of dismissive minimisations, if those young women have been believed at all, we are sacrificing their potential and we do it at the diminution of our parliaments.

In the face of these cultures that we have seen persist, how many women have abandoned their political ambitions and left their posts, deciding in the end that this potential for greatness does come at too high a cost? How many Brittany Higgses have walked away from a career in politics, learning that the light on the hill was never intended to shine for them? How many promising young women's names will we never know, even as their abusers and harassers go on to become more and more powerful?

Of course, we know, and the findings of this report confirm this, that it is not only women who are subjected to this kind of harassment. Approximately one-third of the survey respondents reported having been harassed about a personal attribute that is protected by our equal opportunity legislation and half of those respondents reported that this harassment had gone on for longer than 12 months. In this and other instances of harassment, over two-thirds of respondents said that they had not reported it because of a range of fears, including a lack of trust in the complaints process and the justifiable fear of repercussions on their career. Where they had done, many felt unsupported in the process and were met with what they believe to be an inadequate response. I do not doubt them.

The machinations of harassment are complex and often invisible to the naked eye. It is so easy to say, 'Well, why don't people report?' This attitude betrays a complete ignorance as to the emotional, structural and financial difficulties faced by those people who do speak out about abuse and workplace toxicity.

Politics, we all know, can be an unforgiving line of work in so many ways, but it is especially unforgiving of those who threaten the team, the party, the faction or, worse still, the game of politics. We cannot ask, 'Why do these people not report?' We must instead ask, 'How can we make it easier for them to report in the first place?' Better still, 'How can we change our culture so that no-one needs it ever again?'

If we cannot adequately answer those questions or take necessary, stringent and committed steps to ensuring those outcomes are realised, we have no business in this place being legislators. I would also add that if you find yourself resistant to this need for change, you absolutely have no

business in this workplace in this building. To the respondent who asked to be taken off the list of this review, I say to them it is perhaps time you were taken off the ballot paper.

It is my belief that the most important thing this government can do, and this parliament can do, in response to the acting commissioner's report is to establish a people and culture section. As the acting commissioner wrote, 'Sexual and discriminatory harassment will only be eliminated through concerted efforts to create cultural change.'

That department, that is properly equipped to manage reports of harassment and to swiftly address issues in regard to this, not to mention, of course, provide ongoing workplace training, is what you would find in even any modestly equipped organisation in this day and age. It is astonishing that our state's legislative body has not established this already, but again it perhaps speaks to the hubris that exists across all legislative bodies that assumes the rules are somehow different for us, simply because we get to make them.

Recommendation 3 is the ensuring of flexible workplace arrangements to ensure inclusivity. We may not have experienced the full brunt of the COVID-19 lockdowns, but we have been able to witness adaptability. One of the most logical ways to end sexual discrimination and harassment is to champion the full participation of women in the workplace. If we cannot do that at the highest levels of government here, then what is the point of us?

Until we make it clear that the South Australian parliament is one that values women—many of whom are currently, have been or will be, mothers of small children—then women will not become magically valued in the absence of this practice. This change cannot be done incrementally. It cannot be half hearted, and an immediate start would be to, as the report recommends, make it possible for mothers and fathers—and fathers—to breast and bottle feed babies in this chamber. Who knows, perhaps having some real-life babies in this building rather than just some overgrown ones might actually foster that human empathy that seems to be lacking in our leadership.

In a previous parliament, I was shouted down by a former President for pointing out that we did not allow infant children or their parents in this chamber to be on the floor in the case of a particular division. One of my colleagues, as she faced the difficulty of juggling having a small child and a ringing bell, was put in an awkward position and I raised it at the time as an absence of an inclusive workplace. At the time, I was shouted at. Indeed, by pointing out the problem you are often cast as the problem in this place.

But believe me, in the new-found conversions of those whom I have seen at the rally on Monday to see this place purged of sexism, of sexual harassment and arcane practices, to become a place that is less suited to paid-up members of The Adelaide Club and far more representative of a diverse democracy, I have seen their hypocrisy and it has felt suffocating, but at least it shows we can actually change.

Cultural change is actually quite easy to institute, even the cultural practice of sexual harassment and, yes, it is very much a practice, despite some people's insistence on believing these things to be innate. I point to two examples of the world leadership Australia has shown in reducing harm and how it is quite simple to instil different values and behaviours in the community despite them challenging the cultural norms of the time.

In 1970, the state government of Victoria introduced legislation to require the compulsory wearing of seatbelts. They were the first government in what we would call the Western world to do so. This was met with horror, but within 14 months the rest of Australia had followed suit and within seven years seatbelt wearing rates had increased to 90 per cent in our community. Who knows how many lives have been saved as a result of Victoria's then zero tolerance approach to ensuring cultural change.

Similarly, state-based campaigns to curb smoking have been enormously effective. In 1999, the South Australian parliament enforced a ban on all indoor dining areas. By 2004, amendments to the Tobacco Products Regulation Act 1997 saw smoking banned in all enclosed public places, workplaces and shared areas. Did the public love it? Not so much. At the time there was a visceral level of outrage. 'You can't ban smoking in restaurants,' they said. 'People love to smoke after a meal,' they said, but they adapted and quickly.

When smoking was banned inside pubs and clubs five years later, the response was similarly incensed but then accepted. 'You can't ban smoking in pubs,' they cried. 'People love a cigarette with a drink. You are infringing on their rights. This is a nanny state.' But they did adapt. If one were to stroll down Rundle Mall right now and pop into a coffee shop or a pub, order a drink and then light up a cigarette inside, not only would they be swiftly interrupted and told to put it out but the people around them would look on in horror because it is simply not done anymore. It was something as pervasive as sexual harassment continues to be in this place, but sexual harassment is also something that we can change with a zero tolerance approach.

I have to ask, as do many millions of women around this country, why it seems so much more impossible to adapt cultural thinking around sexual and discriminatory harassment than it does to smoking or wearing seatbelts. They cause harm. Sexual harassment and sexism causes harm. I cannot understand why one would want to perpetuate the presence of sexual harassment. It makes you scratch your head and wonder, 'Is sexual harassment that enjoyable for the perpetrators?'

The logical answer at the moment seems to be yes. If the body responsible for creating the legislation in this state includes among its number people who enjoy harming others through sexual and discriminatory harassment, then we do have a big problem but it is a problem that we can change. But I have to tell you, Mr President, it is not enjoyable for the victims and the survivors.

It was not enjoyable for me. It was never enjoyable for me, not a single one of the times when I, like so many women in this place, experienced insults or rumours. There have been cracks about karaoke. Tweets with representations of vaginas come to mind, and they are certainly not covered in this report. But the accounts in this report brought back many other instances, more minor perhaps than that. They came back into my mind as I read through these pages because these are all of our stories and the experiences in these pages are actually shared by far too many of us.

My experience is that of many of my political friends both in my own party and across the aisle. It is not enjoyable for those of us who want to go to work and to move through this world without fear of being shoved right back up against the sexist spectrum once again by men, because it is mostly men, reminding us how, in one way or another, at the end of the day, they rule the roost.

It seems at this stage that men do rule the roost in this Parliament House and the federal one. At the end of the day we are being told, either overtly or implicitly, that this house is not a place for us. A woman's place is in the house, the upper and the lower, but this is a parliament that has the least representation of women in the entire nation. While that is changing and improving, I think that has added much to the culture of this place.

I am tired and I am angry, just like the women were on Monday when they took to the streets. I am so angry at the treatment of women that some days in this place I feel it difficult to breathe. I watched how Jasmeen Kaur's body was found in the Flinders Ranges in the last two weeks, and I am angry that we see women stalked and not taken seriously. I am angry that in this house of power and legislation we see women treated with disrespect and sexism and not taken seriously.

If women who are privileged enough to work in this place, Parliament House, of all places, cannot expect to be free from or protected from this sexism and sexual harassment, where can any woman in this nation feel safe? What message are we sending to the promising young women coming up through our ranks about their prospects and what they can expect? More importantly, what message are we confirming to those promising young boys, the inheritors and often the gatekeepers of power, that will let them know just how little it belongs to them?

Indeed, it appears that this house has not been for us as women, but it is time that all women and men in political parties stop keeping the secrets of sexual harassment and sexism. Those secrets are not our shame, they are the perpetrators' shame. Whether it is in your party, in your faction or in this parliament, a woman's place is in the house and that house must be safe for all of us.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (16:56): I too rise to speak on the Review of Harassment in the South Australian Parliament Workplace undertaken by the South Australian Equal Opportunity Commission. The report clearly outlined that there is a culture of unacceptable behaviour within this workplace that has the effect of working to the detriment of women employees in this workplace, whether they be members, staffers, clerks, parliamentary service officers, cleaners or catering staff.

Within the first page of the report the acting commissioner gives a scathing appraisal of this place when she stated:

There are some fundamental gaps in policy, training and complaints practices that, if addressed, will make a significant difference in preventing and responding to harassment.

It is clear that changing practices, procedures and policies will assist with the objective of working towards creating culture change. The acting commissioner identified:

...strong leadership in driving workplace standards and an emphasis on systems that shift responsibility away from victims and place the onus on leaders to respond effectively is crucial.

From the participation of workers completing the survey the commissioner was able to provide a statistical report that identified the basis of their findings. The report found that 27.1 per cent of workers surveyed had experienced sexual harassment within the workplace, and that 31.6 per cent reported having experienced offensive comments or jokes made about a personal attribute contrary to equal opportunity legislation. Further, 77.8 per cent of those who had experienced sexual harassment did not report the instances.

It must be noted that not all in this place participated in the survey and, further, that past employees were not actively approached to participate. It would not be presumptuous to assume that there are many who in all probability have left this workplace because of harassment. Statistics are one measure of the extent of the problem. The stories told by the participants are more important. One participant stated:

The culture is rotten. There is a hierarchical view of management from the political to the staff to the staffers of parliamentarians. The culture says if you want to advance you just put up with behaviour that wouldn't be tolerated anywhere else.

Another said:

I have worked in many workplaces prior to parliament—and it is the worst. I have seen staff be directly harassed, physically assaulted and treated like 'property'.

Another said:

The parliamentary workplace is a toxic environment as most of the power sits with the MPs and staff will harass other staff as part of a way to get ahead and be viewed better by the party and the member.

These stories reflect the human and social cost of these discriminatory practices. They show the true cost of what working in politics takes. So that the choice for women is to suffer in silence or report instances and jeopardise their career prospects or walk away with the hope that the next workplace will not be as toxic as the one they have been in.

It was not surprising that many assumed that political priorities took precedence over the safety and welfare of individuals. The experience of women in parliament is further exacerbated by employment practices. Many women in parliament are employed on a casual or contract basis. This impacts on their vulnerability as women and as workers.

I accept that parliament is a complex workplace; however, this parliament cannot be above the law. This cannot be taken as a political matter. This issue crosses party lines. It affects everyone in the workplace. If it is used as a political issue it is to the detriment of all women in this place. Some will, and have, struck back with, 'Well, you knew what you were getting into.' Being elected to this place does not mean that we lose our voice, identity, dignity and rights. It should mean the opposite. We cannot hide behind the political shield of this as politics. The women in this workplace no longer accept this rhetoric. The public certainly do not either and expect a higher standard of best practice.

Over 100,000 people, mostly women, marched across Australia to voice their concerns and demand an end to gender discrimination, harassment and abuse, and thousands were here in South Australia. Their demands have been met with deflection and attack from the Morrison government. To draw an analogy of our peaceful protest in a democratic country with protesters who live under oppressive and undemocratic regimes being shot is no comparison. It seems the Morrison government would prefer that harassment and abuse remain in private and outside of public discourse.

Speakers at the Adelaide rally spoke about how the power imbalance between men and women and patriarchal and misogynistic structures are deeply rooted within social constructs, laws and institutions within our society. Everything works to prevent women from gaining a level playing field and, as one speaker said, these imbalances and abuses date back to colonial times. As Michele O'Neil said:

Don't think you have or you will get away with it. We know you. We know your name. We know every grope, every insult, every rape. We know you.

As women collectively, 'We know you,' and after reading the report, we know you better. Quite frankly, we did not need this report to tell us what we already know and have been talking about ad infinitum. For those who are oblivious to what is happening under our noses, or claim to not know what is going on, firstly, I am not sure you are spending enough time in this place and, secondly, you may very well be part of the problem, and, thirdly, you need to be part of the solution.

Your complacency perpetuates the status quo and does nothing to assist in rectifying the problems. Our community expects better of us, and parliament can no longer operate like this. Regardless of whether we need this report, we now have recommendations that need to be implemented. It is obvious some have not and will not read the report. To assist some of our members who are not inclined or do not have time to read the report, I would like to list the 16 recommendations.

Recommendation 1: that the South Australian government form a centralised human resources function—the people and culture section—to provide services across the parliamentary workplace, including the development of a workplace training program, a performance management framework, the development of human resource policies and practices, induction and exit practices, a wellbeing framework that includes supporting staff in electorate offices, and other functions as recommended by the review.

Recommendation 2: that the people and culture section develop a strategy to increase diversity across the parliamentary workforce and to create a culture that values inclusivity.

Recommendation 3: to ensure flexible work practices that support inclusivity operate across the parliamentary workplace.

Recommendation 4: that the people and culture section develop sexual and discriminatory harassment policies to apply across the whole parliamentary workplace.

Recommendation 5: that the people and culture section develops training for all members of parliament and staff in the parliamentary workplace aimed at increasing participants' awareness of sexual harassment and discriminatory harassment and induction materials for all newly commencing members of parliament and staff in the parliamentary workplace, covering off on relevant policies, procedures and complaint processes related to sexual and discriminatory harassment.

Recommendation 6: that the houses commit to leading cultural change within the parliamentary workplace.

Recommendation 7: that each political party implement and actively promote internal policies regarding sexual and discriminatory harassment which set behavioural expectations of party members and provide robust procedures and sanctions to respond to complaints of harassment.

Recommendation 8: that the people and culture section prepare a framework to be implemented across the parliamentary workplace which includes a behavioural code requiring that all staff in the parliamentary workplace act in a respectful and safe manner, and associated processes to govern allegations of breaches of the code and a range of sanctions where a breach is established.

Recommendation 9: that the people and culture section develop complaint procedures that apply across the parliamentary workplace in relation to sexual harassment and discriminatory harassment.

Recommendation 10: that the people and culture section establishes contact officers across the parliamentary workplace, suitably trained to provide confidential support and information on reporting options to employees experiencing or witnessing harassment, and ensures victims of

harassment are aware of and have access to ongoing counselling services with the expertise appropriate to the type of harassment experienced.

Recommendation 11: that the Attorney-General consider amendments to the Equal Opportunity Act 1984.

Recommendation 12: that the houses introduce a code of conduct for members of parliament.

Recommendation 13: that the people and culture section develop work health and safety policies, procedures and training to assist persons conducting a business undertaking and other duty holders in the parliamentary workplace to meet their work health and safety duties in relation to psychological hazards arising from sexual and discriminatory harassment.

Recommendation 14: that the houses of parliament support a compliance audit by SafeWork SA across the parliamentary workplace, to be conducted within two years of the date of this report, with a focus on the health and safety risks arising from psychological hazards including those arising from sexual and discriminatory harassment.

Recommendation 15: that the Attorney-General consider a referral to the South Australian Law Reform Institute to review the benefits of amending the Equal Opportunity Act 1984 to provide that employers have a positive obligation to prevent workplace sexual harassment and unlawful harassment and that the equal opportunity commissioner is provided with powers to enforce that obligation and investigate systemic unlawful discrimination, including systemic sexual harassment.

Recommendation 16: that within three years of the date of this report the houses initiate a review of the implementation of recommendations made in this report and their effect on culture and practice in relation to sexual harassment and discriminatory harassment.

It is not enough to implement these recommendations. These recommendations do not comment on the personal responsibility members have to change their behaviour. We need members to commit to programs of prevention and a change of culture. While we remain complacent, this behaviour continues to ruin lives. Let us not be fooled, this behaviour did not begin at a crossbench Christmas party. It was happening before, and it has certainly been continuing to happen after the Christmas party.

I look forward to all the recommendations being implemented and members actively looking at themselves and this parliament to ensure a safe, healthy and egalitarian workplace for all. If you disagree and you are not with us on this, stand aside.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE ACT REGULATIONS

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

That the general regulations under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 concerning the Planning and Development Fund (No. 4), made on 18 February 2021 and laid on the table of this council on 2 March 2021, be disallowed.

(Continued from 3 March 2021.)

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (17:12): I will echo the Hon. Mr Parnell: we know what to do and we know how to do it. I am tempted to sit down and leave it at that, but I will, just for completeness, briefly outline why Labor supports this motion. This motion is to disallow the general regulations made under the Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. As we have said before—and before and before again—these regulations will allow the Minister for Planning to use funds from the Planning and Development Fund to prop up failed planning reforms.

Under the current act, applicants who create new developments are required to pay into the Planning and Development Fund; this is to enable projects to be undertaken to improve the public realm. The fund is for projects to make streets and suburbs more liveable by developing reserves, planting trees, constructing water harvesting projects and building playgrounds, but instead this government wants it to be diverted to prop up the mismanaged planning reforms and e-planning

system—the reform process that has been plagued by a series of crises that have led to massive staff resignations, missed deadlines and massive budget blowouts.

So it is not surprising that the Marshall government wants to cover up its failure and is therefore trying to raid other budget lines. However, raiding those budget lines is not in any way going to improve the quality and the amenity of our communities. The funds are supposed to be to improve the conservation, enhancement and enjoyment of public open spaces and to provide communities access to quality green public open space for positive health and wellbeing outcomes.

The Hon. Mr Parnell reflected in a very timely way on how much COVID-19 and restrictions that have been in place have made us value even more these open spaces, these green spaces. They are appreciated even more by members of our state. So Labor will not support the open space fund being plundered by the planning minister to prop up the budget shortfall in the development and implementation of the planning code, which is why we will support this disallowance.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (17:14): On behalf of the Treasurer, can I say that this is groundhog day. We will be opposing this motion.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Parnell to conclude the debate. I can predict some of the words he is going to use probably.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (17:14): Honourable members, you know what this is and you know what to do. This is the sixth time we have disallowed these regulations, and I will leave it at that. I thank the Labor Party and the crossbench for their support, and I appreciate that we have the numbers. I fully expect these regulations to be back in the *Government Gazette* tomorrow, and I expect that we will be disallowing them again the following Wednesday of sitting.

Motion carried.

Bills

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE (BAN ON HUNTING PROTECTED ANIMALS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:15): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:16): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise to speak on this bill to ban duck hunting in South Australia. I do so knowing that this weekend when, despite ongoing opposition from the community, the open season for duck hunting will begin, spanning from 20 March to 27 June 2021.

From a small volunteer group through to the RSPCA, along with the broader South Australian communities, there is much support for this duck killing to end. For many of us, the introduction to these birds, these ducks, comes when we are young children: in our storybooks, in cartoons and in real life at the edges of lakes and rivers. We are encouraged to adore and make connections with them. We go to feed the ducks at our local park or pond with our grandparents and remember those times very fondly. Juxtaposed with this, of course, each year for several months in South Australia the ducks that many of us are raised to adore are being killed, maimed and traumatised.

Tragically, our ministers for environment, who can end the killing and help us reconnect with wild birdlife in kinder ways, have chosen not to. Those who spend their life working to save wild ducks are disappointed year after year, while the general public asks, 'Are we still doing this?' It beggars belief that our government is choosing to perpetuate another so-called sport based on the suffering of animals. Duck hunting is a relic of our past and, frankly, that is where it should remain.

In 1996, the then Director of National Parks of South Australia accepted as a reasonable estimate that one duck was wounded for every duck bagged. However, as indicated in 2018 report from the Animal Justice Party, it is the more accurate duck shooters who wound rather than kill more

ducks than shooters who cannot shoot straight. Their aim might be more accurate, but they often fail to kill ducks outright and poor shooters actually do not usually get close enough to wound the ducks.

This fact often surprises people, as many would think—and I think it is a natural assumption—that these hunters are firing a single bullet one at a time to try to kill a duck. That is simply not the case. Ducks are shot with shotguns, sometimes called scatterguns. They fire 100 to 200 pellets a time and, depending on size—these are not single bullets—many ducks will be hit but keep flying, not to mention the potential collateral damage for the other species in the air who are often caught in that crossfire.

Pellets have a similar diameter to a roofing nail, so when they are driven into the body of a duck they will cause extreme pain and suffering. They can break wings, legs and beaks. Given the size of ducks and the speed at which they fly, they may be hit by only one or two pellets, which is often not enough to kill them.

Those ducks that are shot and injured severely enough to bring them down may die slow and painful deaths if the shooters do not retrieve them. If they are retrieved, hunters will often break their necks to kill them by swinging their bodies around and around, otherwise they might throw the wounded ducks to their dogs to finish them off. They, of course, can do nothing and simply allow them to struggle until they die from these injuries.

In mainland Australia, South Australia and Victoria are the only states left that allow this blood sport to continue. Western Australia banned duck shooting 30 years ago, with the then Premier of WA, Dr Carmen Lawrence, summing-up the archaic nature of blood sports in these terms:

Our community has reached a stage of enlightenment where it can no longer accept the institutionalised killing of native birds for recreation.

I fail to see that WA is so much more enlightened than South Australia. Indeed, I think it is just our parliament that has not reached that level of enlightenment. It is community expectation that this cruelty should have been ended in the last century rather than continue into this century.

The WA bans were followed by similar ones in New South Wales in 1995 and in Queensland in 2005. So here we are, not just years but decades behind some of those states. In Victoria, duck shooting is permitted on public lands and many volunteer rescuers and veterinarians risk their safety to rescue those injured and maimed ducks that the hunters leave to die in agony.

In South Australia, shooting is permitted on private land, so there is no supervision and rescuers will be arrested for simply going onto those private wetlands to try to save those birds. In the words of Laurie Levy, a long-term campaigner to stop duck shooting in Victoria, from his own eyewitness experience:

Duck shooting is not a sport. It is a cowardly, violent, antisocial act. Sport is an equal contest between humans, such as football, hockey, tennis, athletics, etc. Waterbirds cannot defend themselves let alone fight back against shooters armed with powerful weapons, dogs, whistles and decoys. It is a one-sided cowardly activity.

I introduce this bill today noting that, over 10 years ago, now Premier Marshall was on *Hansard* representing his electorate of Norwood calling on the then state government to 'immediately undertake a parliamentary inquiry into duck and quail hunting in South Australia'. Indeed, he stated further:

If the reports about these slow and painful deaths are true then they are at odds with the law set out in the Animal Welfare Act 1985.

The then member for Norwood, now Premier, went on to say:

I strongly support the right of those opposed to duck and quail hunting in South Australia to a thorough inquiry to establish the facts.

So what is stopping the Marshall government, now in office, from taking decisive action to do just that? Members of the South Australian community are distressed that this continues to happen and that our Minister for Environment, who does have the power to put this barbaric practice to an end, continues to allow for it to happen each year. They write to the minister only to be fobbed off with responses like the one following:

In considering an open season, I seek an appropriate balance between the ecological value of waterfowl and the social and cultural values of the people; and in doing so also ensure that the conservation status of game bird and other species, and the welfare of animals, is protected. An open season is declared only if environmental conditions permit, and it is based on a set of open season conditions which include measures to address animal welfare concerns.

I cannot imagine how this can actually be the case if we consider that our country burned while enduring its hottest and driest year on record in 2020, yet Minister Speirs still gave the go-ahead for that year's kill. What social and cultural values do shooters have that allowed them to carry on their shoot in defiance of one of the most extensive ecological and health crises that this land has yet faced?

I ask again: why are we perpetuating this barbaric blood sport? Further, what sort of social benefit does the government think is achieved by allowing people to hunt and shoot defenceless ducks? In the state government's glossy marketing of killing animals, entitled *Modern Hunting in South Australia*, Mr Tony Sharley, Chairman of CHASA, in his foreword lists 'maintaining mental health and wellbeing' as a benefit of hunting. If hunters and shooters are faced with genuine mental health issues, then ongoing support is needed, not a binge of killing.

During a protest against duck hunting last week, one of the protesters outside on Parliament House steps made an excellent point. He said, 'A rifle in the hands of a person who needs to kill to feel better is not my idea of prescription medication or a therapeutic program.' I could not agree more. How many ducks does that mean would need to be killed each year to maintain the mental health balance of these hunters?

Unlike Mr Sharley's doubtful claims, what I do believe is that there are more mental health benefits from caring for animals than from callously taking their lives. Equally, I have no doubt that volunteer wildlife rescuers and carers, as well as veterinarians, are more likely to suffer from mental health problems, especially in the aftermath of that 2019-20 conflagration that swept this country, from having to care for the wounded animals.

I would like to offer the following quote from a South Australian vet who has been involved in duck rescues in both South Australia and Victoria:

There is no way to humanely shoot a flying animal. I have personally tried to care for ducks with their wings blown off, with bones sticking out, I have watched them quietly await death as if they would welcome it compared to the pain they are in. I have x-rayed many and shown the wounds that we see are only part of it, that many have pellets from previous years still embedded in their muscles. I have treated all the legal and illegal species and the species itself doesn't matter. What united all of them was the pain and suffering that they were experiencing.

Local, national and, eventually, international tourists wanting to visit natural beauty areas like the Coorong or Poocher reserve near Bordertown over Easter are probably going to be shocked to learn that they need to be prepared to hear gunfire while visiting these scenic holiday destinations. They may need to be warned that their families may come across dead or injured birds while out walking along the waterfront.

So there is not even an argument, in terms of tourism benefits, for keeping duck hunting in our state of South Australia. Indeed, its very presence can often be a deterrent when tourists learn that their idyllic visit may be interrupted by the sound of gunshots in the distance. The community has strong feelings about this and a South Australian ReachTEL poll conducted earlier this year found that over 70 per cent of respondents were deterred from visiting an area where shooters were present, that they wanted duck and quail hunting stopped and that they would support their local MP to push for this.

With that in mind, I hope we can say that the 2021 duck hunting season will be the last one in our state. There is a lack of community support for duck hunting to continue. It does not benefit our society. It causes untold harm to ducks and other wildlife, and it is certainly not a sport; it is recreational cruelty and we must put an end to it. With that, I commend the bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

Parliamentary Committees

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION BILL

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:29): I move:

That the report of the committee be noted.

I rise today to speak to the report of the Joint Committee on the Social Workers Registration Bill 2018. It feels like we, along with this bill, have been on a long journey since 2018. The committee has met with and heard from so many people and organisations with regard to the registration of social workers. The hearings and evidence provided were invaluable, and I believe that the report before us today in this council, and the amended draft bill, which I will discuss later, are better and richer for the time and effort so many people have put into this process.

I would like to acknowledge my colleagues who were also on this committee: the Hon. Connie Bonaros MLC; the member for Hurtle Vale, Nat Cook MP; the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos MLC; the member for Adelaide and Minister for Child Protection, the Hon. Rachel Sanderson MP; the now Speaker but then simply member for Heysen, the Hon. Josh Teague MP; and the Hon. Russell Wortley MLC. My particular thanks go to the committee secretary, Ms Leslie Guy, and our research officer, Ms Sue Markotic. I would also like to give my thanks to the Australian Association of Social Workers and, in particular, their CEO, Cindy Smith, for all the advice and information that they have provided to me and to the committee over these years.

Over the past 20 years, numerous state inquiries have called for the registration of social workers. In the ongoing campaign for the registration of social workers I must also thank and acknowledge the Australian Association of Social Workers for their work during this period of time. As has been reflected on many times and indeed during the initial debate on this bill for social worker registration, and during the committee process, it would be preferable to have a national registration scheme for social workers. However, for one reason or another, this has not yet been the case and it is now I think time for South Australia to consider the matter of leadership quite significantly in this area.

The AASW have not been alone in their call to register social workers. The current Marshall government promised this reform in its 2018 election platform, and the former Labor government were also interested in this reform. It has been called for in the Layton report, in the Children in State Care Commission of Inquiry, and it was called for in the inquest into the death of Chloe Valentine. It has been a long time coming, but I am optimistic that with the findings and the work of this report we can see real reform and leadership finally happening and, I hope, happening here in South Australia.

Social workers do incredible work each and every day and I want to recognise that work. They provide invaluable support and services to some of the most vulnerable people in our society. Social workers represent one of the largest professional working groups in Australia, but they have no formal registration requirements. They practice in a range of health and welfare settings, with the three main areas being mental health, health and child protection. They work with some of our community's most challenging and most complex social problems, yet there is no regulation in the entire country that prevents an unqualified person from calling themselves a social worker.

Social workers can of course join the AASW; however, membership is voluntary. In the financial year 2018-19 one-quarter of complaints the AASW received that were made against social workers could not be progressed because the social workers these complaints were made against did not have that AASW membership. Disturbingly, the committee also heard that some social workers had withdrawn their membership of the AASW at the point of a complaint having been made to avoid any further scrutiny.

Even if a complaint or disciplinary matter is upheld, the penalties are quite limited. Even if a person is precluded from membership of the AASW, there is no power to stop them from continuing to identify as a social worker. There may be some further oversight in certain situations by the Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner or by the Ombudsman, but the committee heard that these bodies only have recommendatory powers. This is simply not good enough. Overall, the AASW, as the professional body representing social workers throughout Australia, has over a long period of time maintained that the statutory registration of social workers is the preferred pathway to achieving adequate professional standards for the social work profession.

All of this makes it clear to me, and seemed to make it clear to the committee, that we should introduce legislation in South Australia for the registration of social workers. We found that in the absence of a federal determination towards the registration of social workers, a state level

registration scheme was generally supported and seen as a very important first step. Certainly, most submissions the committee received agreed that registration would, amongst other things:

- improve public safety, strength and confidence in the social work profession;
- improve accountability;
- ensure appropriate qualifications and practice standards were upheld;
- define safe and competent scopes of practice;
- ensure continuing professional social work development and education; and
- establish a profession-specific complaints and disciplinary process with a public record of registered and deregistered persons.

While we could be leaders in Australia through implementing social work registration, it is worth noting that compared to the English-speaking world we are lagging far behind.

In particular, I would like to note that across the ditch in New Zealand they have had a voluntary registration scheme there since 2003. It became a mandated system in 2019. I would also like to take this moment to thank Ms Lucy Sandford-Reed, who is the chief executive of the Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers, for the evidence and information she provided to our committee with regard to the New Zealand legislation. The United Kingdom also requires registration of social workers through the Health and Care Professions Council. Canada and the USA also have registration schemes.

Something that was made quite clear to the committee was that only those who hold recognised social work qualifications should be included in the registration scheme, and the committee agreed that, in particular, only qualifications accredited by the AASW should be eligible for registration. However we did hear, as well, that there are many people out there currently practising as social workers who have been doing so for quite a long time, and that people are understandably concerned that registration would mean they would be unable to keep their jobs.

The new draft bill, therefore, allows for a transitional period, similar to that operating in New Zealand, to allow those who are already employed in the public sector as social workers but who are without the requisite qualifications to be assessed to demonstrate that they are appropriately skilled and competent for registration. The amended bill allows for the Social Workers Registration Board to develop an experience-based pathway for those social workers without formal qualifications but who have extensive practical experience.

The committee considers this experience-based pathway particularly important as we found that excluding, for example, Aboriginal workers from a registration scheme solely on the basis that they did not have formal tertiary qualifications not only disrespects their extensive work experience and cultural competencies but also serves to further disadvantage those families and communities with whom they have worked closely, and supported, over so many years. This bill also ensures that people are required to hold AASW accredited qualifications to be eligible for registration, ensuring that social workers have gained an appropriate degree before they can practise.

Social workers are also now required to be 'fit and proper' persons to be eligible for registration. In recognition of the fact that social workers provide support to and work with a range of vulnerable groups, including both children and adults, the draft bill amended as part of this report we have discussed today now includes a broadening of the reference to 'working with children checks' to include other relevant screening checks. It now also includes a requirement for a national police certificate to be included as part of the application for registration.

I will not go through all the recommendations today and the subsequent amendments, because they are explained in this report, but I highly recommend that all members of this council read it. We do know that registration in and of itself will not ensure safe and effective social work practices, but it is a critical step towards protecting vulnerable people in our state and ensuring that we have consistent standards and practices amongst social workers. I will quote from the submission made by the AASW to our committee. It states:

Statutory registration provides a systemic response and is much needed because: it sets and protects professional education and practice standards; it defines safe and competent scopes of practice; it ensures qualification and fitness to practise checks prior to practise; it requires minimum continuing professional development for practitioners; and it establishes a profession specific complaints and disciplinary process with a public record of registered and deregistered persons.

Through this process, and based on the advice and information provided to us by those who came before the committee, we now have a new draft bill attached to the back of this report. The committee has also made 20 recommendations following its inquiry into the bill, which has resulted in an amended draft bill. The final recommendation of the committee is that:

Subject to the above amendments the Committee recommends that the Social Workers Registration Bill 2018 be passed.

I will not speak for much longer but I would like to draw everyone's attention to the concluding statements of the committee:

In the absence of a federal scheme, submissions to the inquiry overwhelmingly expressed support for a state-based system of registration. The Committee notes that registration will not, in and of itself, automatically ensure safe and effective social work practice. The recent coronial inquests, while calling for social work registration, have been critical of, among other things, the child protection system's lack of understanding of, and compliance with, its statutory obligations. Notwithstanding, the Committee is of the view that the legislative reform is urgently needed. It considers that the proposed legislation will provide a solid framework towards improving the accountability and standards of the social work profession.

When I introduced the originating bill back in 2018, I said at the time that I was doing so with great excitement and positivity, and I hope that it will continue to be viewed in a collaborative spirit in this place. I believe that we have really seen that collaborative spirit through the committee process and because of that I think we have a very strong report with a draft bill that could be carried forward following on from the acceptance of this report.

I know that some people have been keeping an eye on the work of this committee from well beyond South Australia's borders, and indeed right across the country there is that same sense of excitement and positivity. I hope that in South Australia we can, in the absence of a federal scheme, take this important step forward and start legislating for the registration of social workers in our state. I commend the report.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

Bills

VOLUNTARY ASSISTED DYING BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 December 2020.)

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (17:42): I rise to speak on the Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill 2020. I advise the council that this bill is a conscience vote for government members and accordingly I speak for myself alone. I have not supported any of the euthanasia bills that have come before the parliament since I was appointed to the Legislative Council in 2006. While I will be supporting the second reading of this bill I will consider my position on the third reading after the completion of the committee stage.

I do not come to the bill with a fundamental opposition to euthanasia. I would describe myself as a person who is conservative on euthanasia rather than a person who is opposed to euthanasia in principle. As a liberal, I accept the right of every individual to personal autonomy, including the right to make end-of-life decisions. While my Christian faith teaches me that euthanasia is not an option for me, in a pluralist society other people will hold differing views and should have the freedom to live their lives according to their values and their moral codes, as long as their actions do not cause harm to others.

Society, and each individual within it, has a strong interest in making sure that euthanasia does not become a cloak for murder. As a House of Lords Select Committee on Medical Ethics put

it in 1994, 'Society's prohibition on intentional killing is the cornerstone of law and of social relationships.' The prohibition protects each of us impartially, embodying the belief that all are equal. By acts of omission and acts of commission people can already act to hasten their own death. People can already choose to do so by not taking food and drink, by not consenting to necessary medical treatment or by taking their own life by other means.

Voluntary assisted dying is fundamentally different because it involves the state allowing certain third parties to hasten death directly or indirectly without fear of action being taken against them. In considering this bill, we need to ask ourselves whether it is reasonable for a citizen to expect that the state will take active steps to support them to hasten death.

Of course, the key factor that turns assisted suicide or voluntary assisted dying into murder is the will of the person who dies as a result of the act. The first test for any euthanasia legislation is whether it provides strong confidence that medical assistance in dying will not be administered without the consent of the subject. Are we sure that the person who will die as a result of voluntary assisted dying wants to die? We also need to be sure that the intention is enduring. We want to protect people from transient desires. This bill puts in place a process that in my view provides sufficient assurance that the person's intention to terminate their life is clear, voluntary and enduring.

The desire also needs to be well founded. I do not consider that it is reasonable for a citizen to expect that the state will take active steps to support them to hasten their death in any and every circumstance. This bill says that the state will only provide voluntary assisted dying in the context of imminent death. The person needs to be in the last six to 12 months of a terminal illness. Previous bills put before the South Australian parliament have proposed too broad and subjective tests for eligibility. In my view the threshold in this bill is sufficiently clear and appropriately narrow.

Since the parliament last considered euthanasia legislation the context has fundamentally changed. If the Parliament of South Australia had passed previous bills, we would have been the first jurisdiction in Australia to have legislated for voluntary assisted dying. If we pass this bill, we are likely to be joining four other states who are moving to legally allow voluntary assisted dying. Three of those states have already legislated, and Queensland is well advanced.

This changes the context of our deliberations, because we now need to consider issues of equity of access to health services. Not putting in place a voluntary assisted dying regime would deny South Australians access to a health service which is becoming available to a majority of Australians. Let me be clear that access is a factor; it is not determinative. In my view, it is better not to have access to a health service than to have access to the service under a flawed law.

The changed context—the wave of voluntary assisted dying legislation in a relatively short period—also gives our nation an unprecedented opportunity to establish nationally consistent legislation in a very sensitive area of health law. The voluntary assisted dying laws enacted or emerging in other states are very similar to each other, drawing in particular on Canadian legislation. They are so similar that I think it is fair to describe all of them as reflecting the Australian model.

The Australian model of voluntary assisted dying laws shares a number of core elements. The Queensland Law Reform Commission summarised those elements as follows:

- eligibility requirements that limit access to competent adults with a diagnosed disease, illness or medical condition that is advanced and progressive, will cause death and involves intolerable suffering;
- limitations on access to voluntary assisted dying based on the adults' voluntary and enduring requests;
- independent assessments of eligibility by two suitably qualified and experienced medical practitioners;
- the right of conscientious objections by health practitioners;
- providing for self-administration of a voluntary assisted dying substance or, in limited circumstances, administration by a medical practitioner;

- oversight provisions including reporting obligations, monitoring by a review board and tribunal review of certain decisions; and
- a period after enactment but before commencement of the legislation to prepare for implementation.

I think it is helpful for patients, for clinicians and for regulatory bodies if the laws in an area of law such as this are similar across Australian jurisdictions. Consistency would support access, it would support quality and safe practice and it would reduce the pressure for what is sometimes called medical tourism.

I support South Australia joining our sister states in enacting the Australian model of voluntary assisted dying. In that context, I want to be clear on my general stance in relation to amendments. I think that the basic framework of the bill is sound and should be supported. I think there is significant value in national consistency of voluntary assisted dying legislation.

Accordingly, I indicate to the council that I will only support amendments to the bill that do not undermine close national consistency, and I will not support the third reading of the bill if the bill is amended in committee in a way that does not maintain close national consistency. The sponsors of this bill may well get majority support for this bill without my support, but they should be in no doubt that I will not support the bill at the third reading if significant changes are made.

Within the Australian model, different jurisdictions have made different calls on what I would call secondary issues, for example, whether to allow the use of telehealth. I am willing to consider amendments on secondary issues, but I am not willing to consider amendments that amend the primary elements of the model. Further, I am open to amendments that adjust the Australian model for the South Australian context. As the Queensland Law Reform Commission put it:

Caution is required in drawing comparisons and guidance from legislation adopted in jurisdictions with different legal and health care systems.

It goes on to state:

It is also important to ensure that the draft legislation is well adapted to Queensland's specific needs.

That statement is just as true of South Australia. One area where I think the bill does need to be adapted is to clarify the relationship between restorative care, palliative care and assisted dying. In particular, this is important in South Australia. In my view, we have superior legislation supporting consent to medical treatment and palliative care, and I would not want this bill to undermine that law.

If I could beg the forbearance of the council, I would like to quote a relatively large section of the recent University of Tasmania report that addressed the legal status of the double effect principle arising in palliative care. The report stated:

Elsewhere in this report (Section 6.6), consideration has been given to the provision of palliative care in Australia and its relationship with VAD. For the purposes of this analysis, the focus is on the legal status of the doctrine of double effect in Australia with the aim of differentiating this from VAD.

The doctrine of double effect, which had its origins in moral theology, recognises that palliative medication administered to a patient with the intention of relieving pain and symptoms will be lawful even if that will have the unintended effect of hastening the patient's death.

Central to this doctrine is the focus on intention: provided the primary intention is to relieve pain and symptoms rather than to cause death, the doctrine holds that the medical practitioner or other authorised person administering palliative medication will not be criminally liable even where death was foreseen.

Based on the circumstances of the cases where this doctrine has been relied on, it is generally understood that the doctrine of double effect only applies to a person who is near death.

Palliative medication administered to a patient with the intention of relieving pain but which may hasten death is an accepted part of medical practice.

It is important that this is clearly differentiated from VAD, which involves the intentional assistance to bring about death at the request of the patient.

The critical distinction is intention; for palliative medication, the intention of the medical practitioner is to relieve pain, not to cause death. The consent of the patient is not a prerequisite; indeed, the patient may not be in a

position to consent. VAD, by contrast, involves the deliberate and intentional bringing about of the death of the patient at the patient's clear and explicit request further to the detailed substantive and procedural legislative requirements.

Whilst the doctrine of double effect is supported by case law in the UK (Adams Case) and other common law jurisdictions, there is no Australian authority directly on this issue. However, South Australia, Queensland and Western Australia have legislated to clarify the law in this area, providing that authorised persons who provide palliative medication will not be criminally liable provided that certain criteria specified in the legislation are met. Under the legislation of Queensland and Western Australia the palliative medication must have been provided in good faith, with reasonable skill and care, and be reasonable having regard to the person's state at the time and in the circumstances of the case (Criminal Code (Qld) s282A; Criminal Code (WA) s259). The South Australian legislation requires additionally that the person is in the terminal phase of a terminal illness and that the palliative medication is administered with the consent of the person or their representative (Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Act 1995 (SA) s17).

Further, the University of Tasmania report states:

In conclusion, even though practices that constitute this double effect and VAD are distinctly different, perhaps because of this very difference, legislation could be considered to clarify the double effect issue.

I advise the council that I intend to develop a set of amendments to seek to support the integrity of palliative care by differentiating it from assisted dying and protecting South Australia's laws on double effect. Current health law and practice, in particular in palliative care, in my view would benefit from enhanced clarity. Clinicians, patients and their families often conflate palliative care, double effect and euthanasia. This bill may also provide an opportunity to provide clarity. I also indicate that I am yet to consider possible further amendments.

I must admit that I am uncomfortable that this bill has not been the subject of detailed legal analysis in South Australia. Tasmania recently released the report commissioned by the University of Tasmania before they legislated. Queensland has commissioned a report from the Queensland Law Reform Commission, which is due to be finalised by 10 May. I would prefer that the committee stage of this bill did not progress until the QLRC report is available, but I will not be insisting on that. In conclusion, I reiterate that I will be supporting the second reading, I look forward to the committee stage of the bill, and I reserve my position on the third reading.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (17:57): I rise tonight to speak to the Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill. As with previous such bills, this is a matter of conscience for Labor members of this place. This bill represents, I think, perhaps the 17th attempt to have parliament allow voluntary assisted dying in certain circumstances. I have supported legislation for voluntary assisted dying each time it has come before the Legislative Council since I was first elected to this place in 2006—I think perhaps four or perhaps even five times—so it will surprise no-one here then to know that I will be supporting this bill as well.

In past debates, some members of parliament have expressed concerns about previous bills in regard to the lack of safeguards, or their view of sufficient safeguards, in various iterations of the legislation that has appeared before us. Concerns about misuse of the scheme have outweighed the community desire to allow death with dignity in the minds of many members over many years. That is why I would particularly like to acknowledge the Hon. Kyam Maher and the Hon. Mark Parnell for their approach in this bill. I understand that the bill before us is an almost direct translation of the successful Victorian legislation, which has been in operation in that state since 2019.

That scheme was described by Victorian Premier, Dan Andrews, as 'the safest and most conservative scheme in the world'. Whilst I am not often one to jump at supporting conservative approaches to anything, it is clear to me that the Victorian model is the one that perhaps may allow legislators in this place, and the other place as well, to adopt dignity in dying legislation, which we have not been able to do in the past. Certainly, we have passed it in this place, but it has fallen very narrowly in the other place.

I hope the approach adopted in this bill will get us over the line in the lower house. It will enable enough legislators to accept that we can allow people the dignity of choice in dying to alleviate extraordinary suffering at the end of life safely and with medical supervision and safeguarded by the law. This is a scheme that members of parliament and the wider community can have some confidence in. It has extensive safeguards, as I outlined. They include:

- the requirement that a person take it upon themselves to ask their doctor about voluntary assisted dying rather than having it offered;
- the requirement for assessment by two doctors to ensure a person meets the criteria for access to voluntary assisted dying;
- provisions that make clear that a person's request must be clear and unambiguous;
- that records be kept of that request and that a range of information must be given to the person about all of their end of life options; and
- a minimum time frame of at least nine days between the first request and the actual provision of a voluntary substance, unless a person's life expectancy is less than nine days.

This is a safe scheme. It is one that operates in Victoria well. It has been reviewed in Victoria and found to operate within the parameters that were set for it in the legislation. It has protections against coercion and misuse and, most importantly, it offers people dignity and choice when facing the end of their life, often in unimaginable, painful circumstances. For those reasons, I will be supporting this bill.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (18:01): I thank the Hon. Kyam Maher and the Hon. Mark Parnell for their continued work on voluntary assisted dying legislation and their advocacy on this issue. This is the 17th time legislation on voluntary assisted dying has come before this parliament. Fitting with our state's slow rate of dealing with social and human rights, South Australian laws have fallen behind and we have again failed to address the public's interest in this issue.

Over 80 per cent of South Australians agree that voluntary assisted dying should be legalised in South Australia. There is a nationwide call for voluntary assisted dying to be addressed. In 2017, the Victorian government was the first jurisdiction to pass legislation enabling voluntary assisted dying. Western Australia was next in 2019. Tasmania has followed suit in the last couple of months. In fact, the South Australian Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill is based upon the Victorian model of legislation. We are also aware that New South Wales and Queensland currently have active legislation on voluntary assisted dying.

The Joint Committee on End of Life Choices, established in 2019, was able to provide a thorough review of the Victorian legislation and analyse how implementation in South Australia could be done. Over 120 individual submissions and dozens of witnesses gave evidence to the committee. As to be expected, a range of views were given to the committee. Some were personal stories and views on the issue, others were considered, research-based evidence. No matter how protective or restrictive certain schemes were, some people who appeared before the committee were just opposed to voluntary assisted dying altogether.

Perhaps two of the most compelling submissions given to the committee were by the South Australia Police and the Coroner's office. Both wrote in support of voluntary assisted dying legislation. In January 2019 alone, 10 people took their own life as a result of a terminal illness. Of these deaths, many were in undignified circumstances, violent and often committed in isolation, which on occasion results in the death not becoming known to others for some time.

SAPOL acknowledges that VAD legislation will not provide for every circumstance, but to many individuals it would provide a dignified end to life. Around 10 per cent of suicides attended by first responders are of people who have chosen to take their own life because they are facing a terminal illness. This bill goes beyond giving a compassionate option to the person with a terminal illness but also affects first responders and families and friends, who are all connected to the person.

The committee also took evidence from multiple health professionals. Some of those health professionals practised in Victoria and regarded the Victorian model as restrictive, and worldwide considered to contain the most checks and balances. As stipulated within the Victorian legislation, the Victorian Voluntary Assisted Dying Review Board reviews systems and practices of VAD and releases public reports every six months. The board is currently overseen by former Supreme Court Justice, Betty King, and she has just handed down her third report. Each case satisfied the legislation,

and there was no evidence that VAD had been used for other than the purpose of ending one's life with dignity.

I note that the Hon. Stephen Wade has indicated he will be proposing amendments to the bill. I look forward to his contribution and to considering matters further. As this is a conscience vote, members will be compelled by their own experiences to shape their decision-making on this bill. Just as critical is the need for members to heed the views of their electorates. I support this bill in its totality and commit to voicing the views of 90 per cent of South Australians.

Contrary to some of the arguments that we have already heard, and heard before, this bill is not a bill to hasten death but a bill to alleviate the suffering of people who are in pain and whose death is imminent; they are already dying. There is no question that this is a serious issue, and this bill provides choice and relief for seriously and terminally ill citizens. However, it is not an obvious decision to make voluntary assisted dying legal in this state and, most importantly, to provide choice to those members in our community who are needlessly suffering at the end of their life with a terminal illness.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (18:06): I am not normally a person who likes to speak on social bills. I like to keep my thinking, where there is a conscience vote, to myself, because I am granted that ability. I want to speak here because I do not like this bill, and the reason I do not like the bill I will elaborate on in a minute. I appreciate that in here, commonly, there is the idea of political compromise, because that is sometimes how you get things done. What colours my dislike of this bill is that it seems exactly that, and a few speakers have gone to that already.

With a lot of people that I have spoken to about this bill there is a common concept that comes up that is pretty critical, which is time. Any person you have ever dealt with who is looking at ending their life is concerned about time, either not having enough or wanting to have a whole bunch less. More than that, all critical responders talk about time: nurses, doctors, ambulance drivers talk about how much time they think someone has left. They talk about doing no harm, because they are worried about how much time a person has left. Family members of people who are considering ending their life understandably talk about the amount of time they have left with their loved one.

What bothers me in regard to this bill is the political compromise we have done around time. The best bill, according to people who are undoubtedly pro having a VAD option, would have empowerment and control shifting to the patient and, in an ideal world, there would not be time limits around a person choosing to end their life, because wanting to initiate a process should not have an artificial time frame on it. I understand we are not going to get that bill through, but having an artificial time frame that is so limited to six months for the vast majority of people is something I am having a lot of trouble accepting.

Equally, there is the argument that has been put by many to me around the elephant in the room that is palliative care. We are not making a bill on palliative care, and we cannot bind future governments—I get that too—because the spending on palliative care, I think everyone is acknowledging, is inadequate in regard to the problem.

Some people have remarked to me that essentially palliative care does not have all the answers. I agree with that, but a better palliative care system surely should be something that we can at least be working towards in regard to this bill. In thinking about that, I do not see enough measures within this bill that are at least creating push-pull mechanisms to achieve that.

Not wanting the majority of people to be made vulnerable at the expense of the minority is an argument that has been put to me for voting down this bill. I want to be clear in saying that I do not accept that argument. I would love to see more options provided to those who are looking at a situation where the pain is intolerable and their illness is terminal. I remain unconvinced that this bill will achieve that, so I am going to spend a bit of time listening to the debate in the committee stage around that and, indeed, some of the amendments that are going to be put.

If you want to avail yourself of the withdrawal of treatment, you can now. That is something I do accept. Whether that is providing good medical care I think is something that maybe puts too much pressure on emergency responders and the existing systems that we have, and I think that is unfair.

I also have a problem somewhat with the conscientious objector provisions. I worry that we are creating something of a war within a profession, where some will engage with those provisions in a world where that may be detrimental to them. I worry that some may seek employment where they may not then agree with their colleagues about decisions that they have to make. I am not a doctor, I do not live in that world, but I do worry about that. I have not had enough evidence provided to me by those that I have spoken to that the conscientious objector provisions will not create that problem.

I would like to see everybody have more time. The reason why I think that is an ideological one. We have a problem in our society around death. That problem is a cultural one. Families do not enjoy talking about it with other family members. When there is a particularly painful death in the family, it can be very hard to talk about with even those people who arguably you spend most of your life with, your work colleagues, or even sometimes the medical professionals who are treating your loved one. We also have a problem with it culturally, and I mean that in terms of the multicultural society we live in. Different cultures do have different approaches to death and how they deal with it.

I think there is overwhelming support for euthanasia in our society. I think there is overwhelming support for a bill like this, but I think people want a bill that is going to deliver the kind of result that they overwhelmingly support. I again go back to the concept of time: I do not know that six months achieves that. I worry about the ability of having enough doctors within the system and who are going to sign on to that system, as well as, indeed, they had that problem somewhat in Victoria, albeit that is now solved.

I worry about families not having enough time with someone who wants to initiate that process at six months to discuss that with them. I have concerns around the time frame. I have concerns around the conscientious objector provisions. I guess I will find out during the debate if those can be somewhat resolved for me, and I look forward to them being so. I am not against having solutions for what is clearly a problem in our society, but I want them to actually work when we put a bill in and not just have a political compromise that delivers a result for not all people.

I underline again that I do not believe in the concept that the majority is made more vulnerable at the expense of a minority. I do not believe that is a legitimate concept. I do not think the system we have in place now is achieving the best result for anyone in it, but I want to see it replaced with something that does achieve a good result for everyone in it.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (18:16): I rise to support this bill. It will come as no surprise that the Greens support voluntary assisted dying legislation as a party position. We have the chance here to ensure that people are able to make their own choices with dignity in their final days. Stories of family, friends or loved ones who are slowly fading away in a hospital bed or a nursing home with no other option but to just wait are absolutely heartbreaking and far too common. I believe each and every one of us would have our own stories to share. With these pieces of legislation, I always recall my grandfather.

As this is the 17th occasion voluntary assisted dying has come before this parliament, I believe, in the last 25 years, it is an issue that this place has grappled with for some time now. It is far from a simple issue with a simple answer. We have seen in Victoria that this is something that can be implemented effectively and compassionately.

The latest report from the Voluntary Assisted Dying Review Board released in August 2020 states that since June 2019, when the act commenced, there have been 348 people assessed for eligibility, and of that 272 were eligible; 231 permits were issued and 124 people voluntarily died from taking the prescribed medication. It was found that four out of five of those who took the medication were suffering from terminal cancer, and the average age was 71, although ages of course ranged from, I believe, 32 to 100.

There has been only one case that was found to be noncompliant with the Victorian act, which resulted from a failure to comply with a procedural matter and was not an issue of eligibility. As with the bill before us, the Victorian act does have a lot of safeguards, which are certainly necessary to try to avoid abuse of the system as much as possible.

However, a consequence of this is that the scheme is much easier to access if one lives in a metropolitan area. This is because having greater access to medical services ensures that one is able to more easily fulfil the more than 60 requirements within the set time frame—much easier. Only 38 per cent of the 348 applicants under the Victorian act lived in a regional or rural area, and it is accepted that the bill before us will likely have similar consequences.

The mover, the Hon. Kyam Maher, has described it as 'one of those balancing acts'. Whilst it is no doubt important to have these safeguards in place, we must also ensure that this service is equally accessible to all South Australians. Every South Australian deserves the chance to die peacefully and with dignity if they so choose, regardless of where they may reside.

As we debate this legislation I want to pay tribute to my former colleague and a former Victorian Greens MP, Colleen Hartland. She was the one who introduced the first voluntary assisted dying legislation in Victoria as a private member's bill in 2008, and she has tirelessly campaigned for it since. Indeed, Colleen and I listened to the broadcast of the previous debate in the other place as it reached that very disappointing vote in the House of Assembly.

She put in such hard work leading the debate in Victoria, which has of course led to the bill we have before us now and to the breakthrough in Victoria. In one of her many speeches on this issue she highlighted that on more than 30 occasions where voluntary assisted dying had been discussed across Australia—back then, when she made her speech—it had overwhelmingly been the Greens party of that jurisdiction behind those bills.

I would like to thank my colleague the Hon. Mark Parnell for co-introducing this bill and for previously speaking to it in the chamber and to previous bills. I am proud to be part of a party that has co-sponsored this bill and long supported the issue in many other jurisdictions. Voluntary assisted dying forces us to think about something unpleasant and complex that may make us uncomfortable, but our communities have shown their overwhelming support for this issue and I believe it is time we listened.

I have received thousands of pieces of correspondence, and I want to let them know that I am listening. There are three I wish to remark upon, and share not just with the council but also with the community, that have particularly affected me. One is from an aged-care worker in a local aged-care facility. That person wrote to me that they had seen many people suffer a painful, slow and undignified death. They said:

The pain is not the hardest part of it. It's the person who is suffering and wishes they could have a choice of how they leave this world. Nobody likes hearing 'it took so and so two weeks to pass away even though they were end-of-life.' I have had residents who have just laid there in bed for months on end unable to move, communicate and eat. The fact is, if you are bedridden at the end of your life you will not be showered, your hair will be washed in a shower cap, your food will be minced and your fluids thickened. There is no dignity, pride or joy.

Another that struck me read:

I am an ex-Catholic nun who has been diagnosed with a terminal bowel disease in 2020.

This person went on to say:

For me it's when I'm still of sound mind but in palliative care, that I want to choose to die, before my bowel explodes within me and I'm vomiting up my own faeces, causing me to be in excruciating pain. I do not wish to be under palliative sedation, dehydrated nor starved to death. I wish to be at peace and say goodbye to my family without trauma to them and to myself.

She goes on to say:

I believe that I'm dying anyway, and that God would not want to see me or anyone else for that matter die such an intolerable death. It isn't suicide or killing, it's dying at a time when its most dignified, respectful and it's of my choosing.

I thank her for her correspondence. Finally, there is one particularly sardonic piece of correspondence by somebody who is known very closely by myself and the Hon. Mark Parnell. Indeed, he is a member of the Greens family. He wrote to us:

...a year ago I was a perfectly healthy, gainfully employed, lapsed Catholic 44-year-old man.

Until that fateful day when I told my wife, 'I don't feel well', which turned out to be a golf ball-sized tumour in my brain that can't be removed. So, finding out you're terminally ill, not as much fun as it sounds. I sit through chemo every month to try to keep me alive. Chemo, also not as much fun as people said it would be.

Eventually soon I'll be dead. That's okay, happens to everyone. Morbid sure, but I'll be damned if I don't go out on my terms. No way in hell am I making my wife watch me wither into nothing where I can't feed myself or go to the bathroom, [expletive] that. So please support this bill.

To him I say, 'I will,' and to the chamber I commend the bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. C.M. Scriven.

At 18:26 the council adjourned until Thursday 18 March 2021 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***KANGAROO CULLING**

In reply to **the Hon. M.C. PARNELL** (17 February 2021).

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): The Department for Environment and Water has advised:

The South Australian Commercial Kangaroo Management Plan 2020-24 (the management plan) has been developed to guide the sustainable management of commercial kangaroo harvesting in South Australia. The management plan is prepared in accordance with the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 and satisfies the requirements of the relevant commonwealth legislation, the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.

The primary goal of the management plan is to ensure an ecologically sustainable harvest of kangaroos and to provide a mechanism to reduce the damage that can be caused by overabundant kangaroos. This is achieved through the application of the best available scientific knowledge, best practice management and monitoring of outcomes, to ensure that the viability of kangaroo populations is not compromised by any action undertaken in accordance with the management plan.

The management plan provides a framework for the sustainable harvest quotas to be calculated based on population surveys. Permits for commercial harvest of kangaroos allow for a set proportion of the population to be harvested each year. In circumstances where the kangaroo population is low, based on the results of the population surveys, the plan provides for the reduction in harvest quota and the number of permits that can be issued, or in certain circumstances, the closure of specific harvest zones.

RECYCLED WATER

In reply to **the Hon. J.A. DARLEY** (18 February 2021).

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): The Department for Environment and Water has advised:

The City of Burnside takes water from the Glenelg to Adelaide Recycled Water Scheme. This is recycled water pumped from Glenelg Wastewater Treatment Plant via Anzac Highway and Greenhill Road. The amount SA Water charges for recycled water supplied from the Glenelg to Adelaide Recycled Water Scheme for irrigation use is commercial-in-confidence and is less than the statewide price for drinking water.

ELECTRIC VEHICLES

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (4 March 2021).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised:

There were 123 new battery electric vehicles sold in South Australia between 1 March 2020 to 28 February 2021.

The official mechanism for reporting new vehicle sales is the Federal Chamber of Automotive Industries (FCAI). Tesla as a manufacturer choose not to report their sales to FCAI, so the vehicle sale numbers exclude Tesla vehicles.