

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 12 May 2021

The **PRESIDENT** (Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins) took the chair at 11:01 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 37th report of the committee.

Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. R. I. Lucas)—

Return pursuant to section 74B of the Summary Offences Act 1953 Road Blocks—Report by the Commissioner of Police 1 January 2021 to 31 March 2021

Return pursuant to section 83B of the Summary Offences Act 1953 Dangerous Area Declarations—Report by the Commissioner of Police 1 January 2021 to 31 March 2021

Question Time

YOUTH DEATH, PORT LINCOLN

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding human services. Minister, have you now been briefed regarding the circumstances surrounding the tragic death of the 13-year-old child in Port Lincoln yesterday? In particular, what was the knowledge or involvement of any of your agencies or their NGO service providers with the children or their families linked to yesterday's tragedy?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:19): I thank the honourable member for his question. I was made aware of this matter yesterday morning by the Chief Executive of the Department of Human Services. As this matter is under the investigation of the police, I am not going to comment any further.

YOUTH DEATH, PORT LINCOLN

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): Supplementary: bearing in mind the need not to identify individuals, can the minister simply inform the chamber if any of her agencies were involved with any of the families in these tragic circumstances?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:19): The child who died was known to the Department of Human Services and some of the organisations that we fund.

YOUTH DEATH, PORT LINCOLN

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): Final supplementary: can the minister inform the chamber if any of the other children that have been reported as present at the time were involved with any of the minister's agencies?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:20): I am not going to comment any further on this case.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:20): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Treasurer regarding shop trading hours.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: In 2017, the town of Millicent undertook a referendum of its 5,000 citizens, conducted by the Australian Electoral Commission, relating to the deregulation of shop trading hours in the town. The result was nearly 80 per cent support in favour of regulated shopping hours in the town. This was an increase in support compared to a similar referendum a few years earlier. My question to the minister is: what does the Treasurer have to say to the people of Millicent whose voices he is ignoring with his constant attempts to force the complete deregulation of shopping hours?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:21): I say to the very good—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: The good people of Millicent.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I say to the very good people of Millicent the same thing I have been saying to them for many years: I love them and respect them.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Exactly.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: They were a good football opponent when I was tied up with the fabulous East Gambier Football Club, almost 100 years ago. I broke the only bone in my body, a collarbone, on the Millicent football ground, but I don't hold that against the good people of Millicent at all. My views in relation to shop trading hours—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The opposition might like to listen to the answer.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: My views in relation to shop trading hours to the good people of Millicent are exactly the same as the views I have been expressing for the last three years or so. I might remind the Hon. Ms Scriven that the good people of Millicent ask me every year to use my ministerial powers of exemption to allow them to trade on days when they are not allowed to trade under the referendum proposal that they supported. Every year, they seek special dispensation from me to allow them—

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: Not for 24 hours a day, 365 days a year they don't.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, they seek special dispensation from me, and they say, 'Please, minister'—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: 'Please, minister, will you allow me to trade'—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —'on these particular days when the current laws don't allow us to trade?'

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Leader of the Opposition is out of order and so is the deputy leader.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: My recollection is that—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Chuck them out!

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway is not helping me.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —each year in relation to Easter Saturday trading—there is also a special festival that the Hon. Ms Scriven might be able to remember the name of; it starts with a G, even though I can't remember it now. Every year they—

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: I am not going to help you.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: You can't help me. It's the G festival and every year they ask me for special dispensation to allow them to trade on that particular day, or around that particular day, to celebrate the festival, because their current laws don't allow them to do so. And being the generous, cooperative self I am, not being vindictive, I allow them to get a special ministerial exemption to trade on those days on which the current laws don't allow them to trade.

I understand their views. We just happen to have a healthy disagreement in relation to the shop trading laws as they relate to suburban Adelaide but also the township of Millicent, as one of the very few proclaimed shopping districts still left in South Australia. I respect their views, I love the people dearly, but I just happen to respectfully disagree with them on this particular issue.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:24): Supplementary: why doesn't the Treasurer care that one of the small supermarkets will close, as accepted by all the residents of Millicent, resulting in a lack of jobs and loss of local business?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:24): That's a claim that the member makes and one of the traders makes and I understand that particular claim.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The honourable Leader of the Opposition!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: What we have in Millicent is the extraordinary circumstance—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —where one of the local retailers, because they found that they were trading unlawfully above the 400 square metre magic limit, what they did was they moved the fridges and the freezers in from the walls to reduce the trading area of the shop from above 400 square metres to below 400 square metres so that they could lawfully trade. When you get to a situation as silly as that, where retailers have to move their cupboards or their fridges—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Now he's calling them silly—insult after insult!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —or whatever it is, in from the extremities of their shop floor, squeeze all their customers up into narrower aisles because the shop trading laws say if you are under 400 square metres, or under 200 square metres in some other stores, you can trade whenever you want to, but if you happen to be at 401 square metres then you are not allowed to trade and so we have this extraordinary circumstance where fridges, freezers and heaven only knows what else were being moved to try to get it underneath the 400 square metre rule.

They are the crazy, dog's breakfast laws that the Labor Party and, indeed, others support. We have to provide special dispensations. We turn a blind eye to people moving freezers and fridges in from the walls, whatever it might happen to be, to get underneath the 400 square metre rule. It makes no sense to anyone other than the shoppies union and the people they control like the Labor Party.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

SHOP TRADING HOURS

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:26): Final supplementary.

The PRESIDENT: The deputy leader will resume her seat. There is not much point her asking a supplementary if she is being drowned out by other members of her front bench.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Does the Treasurer care at all about small traders going out of business, and if not, why not?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:26): I care deeply about not only the people of Millicent but small traders. As I have said on a number of occasions, the independent retailers in South Australia will always have a valued share in the supermarket market in South Australia because South Australians are loyal to their local independent retailers and their connection with community. If they are good retailers, connected to their community, and if they are providing a niche service to their market—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —then they will always thrive.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I don't subscribe to the view, as the Hon. Ms Scriven does, that the mere change of shop trading laws will drive independent retailers across South Australia out of business as indeed—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order on both sides!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —the independent retailers, Mr Shearing and the other spokesperson claimed in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The conversations across the chamber are out of order, leader!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The independent retailers will always remain a valued and important part of the South Australian retail market.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:28): Supplementary arising: can the Treasurer please confirm which industry has called for the deregulation of trading hours?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:28): There are so many, I haven't got time to remember.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I think there were polls last night in the metropolitan media, one of which had 86 per cent of people—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: At the lower end, they were at 70 per cent. They averaged 75 or 76 per cent. We in politics—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Ms Bourke!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —dream of those sorts of election results—we would dream! If we scrounge together 52 per cent of the vote, we are delighted—it's almost a landslide! On something like this, 86 per cent of people saying, 'Give it to us, we want it! This is what we want in South Australia.' That's the people.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Wortley!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: We listen to the people. In relation to industry sectors—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —there are a number of different individual businesses, industry groups—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —industry sectors who support it. Of course there are the independent retailers, the motor traders for example, who have a special place in shop trading hours legislation and haven't supported shop trading hours legislation—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: We respect their views but we don't just listen to business in terms of making our particular decisions. We make decisions in the public interest.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: We make decisions in the interests of the people of South Australia, the consumers—

The PRESIDENT: I think the Treasurer can conclude his remarks.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —the individual businesses. It's not big businesses or union bosses who dictate to us.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Point of order.

The PRESIDENT: Point of order. The Treasurer will resume his seat.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: This has been going almost five minutes and the relevance is completely finished.

The PRESIDENT: I'm very confident that the Treasurer is about to conclude this answer.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I forgot. I know we're limited to Dorothy Dixers and I thought this was a Dorothy Dixer, but I will limit myself even though it was a question from the opposing benches.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: I have a supplementary.

The PRESIDENT: Well, I am very keen to move on. The Hon. Mr Stephens has a supplementary.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:30): Treasurer, can you inform the chamber how many people from other regional towns in South Australia have written to you begging you to impose these draconian regulations on their communities?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:31): I will be very short: none, because the rest of country South Australia already has 24 hours a day trading, 365 days a year.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Stephens is out of order.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: If you go to Mount Gambier, if you go to Whyalla, if you go to—

The PRESIDENT: And he knows better than to be—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —Victor Harbor the traders can trade if they want to Christmas Day, Good Friday, ANZAC morning. Even our proposal is not going to allow that sort of deregulation. That is what happens in country South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: Before calling the Hon. Ms Bourke for her primary question, I recognise in the gallery today Ms Lucy Stronach, the Australian Youth Representative to the United Nations. Welcome.

Question Time

SHOP TRADING HOURS

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:31): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer a question regarding shop trading hours.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Last week, we saw callous cuts to the homeless service sector—

The PRESIDENT: Leave the opinion out of it, just get on with the explanation.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Sorry, Mr President, I thought that was fact. Now we have heard reports through the media that a referendum into shop trading hours could cost \$2 million. My question to the Treasurer is: why is the Treasurer putting his political agenda before the South Australians who are experiencing homelessness?

The PRESIDENT: The Treasurer has the call—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: —and will be heard in silence.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:32): The premise of the member's question is entirely wrong. As my colleague the Hon. Ms Lensink has pointed out on any number of occasions, the total amount of funding for this particular sector has actually increased by a number of millions. I can't remember what it is—\$69 million up to \$74 million or whatever it happens to be. It is actually being increased, so the introduction to the member's question was 'given that there had been a callous cut to homelessness funding', there hasn't been and therefore there is nothing in the question at all.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Ridgway has the call.

FEDERAL BUDGET

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (14:33): My question—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, leader! You can't help yourself today. The Hon. Mr Ridgway will be heard in silence.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Thank you, Mr President, I appreciate your protection. My question is to the Treasurer. Following the wonderful federal budget last night, can the Treasurer update the house on our share of GST?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Point of order, sir.

The PRESIDENT: You can resume your seat. The Hon. Mr Ridgway has been here long enough to know that he shouldn't include opinion in his explanation or question. The Treasurer has the call.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:34): Mr President, he just couldn't resist. I thank the honourable member for his question because I had a question on a similar issue yesterday and foreshadowed, I guess, our best guess as a state Treasury as to what the GST might look like. We have certainly now been provided with the detail in the federal budget, which indeed reflects in broad terms what I indicated to the house yesterday. That is, that the national economic recovery—and credit to the commonwealth government—has meant an enormous rebound in consumption spending and an enormous rebound in GST revenue receipts significantly above what federal Treasury was predicting during the global pandemic or the worst of the global pandemic last year, so in their budget and then their midyear update at the end of the year.

I am pleased to be able to report for this financial year which is just finishing, 2020-21, the GST revenue for South Australia is estimated by the commonwealth government to increase by \$926 million over their low estimate from last year. I hasten to say that it is still \$375 million less than what we were predicting for GST for this year pre-COVID. So instead of losing approximately \$1.3 billion we only lose approximately \$400 million. So it is still significant, but it is nowhere near as parlous as losing \$1.3 billion in GST in one particular year.

Again, the federal budget papers indicate that for next year, 2021-22, federal estimates are that we will see \$668 million extra in GST compared to their estimate last year—or our state budget estimate and their estimate last year. Again, I hasten to say it is still \$364 million lower than what we were predicting pre-COVID. So in broad terms, again, instead of losing \$1 billion in GST for next year, 2021-22, we are only going to lose \$364 million.

So in both cases they are enormously encouraging results. No-one, including federal Treasury, saw the extent of the economic recovery—the rebound—and therefore the significant increase in GST revenue that has been reported last night. It retrieves a lot of what we were expected to lose, but nevertheless we are still confronted with \$375 million less this year and \$364 million less next year, so we are talking about \$700 million less revenue that we have been able to spend on goods and services in South Australia this year and next year.

HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:37): Supplementary: given that there is now almost \$1 billion more in GST revenue than was most recently expected, will the government stop its cuts to our hospitals and ambulances and move to stop ramping and delays for South Australians awaiting care in our hospitals?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:37): We are not cutting health or hospitals. We are actually significantly increasing spending on health and hospitals. It doesn't matter how many times the Labor Party makes the claim that the government is cutting health or hospital spending—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind members that conversations across the chamber are out of order.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —or ambulance spending. The mere claim—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Ridgway is out of order, as is the leader.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —doesn't prove the facts.

An honourable member interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Yes, I could do.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: This government is not. It is actually increasing spending on health and hospitals and on ambulance services.

SOCIAL AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:38): I seek leave to make a brief statement before addressing a question without notice to the Minister for Human Services on the topic of rental affordability.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Last night, the federal Treasurer handed down the budget, which yet again failed to show leadership in investing in the essential social infrastructure of social housing. In fact, social housing investment is trending down. With not one single house added into the social housing pool in Australia, no strategy to deal with rising homelessness and no increase to JobSeeker and other income support payments, we are seeing a continued trend in rising housing insecurity felt by some of our most vulnerable South Australians. My questions to the minister are:

1. With no commitment from the federal government to establish incentives to encourage investment in social and affordable housing, what is the South Australian government doing to build more social housing to ensure that our most vulnerable citizens are not forced into homelessness?

2. Can the minister provide this chamber with the total number of people who are sleeping rough in South Australia tonight versus the total number of public and private rentals available?

The PRESIDENT: Before calling the minister, I just remind the Hon. Mr Simms that he did have quite a bit of opinion in that explanation. However, he has been set a bad example by some other more senior members here earlier today. I call the Minister for Human Services.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:39): I thank the honourable member for his question. There are quite a lot of issues to unpack in what he has asked. I will do my best to endeavour to respond to them all, but if I haven't answered them all I am sure he will ask me a supplementary at some stage.

The issue of affordable housing has been something that has been on the South Australian government's radar for quite some time, therefore we have already produced a strategy, Our Housing Future Strategy 2020-2030, which was published late in 2019 and addresses a lot of the issues that he has raised. I think it's important to point out, too, that the housing spectrum consists of a range of components and there can be movement in between all of those. If we look at the issue of public housing, which is the housing that is managed by the South Australian Housing Authority, there are some 34,000 properties in South Australia for our most vulnerable and the rental for those people is capped at a household income of 25 per cent of their income.

He will probably grow quite tired of me quoting these statistics, but I think it is worth reminding the house that when we came to office the public housing system in particular was in very poor condition. The average age of our properties is some 40 years old. The stock was built with larger households in mind. We have a tendency for people to need single properties these days, whereas a lot of them were two to three-bedroom homes for working families some time ago. It takes time to convert that stock into ones that are modern for today's client in these times.

We also had a program in the forward estimates, courtesy of the former Labor government, that was a sales viability program. One of the things that the former government did when they needed cash for the rest of the budget was they used Housing Trust stock as an ATM. They reduced the cash balance, they reduced the maintenance budget and they sold houses. So under the former

government, there were some 7,500 properties sold for \$1.5 billion. When we came to office, the sort of average annual number of properties being sold for that program was in the order of 600. It has been my aim to reduce that to net zero. We are down to 150, so we are on track to see that stabilise.

In addition to that particular stock, which obviously is managed by the government, there is the community housing sector. I think there are five or there might be six tier 1s now. They also provide more affordable housing in the rental market. They have the capacity to use capital funds from the federal government's NHFIC funding arrangement and their goal is to increase in the rental sector.

There has also been a lack over the years of affordable houses to purchase. If people who are in those lower income brackets can purchase a house, it takes pressure off the private rental market, so that is why we have had a program: 70 affordable homes, through the 2019-20 budget, and then 1,000, through the strategy, in addition. Those are very, very popular. We have an affordable housing website, which is called HomeSeeker, that people who are on lower incomes can register for. They will get specific advice about a range of things.

We have been a bit ahead of the curve, in terms of when COVID hit last year. The rental subsidy that was available to landlords and tenants through COVID last year, when they could get a grant of \$1,000 to assist people in hardship, wasn't actually well taken up. I can find the figures for the honourable member, but I think from memory that it was less than 500. There is quite a bit of flux in the market at the moment. There is obviously demand for rentals and demand for housing.

In the background, there are the other programs that I mentioned when you asked me a question about this previously. There is a lot that goes on in the background, notwithstanding that there is a lot of media interest in this area. Programs such as Commonwealth Rent Assistance and the Housing Trust support people in the private rental market as well with bond and rent.

There is quite a range of programs to assist people. I also note that the federal government is providing support for single parents to be able to purchase a home with potentially as little as 2 per cent deposit. It is very much about recognising that there are different segments in that housing market and that we provide support to people in those points of contact.

I might add, too, that I do get a lot of correspondence from people from time to time about people in particular situations. Those issues generally do get resolved relatively quickly. Usually by the time the letter gets to my desk, somebody has been assisted into the private rental market or been provided with a public home. It's about trying to make sure that all the parts of the system are working efficiently and effectively together, and that's our long-term goal as well.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Simms has a supplementary.

HOMELESSNESS

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:45): I thank the minister for her response. Again, I reiterate my question about the number of people sleeping rough in South Australia tonight. Can the minister provide this chamber with the total number of people who are sleeping rough in South Australia versus the total number of public and private rentals available? If the minister is not in a position to provide that information today, will she give this chamber an undertaking that she will provide an update in due course?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:46): In terms of rough sleepers, the data that we have relates to the CBD, which is the Adelaide Zero Project, which the honourable member is quite familiar with. They do a monthly tally. It has actually gone down for the month of March. It was 204 and it has gone down to 196 on that list. We may well have a statewide figure, if I can find that for the honourable member very quickly. It wouldn't be point in time, however, as there are people who move in and out of the system quite regularly.

The number of homeless people that we have in South Australia is generally not just considered those who are rough sleepers but people who are in other forms of homelessness, which includes temporary accommodation such as shelters or indeed people who might be couch surfing and the like. Generally speaking, in South Australia we quote that there are 6,000 at any one time across the state.

I know that some people get very excited about vacancy rates in the public housing system. It is worth pointing out that there is a range of reasons why there are vacant properties, such as they

are already under offer to someone or there is some maintenance being done such as painting for people to ensure that it's properly tenable, and then there may be other more serious issues such as a roof needs to be fixed and the like.

Point-in-time data is not necessarily that useful because there is a range of reasons why houses are considered on the vacancy list, which means that they are not actually available to rent to people. But it's a moving feast and there is a lot of flux in that space.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Simms has a supplementary.

HOMELESSNESS

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:48): I thank the minister for her response. I note that the minister's reply in terms of the availability of the—

The PRESIDENT: Just a question, the Hon. Mr Simms.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Sorry, Mr President. Can the minister give the undertaking that they will provide an update to this chamber on the number of public and private rentals available?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:48): I am not sure that we are able to provide any numbers about the number of private rentals. In fact, I think I have asked for that data from the Attorney-General, who is responsible for Consumer and Business Services—some of that data. I will ask whether there is any information available about private rental, but there are some firms such as CoreLogic, I understand, which monitor the overall percentage of vacancies both in capital cities and across the state, so that is publicly available information which is sort of a comparison.

In terms of the public system, we can try to get a point-in-time number for the honourable member, but there is also the community housing sector. I am not sure whether we have that data as well, but I will do my best to find it.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:49): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Human Services regarding disability.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS: Point 7 of the 10-point plan developed in a recent mental health crisis meeting included John Mendoza saying:

There are over 50 beds, nearly a third of total capacity across CALHN, occupied by NDIS-ready and/or eligible clients. Some have been stuck for over 1,000 days in a small room. The average length of stay for 40 of these patients is over 620 days, and 26 of them are over 900 days. This is deplorable and a violation of human rights.

My questions to the minister are:

1. Given that the minister is responsible for disability and housing, and that this issue relates to NDIS-eligible people, what exactly has the minister done to address this violation of human rights and ensure that people have access to disability support and housing?

2. How is the minister's failure to act adding to ramping and mental health patients spending days in emergency rooms?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for her question. The issue of people in long stay—who are categorised as, I think the term is, 'long stay'—in our hospitals is something that has not happened overnight; it has been an issue that has been around, for anybody who has worked in the hospital system as I have, for some decades and is something that clearly needs to be rectified.

There are a number of parts to the issue for all states and territories in the commonwealth in terms of housing policy going forward to assist people with disabilities to obtain appropriate accommodation. There have been and will continue to be working groups across the South Australian government, because there is a range of different parts to the system. It is fair to say that into the future the appropriate accommodation for people is much more community based and

purpose built. There are some really fantastic properties available to people, which have come onto the market in more recent years.

This particular issue is something I have advocated for at the Disability Reform Council. I have had discussions with the new minister, who is quite well aware of the challenges in this space because it is a matter of not just the public and the social housing system but also how we make the payments that may flow from the commonwealth to assist people to live in either the private rental market or to own their own home.

I have spoken in this place in terms of our affordable properties that we built for sale. A young man has moved out of community housing and bought one of these properties because it has been built to silver standard. There are a range of parts to the puzzle in terms of lining up the supported independent living, the SDA and EHO, which is exploring housing options funding when people want to move out of housing. We also have been actively working with providers in this sector to ensure that support coordinators know that alternatives are available.

It is fair to say that South Australia's market for that diversity of supply is quite immature. It is something that I have personally spoken to the federal minister about, and we have had a range of actions between providers—DHS and SAHA—to ensure we are improving the supply available for people so that people are not stuck in hospitals.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Pnevmatikos with a supplementary.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:54): Can the minister confirm that the longer a person stays in hospital increases the cost unnecessarily? The costs of long-term housing and disability increase because their physical condition and independence keep deteriorating.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:54): I think she is assuming that people aren't necessarily receiving physiotherapy services in hospital or something of that nature. Ideally, nobody would want to spend any more time in hospital than they absolutely have to, I think that's a given. Nobody would disagree with that, but I think trying to portray the excellent work that the people who work in our public hospital system in trying to look after people who are in their care is a bit unfair to those staff.

NURSES AND MIDWIVES

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:55): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding the health workforce.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted the contribution made to Australians by our frontline health staff, with nurses in particular supporting a range of COVID-related activities as well as maintaining ongoing healthcare services. Can the minister update the council on the contribution of nurses in South Australia Health?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:55): I would like to thank the honourable member for his question. Today in South Australia we celebrate International Nurses Day and acknowledge all nurses and midwives around the world. Nurses and midwives are the largest workforce globally and in South Australia we have more than 33,000 nurses and midwives who play a critical role in delivering health care.

COVID-19 has brought new challenges in response to which nurses are demonstrating the breadth of their skills and their versatility. Nurses and midwives have responded to the challenges impacting on traditional models of practice and ways of working by embracing new technology to support patients and their families. On behalf of the government I would like to honour the outstanding leadership, commitment and compassion of the service provided by nurses to the people of South Australia.

This morning, I was delighted to be part of a gathering of past and present nurses at the Repat in the SPF hall where we celebrated International Nurses Day and the relocation of the nurses honour boards from the Keswick barracks to the refurbished SPF hall. Nurses have been central to the legendary care that grew at the Repat. During World War II the hospital at the Repat was initially an active military hospital called the Adelaide Military Hospital 105.

The first nurses of course were military nurses. Over more than 75 years the relationship between the military and the nursing profession was central to the fabric of the Repat, its culture and its quality of care, so it's only apt that the Repat is a place where we will remember the military nurses of this state. The honour boards name the South Australian nurses from a range of campaigns from the Boer War in the late 1800s through both world wars through to the Vietnam War.

One such listing which I was determined to find this morning and I did find was the reference to Vivian Bullwinkel, who is a model of resilience and a symbol of strength for nursing. Vivian was born in Kapunda, South Australia, and was an Australian Army nurse during World War II and the sole survivor of the Bangka Island massacre in Sumatra in 1942.

During the massacre she was struck by a bullet which passed completely through her body. She feigned death until the attackers left; however, she was eventually found and taken into captivity as a prisoner of war where she was held for 3½ years. Vivian went on to testify before a war crimes tribunal, later retiring from the Australian Army but continuing to dedicate herself as a leader in nursing and in humanitarian causes.

On this day—a day to celebrate and acknowledge nurses and midwives—I would like to recognise the way nurses are continuing to respond to challenges, embracing new technology over the decades past and decades to come.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:59): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question about mental health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: The crisis gripping our mental health sector is well known, primarily thanks to the whistleblowing of Adjunct Professor John Mendoza, who warned that the crisis is leading to people taking their own lives. He even went as far as to describe the mental health system in Adelaide, and I quote:

...the worst in the country and among—if not the worst—in leading OECD countries and regions...utter tragedy...

In response to the crisis, the government held a roundtable forum, which was subsequently labelled by some commentators as 'nothing but a gobfest'. One of the outcomes of that forum was the announcement that priority care centres across Adelaide would start taking mental health patients, with the objective being that such action would free up ED beds in our public system currently being occupied by mental health patients.

I am not sure that it's working. As of 1.30 today, CALHN had 24 patients admitted, waiting for a mental health bed, with 18 having waited more than eight hours. I note that last week on ABC, Dr McGowan made the startling confession that those centres—and I think there are four across Adelaide—are open only 8am to about 9 or 10pm, or so he thought.

My questions to the minister are: is there a dedicated mental health practitioner at the centres at all times? What is the point of a mental health patient presenting at a centre if they won't be treated by a dedicated mental health practitioner? As respected host David Bevan asked McGowan, and I quote:

Okay so if you are having a mental health episode, have it between 8am and 9pm.

How does the minister respond to that? For the record, what are the opening hours of those centres?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:01): Currently, there are four priority care centres. There has been a pleasing increase in some of the daily tallies. For example, on 3 May I am advised that there were 79 patients seen by priority care centres. That's 79 patients that would otherwise be needing to present at an emergency department. As I have highlighted before, often patients who are taken to priority care centres are the type of patients who might otherwise spend time on an ambulance ramp.

I would disagree with the honourable member. Forgive me if I am taking the wrong interpretation and she doesn't mean this. One of the implications I was taking from her question is

that a person with a mental health challenge needs to meet with a mental health specialist. I think one of the key challenges in our health system responding effectively to mental health challenges is actually to make sure that we broaden the base of health professionals who engage in mental health services.

Recently, I was talking to a leader of the general practice community—in other words, doctors—and she was stressing how important it is to make sure that we not only equip GPs to respond to mental health issues, including suicidal ideation, but also that we support them, that we might well have, through telehealth, psychiatrists who might, on an on-call basis, provide support. I would certainly not suggest that a GP-led practice or centre, such as a priority care centre, would not be well-equipped to respond to a whole range of mental health issues for the lack of a specialist mental health professional.

I would also stress that the priority care centre model engages a nurse at the priority care centre who is an emergency care nurse. These are the same highly skilled professionals that would be providing care at the front door, at the treatment bays, in a hospital. Just as a generalist nurse will respond to an ED presentation, including a person with mental health issues, there is a similar nurse with similar skills in the priority care centre. I stress that I don't agree with the suggestion that general practices are not a very valuable tool in providing that broad level of care that South Australians need to support their mental health.

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

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:04): In response to one of the earlier questions raised, what are the opening hours of the centres? My question was: do we have a dedicated mental health practitioner available for each of the four centres at all times?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:04): I will take the detail of the honourable member's question on notice, but my general understanding is that the hours are approximately 10am to 8pm. That later start in the morning, as I understand it, was to reflect the normal pattern in EDs. The Monday that has just passed was unusual, because we were seeing significant demand quite soon after eight, but my understanding is that ED demand often comes later in the morning.

In terms of the honourable member's question, I am not aware of any specialist mental health clinicians in the priority care centres, but the point I have just been trying to make is that emergency care nurses, supported by GPs, able to tap into specialist services off site I believe are well placed to respond to a whole range of health issues for South Australians.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:05): Supplementary: since the government made the announcement that priority care centres across Adelaide would start taking mental health patients, how many beds have been freed up in public hospital EDs?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:06): I am happy to take the honourable member's question on notice.

HOSPITAL BEDS

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:06): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing about health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: On 27 November 2018, the Premier told the other place about bed closures:

The reality is that all hospitals should have some flex capacity, but we certainly shouldn't be keeping hospital beds open when there is no requirement for them. If we have no requirement, then they will remain flex beds.

My questions to the minister are:

1. Has the minister sought assurances that all beds and wards across major hospitals are being used and that there is no ward or bed sitting idle for budgetary reasons?

2. Has the government reopened all flex beds?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:07): I certainly haven't asked CEOs that question, because what I would be basically asking them is, 'Are you opening beds when you need them?' and I know they would do that.

DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (15:07): My question is to the—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Dr Centofanti will be heard in silence.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding women's safety. Can the minister provide an update on the reform and legislative measures the Marshall Liberal government is exploring to improve responses to domestic and family violence?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:07): I thank the honourable member for her question and for her interest in this vitally important area. It was a privilege to be part of an announcement, together with the Deputy Premier and Attorney-General Vickie Chapman and Carolyn Power MP, the Assistant Minister for Domestic and Family Violence Prevention, recently in relation to further areas of potential reform that are being explored by the Marshall Liberal government.

As we know, tackling the insidious scourge of domestic, family and sexual violence is a priority and something that is important to all of us here. We are doing more than ever before to support and protect at-risk women and children, which includes legislative and policy reform, as well as record funding for support and prevention, and it is important to remember that every South Australian has a role to play.

When it comes to preventing domestic and family violence, nothing is off the table. We have had a number of initiatives through the election, which we have been implementing, and a range of things that we are looking to further explore. This includes the domestic violence disclosure scheme, which many people would be familiar with, which allows either a person who is experiencing domestic and family violence or a friend or loved one to make an inquiry about a potential perpetrator's history.

The current model is described as a 'right to ask' model, which we committed to via some funding of \$1.9 million. We are currently exploring whether it be a right to ask model, which is a more proactive model and we are also looking at further amendments to our intervention order schemes to look at supervision of reporting requirements, exploring the development of a domestic violence offenders' register, with a requirement for perpetrators to disclose matters in certain circumstances.

The Attorney-General is the lead on these matters and is currently consulting with the relevant offices within South Australian government, including the Director of Public Prosecutions and the Commissioner of Police, as well as consulting with other jurisdictions in which there are some of these policies in place or under investigation.

At a national level, there is work underway to ensure the commonwealth's Family Law Amendment (Federal Family Violence Orders) Bill 2021 will be seamlessly implemented into South Australia when it becomes law. New orders will reduce the need for vulnerable families to navigate multiple court systems when they are already before a family court, saving time and money and allowing victims to access personal protection when they need it. That is something that we are notifying that we are in the process of investigating and would look forward to any feedback from honourable members.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:11): My question to the Treasurer on shop trading hours is: does he stand by his words that his 2020 decisions to extend shop trading hours under the COVID pandemic were made on health advice, and can he provide this council with the names of the clinicians and their credentials to make that advice to him.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:11): Yes, I do. I think there have been a number of FOIs where the emails have been released.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:11): Supplementary: that is not providing the information to the council. Can the minister please provide the names and the credentials of those who provided the public health advice to this parliament?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:11): The advice came from the public health officers. First, I think it was Dr Chris Lease, but I will check that via the minister's office, and through public statements made by Professor Nicola Spurrier, who might be known to the Hon. Ms Franks, who made public statements supporting the need for the changes that we instituted.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:12): Supplementary: will the minister table the public health advice made that he claims supported his decision for extended shop trading hours?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:12): I am happy to table the freedom of information request that I have already circulated for members.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:12): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Assistant Minister to the Premier regarding multicultural affairs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Within 12 months of the last election, the government replaced all but one of the current SAMEAC. This was done without expressions of interest, as acknowledged by the Premier in another place. On 7 May 2021, the government issued an invitation for expressions of interest regarding membership of the multicultural and ethnic commission (SAMEAC). This invitation was issued despite the bill before the parliament that could change the membership of the commission. My question to the assistant minister is: why is the government advertising for board members when the composition of the board is not yet settled because it is currently being considered by the parliament?

The PRESIDENT: The assistant minister has the call.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:13): I will take the question, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: The Treasurer.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I represent the Premier and the minister in relation to this particular issue in the chamber. The government's position in relation to this particular issue is that we are in preparation for all circumstances in relation to the expressions of interest. There are transitional provisions in relation to this legislation, depending on in what form and in what time or occasion it might pass the parliament, if it does. We will need to, as a government, either continue with the existing arrangements in relation to the commission or, if it is to be changed, in the government's model—that's one set of circumstances—or if the parliament so chooses to make amendments to make different arrangements.

This government is nimble, agile, flexible and also transparent and accountable, all of those very good attributes. The expressions of interest will assist the government in relation to achieving all those wonderful attributes and make available to the government, dependent on whatever the parliament so decides, the capacity to make appropriate appointments.

MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:14): Supplementary arising from the answer: can the Treasurer outline what has changed in the government that means that the Treasurer is now the individual responsible to the chamber for multicultural affairs when every other time questions have been asked the assistant minister has been the member responsible for multicultural affairs?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:15): As Leader of the Government in this chamber and as the minister who represents the Premier, I have taken responsibility in relation to that question and if on other occasions I choose to do so, I will choose to do so.

MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:15): Further and final supplementary: what has changed that has made this the very first time the Treasurer has decided that he is responsible to answer questions on this issue?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:15): I made the decision, Mr President.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:15): Is the expression of interest being called for as a result of the fact that a number of the SAMEAC members have expressed concerns about the new structure of SAMEAC?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:15): We don't make decisions on the basis of those sorts of claims being made by the Hon. Mr Wortley, correct or otherwise. This government makes decisions in the interests of the people of South Australia and we are just being flexible, as I said, in catering for all circumstances. We don't want to end up in a set of circumstances where we don't have a functioning commission.

FEDERAL BUDGET

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:16): My question is to the Treasurer: what infrastructure funding commitments for South Australia were announced in the federal budget last night?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:16): I am very pleased to respond to that question because there have been a number of ill-founded claims being made by members of the opposition and other commentators in relation to infrastructure.

I am very pleased to be able to reveal that the commonwealth government, through a letter from the commonwealth minister to the state minister, has made clear what their total infrastructure spending commitments to the South Australian government will be for each of the financial years 2021-22 through to 2024-25, the forward estimates. In 2021-22, it is about \$786 million; in 2022-23, \$954 million; in 2023-24, \$1.1 billion; and in 2024-25, \$1.07 billion. It averages \$980 million or almost a billion dollars a year in infrastructure spending.

The ill-founded commentary that in some way there is going to be this gap in funding in the first couple of years of the forward estimates, the money doesn't come until the end of the forward estimates and beyond, is ill-founded and doesn't address the fact that this government has already locked in existing federal commitments for this year, next year and the year afterwards, and what is being offered is to actually top up that spending in the third and fourth year and beyond the forward estimates. What we have actually locked in—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hunter and the Hon. Mr Hanson! They have been quiet today but they are out of order, both of them.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: They are bleating from the backbench. They are squealing like stuck pigs because let me just put the—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —figure on the table. In the last year—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.E. Hanson interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hanson!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: In the last year, under the former Labor government, 2017-18, the exact—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley is out of order.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —same letter from the commonwealth to the state Labor government outlined—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —that over the next four years, should the Labor government have been re-elected, that they would get \$465 million a year, less than half—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —the \$975 million—

The Hon. E.S. Bourke interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: And the Hon. Ms Bourke!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —that has been negotiated by this current government. This government has negotiated double the annual funding per year over the forward estimates than the former Labor government did in 2017-18.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Double the funding. So it is untrue for the bleating from the backbench to claim that there is no funding—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —next year or the year afterwards. There is \$1 billion a year approximately going into infrastructure spending in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Treasurer should conclude his remarks very soon.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: That is more than double the funding that was provided under the former Labor government in their last budget, in 2017-18.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: They can squeal like stuck pigs for as long as they want—

The PRESIDENT: Order, minister!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —but they don't change the facts.

Matters of Interest

E-SCOOTERS

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:20): Take a stroll through the city these days and you would not be able to miss the sight of lines of orange and purple e-scooters crowding our footpaths. You might even get struck by one or trip over one. I have photographed two recklessly discarded in the middle of North Terrace next to the tram stop opposite the railway station.

Something that the Adelaide City Council and the state government has failed to address is the safety of pedestrians, particularly those with a disability or visual impairment. I have been contacted by several constituents who have had accidents involving these vehicles. One of the most disturbing is the case of 82-year-old Audrey Vaughn, who fell over one dumped on the footpath while crossing King William Street to go into Rundle Mall. She was badly injured and was in hospital for

three weeks and will now need ongoing care. Who is going to take responsibility for that? Nobody has called her; nobody wants to know about her.

I have continued to raise the safety problems since e-scooters were introduced. I do not know what it is going to take for the government and the councils to pay attention to the likely risks of litigation they face, as is happening now in New Zealand. Former High Court judge Sir David Williams QC has mounted a pro bono campaign to banish e-scooters from New Zealand's footpaths. Acting on behalf of various charities representing the disabled, Sir David has presented a compelling case for the scooters' removal in submissions to the government body considering major changes to the rules relating to footpath and road safety.

Sir David and the disability organisations he represents argue that allowing e-scooters on footpaths is making footpaths dangerous for pedestrians, especially the elderly and those with disabilities. Sir David contends that the New Zealand government's decision to allow scooters on footpaths in 2018 was in breach of its obligations under the 2006 UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, to which it is a party. So is Australia.

The purpose of the convention is to promote, protect and ensure the full and equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms of people with disabilities and to promote respect for their inherent dignity. As in Audrey's case, this is not occurring here. E-scooter injuries have cost New Zealand taxpayers nearly \$8 million since their launch in October 2018. During this period, Auckland Council recorded 4,382 e-scooter injuries, with male injuries costing just under \$4.3 million compared with just over \$3.5 million for females. Unless something is done, we will see similar problems here.

E-scooter-free zones need to be established near pedestrian crossings and bus and tram stops in the Adelaide CBD to assist people with disabilities. The zones should be at least 10 metres from crossings and major traffic intersections in the city. A system needs to be developed where e-scooters are parked in a secure, fenced-off area to prevent them from being dumped on city streets and footpaths. The e-scooter providers should look at introducing penalties to hirers who fail to park them in designated areas, as happens in some overseas cities.

Many disabled people have a difficult time as it is, manoeuvring their way around the city, without the added dangers posed by the poor placement of e-scooters. This is particularly evident near busy pedestrian crossings and traffic lights, where e-scooter operators and users give no regard for disabled people. Many disabled people, including those with guide dogs, find it physically challenging to get close enough to be able to press the walk button due to the prevalence of e-scooters stacked and dumped near the crossing.

The situation has become so bad for some that they are now too scared to come into the city for fear of hurting themselves. Adelaide City Council has a duty of care, as required under the United Nations' charter of human rights, so that people can feel safe walking the streets of Adelaide.

TASTING AUSTRALIA

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (15:25): I rise today to discuss one of the great South Australian events—Tasting Australia. Tasting Australia has just been completed in the last couple of weeks. It is in its 25th year. It was a visionary event that was established by a Liberal government in 1997. I suspect it was envisaged then to be a media event where journalists, food writers, wine writers, etc., were brought into South Australia and shown some of our great culinary and wine opportunities. It was during 2014 that Events SA took over the management of that particular event. I think there has been an evolution to see it now more as a consumer event, as well as having some media involved.

At the very successful Town Square in Victoria Square, this most recent event, we saw some particularly good numbers, notwithstanding a bit of an inclement day on the Saturday. I spent a little bit of time there on Sunday when it was winding up talking to some of the operators who had had a particularly good time and record numbers, in some cases up 30 per cent on the attendance and takings of the previous event.

What I really want to focus on are some regional events and a particular one in Streaky Bay. In 2018, I had the good fortune, as members know, to be the Minister for Tourism and to speak at a Christmas event put on by the South Australian Tourism Industry Council. I spoke for a few moments

and was then asked some questions. One particular question by Mrs Lyn Finch from the Streaky Bay Tourism and Business Association was, 'How can we get Tasting Australia to Streaky Bay?' I said to Mrs Finch, 'Why don't you put on an event that is worthy of being part of Tasting Australia and I am sure the South Australian Tourism Commission and Events SA would look favourably upon that.'

We fast-forward about six months, or maybe only four months, to April 2019, and indeed the Streaky Bay Tourism and Business Association did put on an event. It was not a Tasting Australia event, but it was in a similar time frame and it was a very successful event. There is a platform on the land end of the Streaky Bay jetty where bales of wool and wheat and things were put in years gone by for ships to pick up. This is now a platform open to the public and the lunch was held on that particular platform in 2019 and was a great success. There were well over 100 people there, including the local member for Flinders, Mr Peter Treloar, and other members of the community, the mayor, etc.

Sadly, with COVID-19 last year, there was no event on anywhere in regional South Australia, but this year they came back with a vengeance. On 2 May, an event was held in Streaky Bay and this time it was a Tasting Australia event. It was not on the end of the old jetty because that has fallen into a little bit of disrepair. I think it is great news that the Marshall government has provided \$30,000 to the community to repair it, so maybe next year it can be back on the end of the jetty.

Although the weather was a little inclement, it was held on the deck at the front of the Streaky Bay Hotel, which shows that the whole community gets involved. This year, it was an even bigger event, with more people than in 2018, but more importantly there were people there from Victoria, Northern Territory and Queensland. In fact, I think the Queenslanders won the major raffle and the Victorian attendees are coming back to a long lunch featuring Streaky Bay seafood at the Wine Centre in a few weeks' time.

Also, 40 per cent of attendees at this particular event were from outside Eyre Peninsula, so it was not just locals enjoying the wonderful ambience of Streaky Bay on that afternoon, it was people from other parts of the state and other parts of Australia. In fact, one of the features of Tasting Australia is the Tasting Australia Airlines, which flew into Port Lincoln on the day before and did an event in Coffin Bay. That was very successful.

The success of the Streaky Bay event highlights the importance of trying to get more regional events on the Tasting Australia calendar. Maybe you cannot do them all by air, because of course you cannot fly to Port Lincoln and it is a 3½-hour drive to Streaky Bay. I am hoping that the Tourism Commission and Events South Australia look at ways to promote events. Now we have our national borders closed, as the federal government is saying, potentially until the middle of next year, it is a great opportunity for the 2022 Tasting Australia to really promote getting more and more out into our regions and encourage communities, like Mrs Lyn Finch and the Streaky Bay Tourism and Business Association the hard work they have done, to get more regional communities to put on events that showcase their local produce and grow our regional economies.

UYGHUR GENOCIDE

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:30): I rise today to express my views and to speak about the genocide being committed against the Uyghur people in the Xinjiang province of China, the autonomous region of China. Genocide is not a word that I would use lightly, but I do not know what other word adequately describes the situation being faced by Uyghurs. There are approximately 12 million Uyghur people living in Xinjiang. They are a distinct ethnic group with their own language, cultural practices and identity.

In Xinjiang there are huge volumes of reports now, undeniable to my mind, of heinous crimes against this community—firsthand accounts of a policy of forced sterilisation of Uyghurs, of the separation of families, of mass and arbitrary detention and the torture of detainees. These are not the spurious accusations of a disgruntled individual or two; they are the mass, evidenced reports of Uyghur people, of human rights organisations and of international analysts and parliaments. To quote the Australian Strategic Policy Institute report on this issue from 2020:

Since 2017, more than a million Uyghurs and members of other Turkic Muslim minorities have disappeared into a vast network of 're-education camps' in the far west region of Xinjiang, in what some experts call a systematic, government-led program of cultural genocide.

The institute's work on this issue has identified what they claim are some 380 re-education camps in the region, alongside the destruction of religious and cultural sites. An investigation by the Associated Press found evidence of the use of forced abortion and sterilisation against the Uyghur people, including forced use of intra-uterine devices.

The US-based Newlines Institute for Strategy and Policy found, based on the work of 50 global experts in international law, that every marker of genocide has been met. They state in their report:

Uyghurs are suffering serious bodily and mental harm from systematic torture and cruel treatment, including rape, sexual abuse, exploitation, and public humiliation...

Around the world, nations are taking notice of this issue and speaking up. The United Kingdom House of Commons has declared these actions as genocide, joining the parliaments of the Netherlands and Canada. US Secretary of State, Antony Blinken, stated in hearings before the US Senate, 'My judgement remains that genocide was committed against the Uyghurs and that hasn't changed.'

Our own Foreign Minister, Senator Marise Payne, has stopped just short of using the word 'genocide', but she stated in April:

We have been very clear about our deeply held concerns about the human rights situation in Xinjiang, particularly as it relates to forced labour, to re-education, to restrictions on freedom of religion, potential restrictions on reproductive rights including forced sterilisations, and also very credible reports of the systematic abuse and torture of women.

I should note for the record that the Chinese government vigorously denies these accusations. They do not accept that genocide is their policy in the region, but the evidence is mounting and poses the question: if this is not genocide, then what is it? Perhaps they may prefer to call it genocide but with Chinese characteristics.

This council cannot set Australian foreign policy of course, but we do owe it to our Uyghur community in Australia, and in South Australia as well, to speak up, to raise our concerns and to urge the commonwealth to do what it can to help the Uyghur people in Xinjiang.

SHOP TRADING HOURS REFERENDUM

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:34): I rise to speak on Cold War crusades in the Legislative Council. In the years following the Second World War, American popular culture mirrored the anxieties that developed between the United States and the USSR. In many cases that popular culture served to subvert Cold War anxieties by questioning those reigning assumptions of both the government and the public. Indeed, those Cold War anxieties persist here in this parliament.

This week, we had the surreal announcement that a 2022 state election poll may well be accompanied, for the first time in 30 years, by a referendum. A referendum on what, the public might ask. Perhaps on the voluntary assisted dying bill that this parliament has failed to deal with in the past 26 years. But no, the answer to that question comes from the Cold War warrior himself, the Hon. Rob Lucas, in the form of a question of, 'Do you want 24/7 shop trading hours in this state—total deregulation?' We have yet to see the actual question.

I look forward to seeing this bill. I am sure it will be no different from previous bills the Hon. Rob Lucas has put before this place and had rejected, but the referendum should, I believe, be on a matter of state, such as electoral reform, as it was that 30 years ago, or on matters that this parliament should put its mind to, such as voluntary assisted dying. But this is truly a referendum with a silent 'b' at the end—a 'referendumb'.

These are desperate tactics, designed to keep archaic Cold War arguments going, arguments from the 1980s, and that is no surprise because the 1980s is when the Hon. Rob Lucas entered this place. Indeed, in his inaugural speech, some four months after he took his seat in this council, in 1983, he noted that he had already worked with a party organisation, that being of course the Liberal Party organisation, for some nine years prior. At the time of taking his seat he was 29. That means that the Hon. Rob Lucas has been institutionalised in parliamentary and political processes for the duration of almost his entire adult life—not quite the '100 years ago' that he often claims in this place, but nearing close to 40 years.

Of course, 1982 was a very different time. Ronald Reagan had not just done it for the Gipper, he had done it for the Republican Party and he was the President of the United States. Mr Reagan in his previous career had been an actor and had been that dreaded thing that the Hon. Rob Lucas hates so much, hates so much that he used the term 88 times this parliamentary session alone: Ronald Reagan had been a union boss from the years 1946 to 1960, being president and also on the board of the Screen Actors Guild.

If there is anything the Hon. Rob Lucas detests it is a union boss who earns money, as we found out in the media recently, which stated that the salaries of the union bosses had stunned the Hon. Rob Lucas—those salaries of Max Adlam, of just over \$100,000, who works so hard for the Firefighters Union, or Phil Palmer, on \$107,200 a year, representing the Ambulance Employees Association—a man who has accrued some \$6 million or so, according to my staff's calculations, simply in salary and entitlements alone.

The \$6 million man, the Cold War warrior of this parliament, wants to take this state to a referendum on shop trading hours, yet he is a leader of a faction which is holding out on debating voluntary assisted dying in that other place—a vote that passed this house last week 14 to seven and that has overwhelming community support. He and his Cold War warrior allies are holding up that debate in the other place, something that I know will not surprise you, but it should surprise the public, and the public deserve to know.

I call on the Hon. Rob Lucas to recognise that the Cold War ended in 1991, that we pulled down those walls and that we can get on and vote on voluntary assisted dying in this parliament, or he will see a referendum on that at the state poll, as he will see a referendum on his Marshall Liberal government failing the people of South Australia.

ANZAC DAY COMMEMORATION SERVICES

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (15:39): I rise today to speak in recognition of this year's ANZAC Day. In 1914, as conflict broke out across Europe, Australia—a federated nation for just 13 years—was thrust into war to support Britain and the commonwealth. On 25 April 1915, Australian and New Zealand troops landed on the beaches of the Gallipoli Peninsula to fierce resistance. That day marked the first major military action fought by Australian and New Zealand forces. It was the start of a determined but damaging eight-month campaign that, sadly, saw 8,000 Australian lives lost.

Today, 25 April marks one of Australia's most important national occasions: ANZAC Day. The first ANZAC Day ceremonies were held in 1916, one year after the ANZACs' fateful landing on the Gallipoli Peninsula. The day was marked by ceremonies held across Australia as well as a march of more than 2,000 Australian and New Zealand troops through London and even a sports day in the Australian military camp in Egypt.

During the 1920s, ANZAC Day was established as a national day of commemoration for the 60,000 Australians who had died in the Great War. Today, ANZAC Day ceremonies take place annually on 25 April across Australia and New Zealand as well as other destinations around the world, such as London and Gallipoli. ANZAC Day has become an important moment of national reflection for all Australians. It is an opportunity to recognise our fellow Australians who have in conflicts past and present sacrificed so much defending our country and our way of life.

Undoubtedly, COVID-19 was tremendously challenging for everyone in South Australia, across the nation and around the world. The reality of COVID restrictions became apparent in 2020 when for the first time veterans and the community were unable to come together to support ANZAC Day. Although restrictions were needed at the time, I know that cancelling dawn services and marches was particularly challenging for many veterans, but the outpouring of support for our veterans remained.

Instead of gathering at the local RSL, people commemorated their own dawn services at the end of their driveways, they posted on social media and they followed televised services. The adaptability shown by South Australians to recognise the ANZAC spirit was symbolic of the community's pride in our nation and those who have fought to defend it.

This year, I was pleased to once again be able to join my community in the Riverland and attend the Garden of Memory in Barmera for this year's ANZAC Day service. Thank you to the Berri and Barmera RSLs, who worked hard to ensure that this year's dawn service went ahead. I would

also like to thank the Berri Barmera Council, who played a critical role in supporting the RSLs to assist them to make the service COVID safe. I was proud to lay a wreath on behalf of the South Australian Liberal Party.

On ANZAC morning, we take the time to reflect on our brave Australian soldiers who displayed exemplary characteristics in the face of conflict. This ANZAC Day I reflected on the life of Riverland local Tom Derrick, affectionately known as Diver, who served in the Second World War and is one of 100 Australian recipients of the Victoria Cross. Diver was raised in Adelaide and moved to Berri in 1931 seeking economic opportunity during the Great Depression. After camping along the riverbank with two friends for a period of time, Diver found work picking fruit at an orchard in Winkie. Coincidentally, the very block—section 209, Winkie Road—once worked by Diver is now owned and occupied by my family.

Diver's life of struggle and resilience was typical in Australia at that time. Like many, he did not enlist until the fall of France in June 1940 and went on to serve in North Africa and the South-West Pacific. Diver received several military awards, including the Victoria Cross for his courageous efforts against the fierce Japanese resistance in the Battle of Sattelberg, New Guinea. Despite how hard Diver had worked to drag himself out of poverty and build a life for himself and his family in Australia, he still felt compelled to serve his nation. Sadly, Diver sacrificed it all, dying on Tarakan Island in what is now Indonesia on 24 March 1945—the same year the war ended.

On ANZAC Day we remember Diver and the many like him. The loss of Australian lives in war is tragic and that is why it is critical we continue to gather together on 25 April to commemorate those who have fallen and recognise how blessed we are to live in the Australia that we do today.

HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:44): There are people behind the stories of fatigued clinicians, ambulance officers and the unwell calling for help that takes too long to arrive. Behind these people there are also powerful stories, like Agatha, a 93-year-old woman who was ramped outside the Royal Adelaide Hospital for hours this week; like Audrey, a little seven year old, whose appendix burst while waiting for treatment in an overcrowded Women's and Children's Hospital emergency department; like Geoff, a father who had to wait over two hours for an ambulance to arrive to provide help to his son who had a seizure while at school, only to arrive at the Flinders Medical Centre to be told there are no beds and to go home; and like Dr Brett Ritchie, who feels the Women's and Children's Hospital is at the point where resources are so thin on the ground that we are seeing errors that should be avoidable with proper resourcing.

The reality is that anyone in this chamber, any South Australian, could be caught up in this crisis. It could be any of our names and any of our stories. When you have clinicians and ambulance officers in uniform fronting the media to call for help, no politician should look the other way. This is a rare event that shows the true severity of this crisis.

Doctors have expressed their fear of telling their stories, that they were pressured by management not to speak out about things they were seeing and the pressures they were feeling. They were concerned that the act of speaking up might go against them personally and professionally and perhaps result in negative outcomes for the unit they are responsible for.

I would say that they are brave individuals who are yet again putting the safety of South Australians before their personal interests. They are proud individuals who have dedicated their working lives to provide care and safety for all in this chamber, our families and those we represent. The Marshall Liberal government has brought in corporate liquidators KordaMentha to implement an agenda that has cost the safety of our community, and we are all paying the price.

According to the Auditor-General, in net terms 112 nurses have been cut in the past year. South Australia is the only state to cut ambulance funding, with a reduction of \$11 million over the past two years. The government has the levers to pull in order to fix this crisis and they should start pulling them, rather than going about continuing to push their political agenda, to tick off all the boxes before one person retires, to have a referendum on shop trading hours, to build basketball stadiums not in this term, next term, but maybe the term after.

These are not the things that people are looking for at this point in time. They are looking for reassurance that, when they call for an ambulance, an ambulance will come. They are looking for reassurance that, when they turn up at the Women's and Children's Hospital with a sick child, they will be seen not in five hours but maybe the first hour.

We are elected into this chamber to ensure that we use taxpayers' money in an appropriate way, in a way that is for the betterment of all South Australians. South Australians are feeling let down by this government. It is time to look to these problems, to listen to these stories and to do something about them. It is time to act.

WORKPLACE BULLYING AND HARASSMENT

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:48): As we have said many times, bullying and harassment, including sexual harassment, is rife in the Public Service. Disturbing figures that SA-Best has obtained reveal that South Australian taxpayers have forked out almost \$40 million to public servants harassed in the workplace over the past five years. In total, 841 public servants received payouts for work-related harassment, including 24 for sexual harassment, between 2015 and 2020.

The worst offending agency was the Department for Education, which reported 253 cases of harassment, including 10 of sexual harassment, for a total payout of nearly \$13 million over the five-year period. The 10 sexual harassment claims were also the highest across the whole of government, followed by SA Health with seven cases, according to figures released by the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment, Ms Erma Ranieri.

These statistics are extremely disturbing and further proof that much more needs to be done to stamp out all forms of harassment in the workplace. They also confirm what SA-Best and others have long suspected and feared, that workplace bullying and harassment is rife in the Department for Education. We know this because my colleague the Hon. Frank Pangallo and I have met with a number of teachers who have experienced such behaviour, some by their own principals. One of my concerns is that, if principals and teachers are harassing their own, then what chance have we of teaching our children about the insidious nature of harassment and the damage it can cause?

On the back of these figures, we have asked the Treasurer to investigate the extent of harassment in the public sector, including the unacceptable number in his own department. The disturbing statistics reveal that, between 2015 and 2020, ten Department for Education employees received payouts, totalling \$374,781, for sexual harassment claims, at an average of \$37,478.10 each. More than \$12.5 million was paid out to a further 243 Department for Education employees for work-related harassment, at an average of \$51,749.95.

Across the whole of government, 24 public servants received compensation for sexual harassment, totalling \$701,079, or \$29,211.65 on average. Across the whole of government, 817 public servants received payouts for other work-related harassment, totalling \$37,620,485, at an average of \$46,050.77 per claim.

SA Health, SAPOL, the Department of Human Services and the Department for Correctional Services rounded out the worst government agencies for general workplace harassment, with 227, 72, 61 and 44 claims respectively. All South Australians should be alarmed at these figures, including the fact that such a staggering amount of taxpayers' money has had to be paid to victims of workplace harassment over the past five years.

If the government was doing more to tackle harassment and bullying in the Public Service, that money could have been redirected to fund critical public health and other crucial support services cut by this government. To have more than 800 public servants in a five-year period, or about 160 average a year, or more than three every week over the past five years, report cases of harassment against them shows the widespread extent of public sector workplace bullying and harassment.

It is a sad indictment on the current workplace harassment policies of this government and reinforces the fact that it has a lot more to do. We all have a lot more to do to address the scourge of harassment in the public sector, and indeed across workplaces.

*Parliamentary Procedure***STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION**

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:52): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice concerning the circumstances surrounding the death of a 13-year-old child at Port Lincoln on 11 May 2021.

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: I note the absolute majority.

*Motions***YOUTH DEATH, PORT LINCOLN**

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:53): I move:

That this council—

1. Calls for an immediate independent joint report, to be completed by the Guardian for Children and Young People and the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People, into all of the circumstances surrounding the death of the 13-year-old child in an industrial garbage truck at Port Lincoln on 11 May 2021, with particular reference to—
 - (a) any failures, shortcomings or neglect of obligations and responsibilities by any department or agency or sub-contracting agency;
 - (b) any allegations of neglect, abuse, mistreatment, or abuse of process by departmental staff, residential facilities, youth, accommodation, education and other service providers who were responsible for and/or entrusted with any aspect of their care;
 - (c) the adequacy and appropriateness of care arrangements of the deceased child and the bystander children involved in the incident, prior to and since the incident;
 - (d) the compliance of the department with the terms and conditions of any guardianship orders the Department for Child Protection was required to fulfil;
 - (e) any other matters they see fit.
2. Requires the joint report to be tabled in parliament within three months.
3. Calls on the Marshall government to immediately guarantee the safety and wellbeing of the bystander children and all other children under the care of the department.
4. Calls on the Coroner to investigate the death of the child as a matter of urgency.

I speak today on this motion with the heaviest of hearts and I am sure I am not the only one in this place whose heart is indeed very heavy at what we heard yesterday. We have seen the face of a failed and broken system, the face of a dear little chap, only 13 years old, who was sleeping in a dumpster and was killed when he was crushed in a compactor truck emptying the dumpster at 5.20am yesterday morning.

It is a face that will not leave me and others, I am sure. I am sure that there are many people who will not rest until they have answers to all of the questions that surround this horrid, tragic incident in Port Lincoln yesterday morning. The child protection system in this instance has failed all three boys sleeping in the dumpster and I want to make sure we get answers to those questions so that no other child is ever in that situation again.

SAPOL superintendent, Paul Bahr, reported last night on ABC that they were conducting a coronial inquiry. I think he meant that they are preparing a report for the Coroner. Disappointingly, he also stated that the boys had somewhere to stay. This is an assumption that is not his to make, quite frankly—that is a matter for the Coroner.

My motion calls for an immediate independent joint inquiry to be undertaken by the Guardian for Children and Young People and the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People into all of the circumstances surrounding the death of this child yesterday. This is to ensure that measures can be put in place to urgently address any failures that have led to this incident. I want those experts to carefully analyse the adequacy and appropriateness of that care, including any allegations of

abuse, neglect, mistreatment or abuse of processes that those children may have suffered by any department, service or subcontractor.

In particular, I want them to look at the terms and conditions of any guardianship orders or other arrangements the Department for Child Protection and any other agencies had in place and were required to fulfil in relation to all of the children. I have called for this to be completed within three months to ensure that there is an immediate response to address anything arising from the inquiry.

Secondly, as noted, the motion calls on the Coroner to investigate the death urgently. We cannot risk more children dying in any circumstances, but especially these. Thankfully, the Coroners Act has been recently amended to ensure that the entire circumstances surrounding little Kumanjay's death will be fully investigated.

In 2008, we apologised as a nation to the stolen generations and today I apologise to you, little Kumanjay, and to your two best mates, that we have failed you as the next stolen generation. We failed to protect you, to keep you safe and warm on that cold and wet Port Lincoln night, like we had on so many nights before that, in your very short 13 years. But I also give you and your friends a commitment: we can and we must do better, and I will do my part to ensure that we act.

I do not know all of the circumstances in this case—none of us do—and that is the reason why I am moving for this inquiry. But what I have heard over the last 24 hours has absolutely rocked me to the core. There is no place for any child to find themselves in the situation that these three little children found themselves in yesterday. With those words, on the basis that this is very much in the public interest, I urge all honourable members to support the motion.

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

INTERNATIONAL DAY AGAINST HOMOPHOBIA, BIPHOBIA, INTERSEXISM AND TRANSPHOBIA

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:59): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises 17 May as the International Day against Homophobia, Biphobia, Intersexism and Transphobia (IDAHOBIT);
2. Acknowledges that Monday 17 May 2021 marks 31 years since the World Health Organization removed homosexuality from the classification of diseases and related health problems;
3. Condemns the ongoing discrimination faced by lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer South Australians;
4. Opposes anti-LGBTIQ conversion practices, recognising the significant and lasting damage they cause to the health and wellbeing of LGBTIQ people; and
5. Commits to working toward acceptance and inclusion of all LGBTIQ people.

The purpose of the motion is pretty simple; it is to reaffirm our parliament's opposition to homophobia, biphobia, intersexism and transphobia and commit to working towards equality for all South Australian citizens.

It does so recognising the approaching IDAHOBIT, the International Day Against Homophobia, Biphobia, Intersexism and Transphobia. I suspect probably at least half the members of this house will recall that I have spoken on IDAHO at least a couple of times before and even IDAHOBIT once. I think IDAHO first commenced as an international day of commemoration in Canada some years ago and it has slowly grown in prominence as an international day of commemoration around the world. It has also slowly grown in terms of the additional letters of the alphabet we have added to the acronym.

It falls on 17 May each year, the anniversary of the removal of homosexuality from the World Health Organization's international classification of diseases and related health problems in 1990. Essentially, it is about the rejection of hate, the kind of hate that leads to gay bashing, the kind of hate that leads to the murder of trans people around the world, and the kind of hate that we saw just last week with the so-called honour killing of a young 20-year-old man called Ali Fazeli Monfared in Iran.

It is worth reflecting on, I think, when all of our lifetimes, and certainly within the parliamentary career of the Hon. Mr Lucas, homosexuality was recognised by the World Health Organization on the list of diseases. The removal of homosexuality from that list was a very important step, a very influential step, indeed, in terms of helping us launch a series of reforms in this country and around the world on the way towards equality.

South Australia was once at the forefront of that charge but is no more. However, just this week we have commemorated the 49th anniversary of the death of Dr Ian George Ogilvy Duncan on the banks of the River Torrens: 49 years on, that crime has not yet been solved. Those who threw Dr Duncan into the river and ended his life still have not been brought to justice.

Dr Duncan should not have died but his death did, at the very least, act as a catalyst in this place for change. Within months of his death, this place would pass some very narrow defences, but welcome nonetheless, for gay men to the crimes of homosexuality. That is, if you drew the curtains and could argue that it was happening in your own private bedroom you should not be arrested by police. That is not something that we would be satisfied with now, but for its time it was a leap forward. In 1975, with the support of the Dunstan government, our state would be the first in the nation to decriminalise homosexuality when Peter Duncan, the Attorney-General, took that legislation through the lower house.

We may have lost our status as a first mover on LGBTIQ rights but we have made important advances in recent years. I particularly acknowledge the passing of amendments to the Spent Convictions Act in 2013, strengthened again just last year; Premier Jay Weatherill's historic apology to the LGBTIQ community in 2016; and the passing of substantial law reform in 2016.

To summarise those changes very briefly, they were led by a groundbreaking report from the South Australian Law Reform Institute, ensuring that transgender people can have their true identity recognised on their birth certificates; equalised access to assisted reproductive treatment and adoption; and recognise same-sex relationships under the law, in a time before marriage equality eventually became the law of the land. That report from SALRI also led to one of our most recent advances, the abolition—finally—of the gay panic defence. I have already acknowledged the Attorney-General Vickie Chapman, in the other place, for this great reform.

These are good and great achievements. Bit by bit we are pulling apart a system of discriminatory laws and building a framework for the inclusion of all people regardless of their identity in our society. But that work is not over. This parliament has yet to confront the issue of so-called conversion practices. These practices, which seek to change, alter or suppress a person's gender identity or sexual orientation, are rooted in the same discriminatory ideology we have spent so many years working to bring down. It is important that we acknowledge this and that we acknowledge that conversion practices do not always meet the expectations people may hold.

Exorcisms and electroshock therapy have occurred, particularly in years gone by. Thankfully, they are not pre-eminent these days, but recent research has showed us, particularly the Preventing Harm, Promoting Justice report by the Human Rights Law Centre and Latrobe University suggests that those practices, at least, being less common, other practices have taken their place.

The challenge confronting us is now much more insidious. Conversion ideology can be found in some religious communities, usually on the fringes, against the teachings and wishes of mainstream churches. Survivors describe being told that they are broken, that their sexuality or their gender identity is not just sinful but a sign that something has gone wrong in their life and needs to be repaired. This ideology teaches that same-sex attraction or transgender identity can be fixed and that continuing to experience these things is simply a sign that they are still broken.

It is bad enough that this is untrue, but what makes these practices truly dangerous is the harm they do to people who are coming to terms with their sexual identity. The Preventing Harm, Promoting Justice report, among other research, documents this damage graphically. Mental health issues, suicide, depression, anxiety, social isolation: conversion ideology causes lasting and often lifelong damage to victims.

This is upheld by the anecdotal evidence of these victims as presented in this place in a forum that we had, I think it was last year. Conversion practices are causing harm to gay and lesbian and transgender kids right now, today in our state. This is not news. In 2019—it was 2019, not last

year—I hosted a forum here at Parliament House on so-called conversion therapy. We heard directly from survivors and advocates about the harm being caused to members of our community. I know my colleague the member for Hurtle Vale in the other place, Ms Nat Cook, has been working hard on how we can best tackle this issue in South Australia.

So this IDAHOBIT, this day of commemoration, I would like to encourage members to turn their minds to the next frontier. After the success of a years-long campaign for marriage equality, some seem to think that LGBTIQ equality has been won; we can stop now and not talk about it anymore. But I would like to assure members that it is not over. The battle has not been won.

Year 2020 statistics from the National LGBTI Health Alliance reveal that 16 per cent of LGBTIQ young people aged 16 to 27 have reported attempting suicide, rising to 48.1 per cent among transgender and gender diverse young people. In the recent fourth edition of La Trobe University's Writing Themselves In report, 40.8 per cent of participants reported experiencing verbal harassment in the past 12 months based on their sexuality or gender identity, and 9.7 per cent reported physical harassment or assault.

Even beyond the harm of conversion practices, there are many challenges our parliament and our government need to face, like the chronic underfunding of the Women's and Children's Hospital gender clinic, leading to enormous wait times for health care for our trans community members; like the discrimination faced daily by LGBTIQ people accessing health care and the desperate need for many GPs to better understand issues of sexuality and gender diversity; or like the fact that our Equal Opportunity Act continues to exempt religious bodies from needing to comply with anti-discrimination protections and that our equal opportunity commissioner is still underfunded and under-resourced to carry out the work that is demanded of her office; and like the many other barriers and hurdles faced by LGBTIQ people in simply living their day-to-day lives and being their authentic selves.

In recent commemorations of the death and legacy of Dr Duncan there has been much discussion about this Legislative Council and how this chamber was once dominated by conservative ideology which blocked reform for so many long years, delaying the decriminalisation of homosexuality in our state. I would like to acknowledge my friend the Hon. Anne Levy, who successfully led the debate on decriminalising homosexuality in this place in 1975. *Hansard* records her words in introducing this ultimately successful bill:

I contend that our present law with regard to homosexual behaviour is neither humane nor compassionate. It causes unnecessary suffering, and serves no useful purpose. Indeed, it makes criminals of thousands of otherwise law-abiding citizens, and it makes a mockery of our social value of minority and individual rights.

I am glad that the council agreed with the Hon. Anne Levy on that third and final occasion of attempting to reform the law. Today, we have been at the forefront of more recent examples of social law reform. I am very pleased that many of us in this chamber have voted to support those changes, but it is in that spirit that I ask all honourable members to support this motion to support our LGBTIQ community, particularly our young ones, and to continue the work of ending discrimination against that community.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:09): I rise in support of this motion and I thank the Hon. Ian Hunter MLC for putting this forward for the chamber's consideration. May 17 is International Day Against Homophobia, Biphobia, Intersexism and Transphobia (IDAHOBIT day). For me, it is an opportunity for us to reflect on how far we have come, but also, as the honourable member stated in his remarks, it is a time for us to reflect on the work that is yet to be done.

On Monday, I had cause to reflect on how far we have come when I joined the Hon. Ian Hunter and other members of this parliament at the commemoration of the death of Dr George Duncan. It was 49 years this year since Dr Duncan, a law academic at the University of Adelaide, was murdered and thrown into the River Torrens. It is, of course, a terrible travesty that those killers have never been brought to justice.

As has been outlined, we know that it was that tragic event that intensified public pressure and eventually forced legislative change to occur in South Australia. South Australia became the first state in our nation to decriminalise homosexual acts—a breakthrough moment for South Australia. We have achieved an awful lot since then, but there is lots of work to do.

I echo the comments made by the Hon. Ian Hunter regarding conversion therapy. This is an issue of grave concern for the Greens. Those practices are abusive. This idea that you can lead somebody to change their sexuality is not supported by any evidence and it actually puts vulnerable young people in a really invidious position. It compounds their stress and anxiety and has a range of terrible health outcomes, so that is something that this parliament needs to work to scrap as an urgent priority.

I would also draw members' attention to anti-discrimination laws, which I understand are subject to state government review at the moment. Currently, religious organisations have exemptions to those laws, and I think it is appalling that religious organisations have the capacity to discriminate against gay, lesbian and transgender people, including students and teachers. That is wrong.

Organisations that take public funding—take public money—should not get a 'get out of gaol free' card when it comes to anti-discrimination laws. That is something that needs to change and I look forward to those reforms coming to this parliament for consideration because it is time for South Australia to say that all South Australians, irrespective of their gender identity or their sexuality, are equal before the law. We should not be allowing religious organisations to continue to shirk their responsibilities under the law.

I also want to draw this chamber's attention to the ongoing persecution of LGBTI people that is occurring overseas. As the Hon. Ian Hunter stated, just last week there was the tragic murder of Ali Fazeli Monfared in Iran. Mr Monfared was a 22-year-old gay Iranian man who was allegedly killed in an honour killing by some of his male family members after they found out that he was gay, according to the Iranian Lesbian and Transgender Network. I want to read out some of the facts in relation to that case, simply because it is important for us to reflect as a chamber on the appalling circumstances faced by many LGBTI people overseas and the need for all levels of government to take any action they can to advance the rights of LGBTI people.

This young man was allegedly killed in what was referred to as an 'honour killing'. I am quoting from the article of NBC by Jo Yurcaba, dated 12 May 2021. He received an exemption card in the mail from the Islamic Revolution Guard Corps after disclosing his homosexuality, but one of his male relatives found it and discovered that he was gay.

The organisation reported that the relative had previously told this man's father that the young man had dishonoured his family due to the way that he dressed. After finding the exemption card, a group of male relatives took Fazeli Monfared to a rural village on 4 May and killed him. The card and the exemption for homosexuality as a disease put this man in danger.

The organisation 6rang, which is an organisation that advocates for LGBTI people in Iran—again, this is NBC reporting—said that the alleged killers, after the atrocious murder had taken place, called the man's mother and told her where to find her only son's beheaded body. This is horrific and sadly a reminder of the hate crimes that we see unfolding in many places around the world. I am also reminded of the persecution of LGBTI people in Russia and the appalling persecution of LGBTI people in Chechnya, so we do need to do whatever we can to address that ongoing human rights abuse.

In concluding, as part of IDAHOBIT we celebrate what has been achieved and the great law reform work that has been done in our state, but we also reflect on the work yet to be done—the need to get rid of conversion therapy as a priority, the need to strengthen our anti-discrimination laws so that all South Australians are equal before the law and the need for our federal government to call out appalling human rights abuse of LGBTI people around the globe and to do what they can to advance the rights of LGBTI people not just in Australia but internationally.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I. Pnevmatikos.

PRIVATISATION

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:17): I move:

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on the privatisation of public services in South Australia, with particular reference to—
 - (a) the cost to the public of privatised services;

- (b) the quality of privatised services and the outcomes for the public, particularly with respect to disadvantaged members of the public;
 - (c) the impact on employment rates, conditions and locations, especially rural and regional employment;
 - (d) the effect on income and wealth inequality;
 - (e) the effect on public participation, social cohesion and public perception of the role of government; and
 - (f) any other related matters.
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.

This is a motion to establish a select committee of the Legislative Council to inquire into and report on the privatisation of services in South Australia. With South Australia now one of the most privatised states in the country, we need a wideranging inquiry into the impact of almost three decades of privatisation. From the sale of our water supply and electricity services to the complete debacle that is our public transport system, it is clear that private profits have been put before the public good and before quality public services.

It is clear that a number of members of the community, a vast majority of people in the community, are concerned about what is happening when it comes to the privatisation of their essential services. Research from the Australia Institute in 2019 found that 40 per cent of South Australians blame the privatisation of our state-owned electricity provider as the single biggest reason for power price increases, and three out of five people (60 per cent) consider it to be one of the main sources of upward pressure on prices.

This report also found that price gouging from energy companies was the number one concern for one out of three South Australians (34 per cent). Privatisation has become an ideological hobbyhorse pursued by both sides of politics at different times. It has often been packaged up and sold to the public as something that is actually going to deliver improved services to the community.

Could anybody actually say that the privatisation of ETSA was a success? Could anybody actually say that the privatisation of our public transport system has been a success? The results speak for themselves. The sale of ETSA did not see a reduction in our electricity costs; instead, it was a monumental failure that has delivered us higher prices. Privatisation of our public transport network certainly did not result in improved services; instead, it resulted in cuts and a slash and burn approach to some of our most vulnerable communities.

I had a look, in preparing for today, into some of the examples of privatisation that have unfolded over the 30-year history of this experiment in South Australia. I must say that I was stunned by the length of the list and the number of important utilities and public services that have been sold off at great expense to the South Australian taxpayer in terms of the quality of the services they receive.

In 1992, we saw the sale of the SA Gas Company; 1993, SA Financial Trust; 1994, State Bank of South Australia; 1994, Austrust Trustees; 1994, Enterprise Investments (there was a real fire sale happening in 1994); 1994, *Island Seaway*, ferry to Kangaroo Island; 1995, Pipelines Authority of SA; 1995, Sign Services; 1995, State Government Insurance Commission (keep on selling it all off—it has all got to go); 1995, State Bank of SA; 1995, State Chemistry Laboratories; 1995, State Clothing Corporation; 1996, Radio FIVEaa; 1996, Samcor Meatworks; 1996, Forwood

Products (timber); 1997, Port Bulk Handling Facilities; 1999, ETSA (and we all know what happened there); 1999, Central Linen Service; 2000, Torrens Island Power Station; 2000, ElectraNet; 2001, South Australian Totalisator Agency Board (SA TAB); 2002, SA Ports Corporation; 2012, SA Lotteries (master agent); 2012, Forestry SA; 2016, Motor Accident Commission (that was an investment portfolio); and 2017, Land Services, the lands titles office.

It is a long list and, sadly, we know that it is a list that will be added to in the years ahead, with the privatisation of our train network and the appalling consequences that will flow from that. This inquiry is seeking to look at the implications of these privatisations, the impact that this has on the services made available to the people of South Australia and the impact this has on the workers in those industries.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (16:22): I rise to indicate support for this motion. We have seen privatisation in this state time and again, particularly with the explicit promise of not doing that. Prior to the 1997 state election, we remember the ironclad guarantees given in relation to the state's electricity assets: 'They will not be privatised'. An election rolls around and they were privatised. As we know, as the Hon. Robert Simms has pointed out, a large portion of South Australians know that the Hon. Rob Lucas' privatisation of ETSA is one of the primary reasons for the problems we see with the electricity system and the prices people pay.

We roll around to the next time the Liberals are elected in this state, with the explicit promise by then Liberal opposition leader, the member for Dunstan, that there is no privatisation agenda. As soon as they get into government they start flogging off everything again. One notable thing that was not mentioned on the Hon. Robert Simms' list was the Remand Centre, which was privatised recently, but the big privatisation, the one people are treating with a similar amount of disgust and disdain as the selling off of ETSA, is the privatisation of the rail system, of the trains and trams in this state.

I have been at railway stations over the last 12 months on many mornings and many afternoons talking to commuters, and almost everyone—95 per cent of people I have talked to at train stations—knows the facts, knows that, once you sell the railway system to a private operator, fares will increase and services will reduce. That has been the experience overseas and it just stands to reason.

If it is being run for, as the government claims, the same sort of money—although, I think as has been borne out in further inquiries, it is actually going to cost more for the private sector to run it, even though for some weeks the government could not work out exactly how much it costs to run the rail system. When it is finally shown that there will not be savings, the only way that a private company can make a profit is if they cut services or increase costs. That just stands to reason.

This will be an important committee that will look not just at the past but, I think very importantly, to the future. We have a commitment as a state Labor opposition that, at the next election, if Peter Malinauskas, the member for Croydon in another place, is successful we will reverse the privatisation of the rail system. That is a commitment of the state Labor opposition. It is one that almost to a T commuters who use the rail system want to see happen. I think this will be a useful and important committee to look at not just historic, as outlined, but recent and particularly contemporary privatisations to see why they occurred.

This will help the government out because they are unsure of their own figures in terms of how much it actually costs them to run the rail system. This might find it out once and for all and dispel those myths that this is a good thing for South Australia. The privatisation of rail is certainly not.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:26): I rise to speak to the motion. The government does not support it but acknowledges that the numbers in the chamber will be there to see the committee do its work. I am going to place on the record, and I know our representative will follow through on behalf of the committee, a series of privatisations, commercialisations or outsourcings conducted by former governments that the Hon. Mr Simms I am sure, being as fair as he would wish to be, will make sure the committee explores because he has no great love, I am sure, for the Labor governments of the past as indeed he probably does not have much love for the Liberal government of the present.

It is useful, given the claims that have been made, at least to place on the public record, as I have done a number of times before, the explicit commitment that I gave on behalf of the then Liberal opposition to the Public Service Association in relation to indicating that we would not rule out outsourcing or commercialisation of public sector assets or services. I place on the record a letter that I wrote to Nev Kitchin, who was recently re-elected, and I congratulate him and his team for their comprehensive majority.

On 12 January 2018, just before the 2018 election, I wrote a letter to my good friend Nev Kitchin. It was a series of answers to a series of questions. Question 2 was: 'Will your party commit to not privatising, outsourcing or commercialising any Public Sector assets and services?' My response went as follows:

Contrary to their election promises the Labor government has embarked on a massive programme of privatisation (MAC, LTO, Lotteries Commission, SA Forests, etc) and has paid KPMG \$100,000 for a secret report into the privatisation of SA Water. A Liberal Government will not support the privatisation of SA Water.

There are many current examples where public services are being successfully delivered by private or non-government suppliers. We have a responsibility to consider such options where it is clearly in the public interest to do so.

So I made it clear to Nev and his team that the government would not rule out outsourcing or commercialising. The former Labor government had engaged in a whole series of commercialising, outsourcing and also privatising but commercialising and outsourcing of public sector services. We indicated that, if elected, we had a responsibility to consider such options where it was in the public interest to do so, so we would not rule out commercialising or outsourcing public sector services.

We did rule out the privatisation of SA Water and we have adhered to that particular commitment. That was the specific nature of the commitment I gave on 12 January 2018 on behalf of the Liberal Party if elected to government in the lead-up to the campaign. It was a focus of the election campaign because the Labor Party, as they have for the last 20 years, tried to run the ogre that Rob Lucas was going to privatise everything, and they were comprehensively defeated. I am intent—and the Hon. Mr Hunter might be able to help me here—that my very good friend, the current—is it general secretary?

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: State secretary.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The state secretary of the Labor Party, Reggie Martin, had a wonderful life-sized cut-out saying that Rob Lucas would privatise everything that moves, or something. He said that he might sign it for me and give it to me as a memento of battles past and present. At every election, the Labor Party runs this particular ogre and, as I said, at the last election they were comprehensively defeated.

What I will be asking a representative of the committee to do—and if the Hon. Mr Simms is chairing the committee, I am sure he will be even-handed about this—is to list a significant number of privatisations outsourcing some commercialisations by the former Labor government that should be the subject of the same scrutiny as the Labor Party would wish to apply to any recent outsourcings such as the trains and trams that they have referred to.

This is just a quick grab. I will make sure that our representative has a comprehensive collection of outsourcing of privatisations under the former Labor government for this committee to provide a forensic analysis to, if that is what they are going to do. End-user computing, support and maintenance of desktop services, was outsourced on 25 November 2017. Which functions remain in the public sector? None relating to desktop support and maintenance of end-user computing—all completely outsourced by the former Labor government in 2017.

In the old department of DPTI, which is now DIT, the government had a facilities management contract. In 2015, a new contract was entered into by the former Labor government. All facilities, management services, planned and unplanned maintenance, minor works, small construction works and property services, contract management were outsourced at a cost of, as I understand it, about \$30 million per annum—all outsourced in that particular department. Building projects done—these were architects, engineers, cost managers and surveys, contract management functions—were all outsourced in 2013 by the former Labor government.

In April 2014, hotel services within the health department hospitals, non-clinical support services, helpdesk, cleaning, catering, ground maintenance were all outsourced by the former Labor

government. In 2017, there was the Southern Hemisphere's biggest outsourced privatisation of a hospital, the NRAH. The Spotless contract, as part of that, outsourced the food services and ward attendants in 2017. Of course, the NRAH is still owned by a private sector consortium, so if one wants to look at a privatisation in the Labor use of the phrase, they privatised the new Royal Adelaide Hospital and not only that but also the hotel services in a massive contract with Spotless at that particular time.

Back in 2012-13, all of the security services within health were outsourced to MSS Security. On-demand guarding services, mobile patrols and alarm response services were all outsourced to a private sector provider by the former Labor government. In November 2016, medical imaging at Modbury radiology services at the Modbury Hospital were undertaken by Benson Radiology. The continuation and expansion of services was fully outsourced to Benson medical imaging at the Modbury Hospital.

Yet, we had the railing and gnashing of teeth by the Labor Party when the government said that if savings were not made in medical imaging and pathology, the government would leave open the option of continuing what the former Labor government did in a number of hospital areas, of the outsourcing of radiology or medical imaging services.

In December 2016, the Lyell McEwin radiology services were undertaken by DXRS Pty Ltd, also known as Radiology SA. That was the management, administrative, billing and technical services. All of those services in December 2016 were outsourced to a private sector provider. In 2015, in centralised waste management and health, there was one contract for SITA Australia for the provision of general waste recycling and confidential waste services, and a separate contract for Veolia Australia for the provision of medical waste and sharp services. These were all outsourced in 2015.

In 2016, in compounding pharmacy, a pharmaceuticals contract was fully outsourced by the former Labor government. In 2014, the community nurse program was outsourced to a non-government provider. The contract for RDNS renewal was fully outsourced in terms of a community nurse program by the former Labor government. In October 2015, there was a significant expansion of nursing agency work, fully outsourcing nursing provision of nursing agency staff within local health networks. Nurses who were currently employed as SA Health employees were outsourced to nursing agency staff.

In 2015, the South Australian Housing Authority outsourced the management of almost 5,000, it looks like, public housing dwellings. In 2015 and 2017, the public housing tenancy and asset management for approximately 5,000 dwellings were outsourced at that particular time for that number of housing dwellings.

In 2011, the capital delivery in SA Water, share partnership for delivery of capital and services with KBR, was outsourced. Shared partnership, equal roles remaining in both, was a decision taken by the former Labor government within SA Water. In 2009—it finished in 2012—was the infamous South Australian forests or ForestrySA privatisation. This house has discussed that particular privatisation on many occasions. It is still being criticised in the South-East, but that was under the former Labor government.

In 2011-12, there was the privatisation or commercialisation of SA Lotteries. The Lotteries would be licensed to a private sector operator. The management of their operations was transferred to Tatts through the provision of a long-term 40-year licensing agreement. To many people, the much-loved SA Lotteries was privatised by the former Labor government.

In 2009 through to 2016, there was the sale of a portfolio of SA government commercial and industrial properties and housing, including South Australian government employee rental properties. They were all privatised or sold during that particular period. In 2016 through to 2017, there was the land services commercialisation project; that is, the former Labor government announced a range of transactional land services and functions to be commercialised by the state, the LTO privatisation as it has been colloquially referred to by the former Labor government.

The MAC, otherwise known as the third-party insurance market reform project by the former government, started in 2014 and went through for a number of years. The Motor Accident

Commission, previously conducted in government, was privatised under the former Labor government to four private sector insurers, which is the system that is operating today.

There was also the privatisation of domiciliary care and disability services reform under the former Labor government in March of 2017, just 12 months prior to the election, so a relatively contemporary decision by that particular government. There was a significant number of decisions that were taken there owing to the transition of the procurement process, market sounding and to facilitate the transfer of domiciliary care to the non-government sector by 30 June 2018. That was a decision from the former Labor government in 2017 and 2018.

That is just a selection, a taster plate of the decisions the former Labor government took. There are a number of other departments and agencies that had not responded by the time of my contribution today, but I will undertake to whoever is going to chair the committee to ensure that all of these decisions that the former Labor government took will be part and parcel of the work that the chair of the committee and all members of the committee will address.

I am sure if there is a Labor member on the committee, as I am sure there will be, they will want to only look at the handful of issues that this government in the last three years has engaged in. The crossbenchers, I am sure, will be fair in relation to this to say, 'Well, if we are going to look at decisions that the Liberal government have taken in three years, it is only fair that we look at all of the decisions you took in your turn in government and we will provide the same forensic analysis of those particular privatisations, commercialisations or outsourcings as you want us to do to the Liberal one.'

I make no criticism of some of the decisions of the former government in relation to outsourcing because, as I said in the letter to Nev Kitchin, the former government had outsourced where it was believed it was in the public interest to do so and it was in a position to be able to say, 'We will save millions of dollars for the taxpayers of South Australia by outsourcing the provision to MSS,' for example, in terms of security, or Spotless in terms of facilities management, or whatever it might be.

The former government took advice and in the end decided that it was cheaper for the taxpayers of the South Australia to actually outsource to the MSS or to Spotless or to a variety of other private sector or non-government providers to provide those particular services. The hypocrisy that I call out here is this holier than thou attitude when the Liberal Party was at least honest enough to the PSA to say, 'No, we are not going to rule out commercialising and outsourcing. If it is in the public interests, we will do so.' I had those arguments and debates with the PSA in the months leading up to the election, and they know that, I did not back off indicating what our position was.

They were quite clear. They had a letter from me, a commitment in writing, which they circulated to all their members prior to the election. They had all of the answers from the political parties and candidates prior to the election saying, 'These are important issues that you want. You need to know what the political parties are saying in relation to these particular issues.' It was not unknown. It was not hidden. It was circulated to all of their members that this is what a Liberal government reserved the right to do if it made the judgement.

In relation to the train outsourcing, for example, that has saved millions of dollars for the taxpayers of South Australia. The outsourcing of the Remand Centre has saved millions of dollars for the taxpayers of South Australia. As I am sure the Labor Party will claim, when they outsourced the Spotless contract or the MSS contract, they too saved millions of dollars for the taxpayers of South Australia.

Indeed, when the member for Croydon, the now Leader of the Opposition, and other ministers recontracted the outsourced provision of the Mount Gambier Prison or bus services or facilities management contracts when they were ministers, and they had the option to take it back into government if they so chose, they decided not to because they got advice which said, 'If you take it back into government it is going to cost you millions of dollars more and you are going to have to find the money.' It would be useful to get advice from former Labor ministers or indeed current Labor members who were ministers, in terms of the nature of the advice they have.

It may well be that we might be able to assist the committee with some of the information that former Labor ministers might have received in relation to why they should recontract the outsourced Mount Gambier Prison contract or recontract the security services contract or the hotel

services contract, or why they should outsource medical imaging at the Modbury Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Hospital. The simple answer was, 'Because it will save you, minister, millions of dollars in taxpayers' money, and it's in the best interests that you do so,' and they signed up.

But now, as soon as they are in opposition, they revert to type and claim themselves to be holier than thou and they try to create this ogre, as they do every election, that Rob Lucas is going to privatise everything that moves. Well, good luck with that. You tried that at the last election and you lost comprehensively. We are very happy for you to engage in that particular issue in the lead-up to this coming election, if you so choose, and we will let the people decide in relation to the issue.

For all those reasons and, as I said, I undertake to ensure that the committee is provided with even more examples of privatisations, outsourcing and commercialisations of the former Labor government during its term in government so that the committee can have a comprehensive list of all that the former Labor government did in this particular area.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:46): Mr President, I am not listed to speak on this but I will, if you will indulge me, just to briefly say that SA-Best supports the motion of the Hon. Robert Simms for this inquiry into privatisation of public services in South Australia. I note the words of the Treasurer about hypocrisy—and hypocrisy is certainly no stranger to this chamber, particularly to both the Labor Party and the Liberal Party. I am sure that if the Liberals had a period of 16 years in government we would have seen a far greater list of privatisations, in fact probably equal to those that he has mentioned in relation to Labor.

As he has pointed out, and I tend to agree, there are occasions when privatisation is beneficial to taxpayers. There are instances of good examples, and of course this is what the committee is going to look at; it is going to look at the benefits as well as the negatives of privatisation. But there have been crucial ones that have really cost taxpayers money, significant amounts of money.

I do not think even the Liberals can escape the doozy of privatisations that was the sale of ETSA. Here we are in 2021 and we are still paying for it. My power bills have not gone down, and we are looking at spending billions of dollars for interconnectors and all this sort of stuff. This can be related back to that decision when the Hon. Rob Lucas was in government, and former Premier John Olsen. They stand condemned for what they did in relation to our energy supplies and what ETSA stood for.

The Hon. Robert Simms has gone through a whole list of some of those privatisations that have happened over the years, and some certainly stick in my mind. Apart from ETSA, of course, there was SAGASCO, and here we are still with very high gas prices in Australia. The sale of Lotteries by the Labor government was an interesting one. Lotteries was a really good earner for hospitals in South Australia. That is where some of the revenues that came into government went to, into helping fund our hospitals. Well, all that has gone.

The lands titles one, for instance, by the previous Labor government was incomprehensible. When you look at what was happening with lands titles, in fact it was actually generating income from what it was doing. It was overseeing the day-to-day transactions and the titles that go on. This is the state that created the Torrens title. It was going on quite well as a revenue earner for the state, but the previous government decided to get rid of it.

Let us not forget what this government planned to do just over a year ago with Pathology SA. With COVID we have seen the benefits of having Pathology SA in South Australia. Had it not been for COVID, they probably would have flogged it off as well. COVID has saved Pathology SA. We have just seen the fantastic work they have done in helping the state combat COVID-19.

The Treasurer also mentioned ForestrySA, again another blunder by the previous government that has dearly cost taxpayers a significant amount of money. We are continuing to see the effects of that today. I am on the select committee looking into forestry (timber) on the Limestone Coast. We recently made a trip to Kangaroo Island, where we saw the aftermath of the bushfires and the fact that there are millions of tonnes of timber that need to be shipped off that island, and still they have not got a decision from this government in relation to a wharf at Smith Bay to get that timber off the island and be able to feed the demand we are currently seeing around Australia for timber.

I was only informed yesterday that the Morgan Sawmill in Jamestown may be forced to close at the end of June, with the loss of 75 jobs and \$10 million in revenue to the local economy of Jamestown and surrounding regions, because the government has decided not to award a tender to Morgan for timber and instead has apparently awarded it to another company that has significant business interests with China.

Morgan is unable to access timber—they are not able to access South Australian grown timber—because ForestrySA has decided that they would prefer to do business with another company that will actually ship the sawlog to China. Here we are, with sawmills in the Mid North and the South-East that are crying out for sawlog to meet the demand for construction in Australia, and they cannot because of contracts that have been entered into and the sawlog being shipped off to China.

I was shown some photographs the other day, which were quite disturbing, of the amount of sawlog on an interstate wharf that is destined for overseas countries, and one in particular. That sawlog came from our own forests. It is shameful that we lost that valuable resource that would have generated income for South Australia.

Railways is another one. I think I have often spoken about railways. People think I have a fixation with things railway, but I have not. I see the value of railway infrastructure and having efficient railways for our freight around the country. South Australia is the only state that has virtually abandoned its regional rail network, and it is in a shocking case of disrepair. Again, it was sold off and no effort has been made to try to revive rail in our regional areas, which is certainly badly needed and would provide job opportunities and enable the efficient shipment of freight—it is gone.

The Labor government sold SAMCOR. We know where it is. If you travel down Port Wakefield Road and go to Gepps Cross, you see the vast tract of land that is there and you can see what is there now. There are valuable commercial properties and developments and they are continuing to go on. If my memory serves me correctly, I reckon they sold that vast tract of land for something like \$3½ million or \$4 million. What do you reckon that is worth today, Mr President? A significant amount of money.

As I said, when we talk about privatisation, some can be beneficial to taxpayers, but most of the time it leads to increases in bills. That is what usually happens. When you privatise, companies are going to go in there to make a buck and of course the bills are going to increase with that. Whether it is Labor or Liberal, privatisation has and will continue to be some form of contagion.

I think the aim of this inquiry is to have a look at what has happened in the past and how to avoid situations like the sale of ETSA and others that have cost the taxpayers of South Australia quite dearly. This is what we are going to learn from having this inquiry: how to avoid those blunders, mistakes and poor judgements that have been made.

Many times, it is members of parliament or ministers who tend to cop the blame for making these decisions, but I will also heap blame on the bureaucrats who are advising them who seem to think it is a great idea. Usually, these bureaucrats in their ivory castles have no real connection with the real world or real people out there. When institutions or government-run businesses are privatised and end up hitting people in the hip pocket, the bureaucrats seem to be immune to the damage that they have caused them.

The other issue regarding the motion by the honourable member is the effect that it will have on income and wealth inequality. Again, I think we can point particularly to the issue of land sales and public sector housing that has been sold off by the previous government, which has resulted in very long waiting lists for people to get into public housing.

I can remember stories about people having to wait up to 30 years in some instances to get into public housing. In the meantime, the government of the day was flogging them off, not spending money on maintenance and making contracts with private operators regarding maintenance that were totally ineffectual, and we still have that problem today. It is quite shameful that we cannot meet the need for social housing. Social inclusion is very important.

These are some of the issues that the honourable member will be looking at, as well as ways that we can avoid this in the future and what lessons we can learn from the past. In saying that, I did not intend to speak as long as I did, but we endorse the motion by the Hon. Robert Simms.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:59): I thank the Labor Party and SA-Best for their support for this inquiry. I am disappointed to hear from the Hon. Mr Lucas that the Liberal Party will not be supporting the inquiry, because it sounds like he has a lot to contribute. Indeed, he has been a thought leader in the area of privatisation. It was the Hon. Mr Lucas who started the project and the Labor Party that continued it. Now is an opportunity for us to put a stop to it.

What I would like to do with this inquiry is look at what has gone wrong with the privatisation of our public assets, what that has meant for growing inequality in our state, what that has meant for reduced public services and what that has meant for the most vulnerable people in our community, because it has been disastrous. There is a very long list—I do not propose to go through it again—in terms of the examples of privatisation in SA. This inquiry will provide us with an opportunity to get the facts, to put them on the table and to hear from the relevant players. I commend the motion to the council.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:01): I move:

That the select committee consist of the Hon. David Ridgway MLC, the Hon. John Darley MLC, the Hon. Frank Pangallo MLC, the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos MLC and the mover.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:01): I move:

That the select committee have power to send for persons, papers and records and to adjourn from place to place and that it report on 25 August 2021.

Motion carried.

COVID-19 RENTAL AFFORDABILITY

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:02): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises the ongoing impacts that COVID-19 continues to have on South Australians;
2. Notes the significant financial stress many renters are under, with the conclusion of JobKeeper in March;
3. Notes the short-term moratorium on eviction for non-payment of rent due to severe rental distress as a result of COVID-19 is currently due to expire on 31 May 2021;
4. Calls on the Marshall government to immediately guarantee that no South Australian renter will be evicted into homelessness, by extending the moratorium on eviction beyond the proposed 30 June extension;
5. Calls on the Marshall government to immediately waive all rental debt accrued by renters impacted by COVID-19; and
6. Calls on the Marshall government to immediately introduce permanent rent caps to limit annual rent increases.

I will be brief. I have only been here a short time, but I worry that members may already be sick of hearing the sound of my voice this week. This motion is a timely one. It relates to the need to strengthen the protection for renters in South Australia. Last night, we saw the federal Treasurer hand down his annual budget with not a single dollar invested in social housing infrastructure—not a single dollar.

While housing has traditionally been seen as a state issue, what we need to see is leadership from the federal Liberal government to establish a range of incentives to encourage investment in social and affordable housing. There is no such investment of course, and we know that South Australia has missed out once again. In my first speech in this place last week, I spoke about the housing crisis that is gripping our state. During this one-in-100-year pandemic, in the middle of the worst economic crisis in a generation, it is vitally important that we make this a priority.

I understand that tomorrow this parliament will be dealing with a bill relating to ceasing the moratorium on evictions for people experiencing rental stress but also ceasing the rent capping for

those experiencing rental stress. We need to extend those protections and ensure that vulnerable South Australians, those on the lowest incomes, those who are renting, have the protections that they need so that they are not cast out onto the street and so that they do not face eviction.

According to Anglicare Australia's 2021 rental affordability snapshot, there was not a single rental property in South Australia that a person on JobSeeker could afford—not a single one. Well, that is an absolute disgrace, and that is out of 1,788 private rental properties advertised on 26 March. Not a single property was considered affordable for a person on JobSeeker—what an outrage that is! The report also found that there were no affordable properties for those on youth allowance, with just 4 per cent of properties considered affordable for families with both parents on JobSeeker—just 4 per cent.

In South Australia, the cost of rental house prices continues to rise significantly. In Adelaide, there has been a 2.1 per cent increase over the past month, and a 7.2 per cent increase over the last year; in the Murraylands, a 3.3 per cent increase over the past month and a 10.5 per cent increase over the past year; northern SA, a 9.9 per cent increase over the past month and an 11.9 per cent increase over the past year; and, in southern SA, a 4.5 per cent increase over the past month and a 21 per cent increase over the past year. So, again, we are seeing South Australians being hard hit by spiralling rent prices. As I said in my first speech, South Australians should not be required to accept a housing system that puts private greed above the public good—it is not acceptable.

Protection of renters is not something new, and it is not something that belongs to a particular side of politics. It is worth noting that, during the Great Depression, greater protection for renters resulted in policies like rent control at a state level. At a federal level, too, the Menzies government introduced rent control in 1939. Then it was the Curtin Labor government that fixed rents at 1940 levels. You could argue that the situation we face at the moment in the middle of this economic crisis is remarkably similar to that of the 1940s, yet we have no commitment from the federal government, and the state government seems to be asleep at the wheel.

While the moratoriums on evictions will delay the pain, and the Greens are seeking to extend the moratorium due to expire at the end of the month by another 12 months, that is not the long-term solution to the rental crisis that grips our state. We need to invest in social housing and we need the state Liberal government to step up to the plate and do that, and we need to legislate for rent controls so that we can protect the most vulnerable people in our community from rent increases. It works in places like New York; why are we not doing it here in South Australia? Why are we not ensuring that everybody has a roof over their head and a place to call home? Why do we not recognise that housing is a human right in our state?

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

Bills

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY (UNLAWFUL ACTS AT WORKPLACE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:08): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Equal Opportunity Act 1984. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:09): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise to speak to this new Greens bill, which will take an essential and long overdue step to protect workers from sexual harassment and discrimination in the workplace. This is a quite simple bill, but I strongly believe that its impact will be profound. This is a bill that amends the Equal Opportunity Act to impose a positive duty on employers to eliminate discrimination, sexual harassment and victimisation.

Just a few weeks ago, the equal opportunity commissioner handed down the report for the review of harassment in the South Australian legal profession, with one of the recommendations calling for the South Australian parliament to amend the Equal Opportunity Act 1984 to impose a

positive duty on employers to eliminate discrimination, sexual harassment and victimisation. Here is that bill.

This is the second Equal Opportunity Commission review into sexual harassment and discrimination in workplaces handed down this year that has made this recommendation. The report of the parliamentary review also included this recommendation. Again, that is in this year alone, but this is not a new recommendation. Last year, the Australian Human Rights Commission also recommended that employers should be obligated to take reasonable and proportionate measures to eliminate discrimination, sexual harassment and victimisation in the workplace.

Further, on 21 June 2019, the International Labour Conference adopted the new convention and accompanying recommendation concerning the elimination of violence and harassment in the world of work. That is ILO Convention 190, to be specific. A key element of ILO Convention 190 is that it encourages states to place a positive duty on employers to prevent violence and harassment in the workplace. It also obligates states to adopt laws requiring employers to take steps, commensurate with their degree of control, to prevent violence and harassment at work. I would like to note that Australia voted in favour of the ILO adopting Convention 190. We know that we have a serious problem. We know that for many the workplace is not a safe place and that they do not have adequate options for recourse. This has to change.

The Australian Human Rights Commission has found that 71 per cent of Australians have been sexually harassed at some point in their lives. This is a horrifying statistic. Report after report has told us what needs to be done to put an end to this discrimination and harassment in the workplace, and if the government will not step up—they have not stepped up—and get this done then of course the Greens will.

The behaviour described in these reports that I have mentioned is disturbing and appalling. As a parliament we have a duty to ensure that it stops. It is devastating that more has not been done and has not been done sooner, when we think about the scale of the problem and how long we have known about it. Since 2003, the Australian Human Rights Commission has conducted four periodic surveys on the national experience of sexual harassment. The most recent survey conducted in 2018 showed that sexual harassment in Australian workplaces is widespread and pervasive. One in three people experienced sexual harassment at work in the past five years.

This is a serious societal issue, and while we have seen even in this place in very recent times that sexual harassment and discrimination seem so ingrained in so many work settings, we must remember that it does not have to be the case. Workplace sexual harassment and discrimination is not inevitable, it is not acceptable and it is entirely preventable. It could not be clearer that our current legal protections are not at all fit for purpose. We must ensure that avenues for dealing with and preventing sexual harassment and discrimination are evidence based and victim focused. That is why I am introducing this bill today.

The Respect@Work report shows us in particular that in not requiring employers to prevent workplace sexual harassment, they then place a higher priority on compliance with employment and work health and safety laws than on compliance with anti-discrimination laws, which is not to say that we should not be prioritising compliance with employment and work health and safety laws but that compliance with anti-discrimination legislation is just as vitally important. After all, a discriminatory workplace is not a safe workplace.

By not imposing this positive duty on employers to prevent, as far as possible, discrimination, harassment and victimisation, what we have been doing is placing a heavy and difficult onus on the individuals experiencing that discrimination, harassment and victimisation. The onus is being placed on them to complain and take it on themselves. As we have seen highlighted clearly by the equal opportunity commissioner this year, some workplaces, such as this workplace in this very parliament, have arcane or non-existent procedures for reporting harassment, with many, many barriers in the way that actively prevent people from reporting those experiences.

We must also remember the complex and interconnected ways in which experiencing and reporting sexual harassment and discrimination can affect people. These impacts can include negative impacts on their health and wellbeing; negative impacts on their employment, both

day-to-day and, of course, their career progression; and there can be significant financial consequences as well.

The impact of workplace sexual harassment and discrimination extends beyond just that individual person experiencing that harassment and discrimination. It extends to their families and their friends, it extends to bystanders, it extends to co-workers. Even just in terms of the workplace sexual harassment that affects employers through lost productivity, staff turnover, negative workplace culture, resources associated with responding to the complaints and reputational damage, surely we can do better.

It is in everyone's best interest to take proactive and preventative action against sexual harassment and discrimination. As I have said many times in this place, I am tired and I am angry, and I do not want people to continue to face the indignity of harassment and discrimination in the workplace when we know it is preventable. I know there is no silver bullet here to eliminate sexual harassment and discrimination, but I hope this bill will be an important tool in the arsenal. I commend this bill to the council.

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

Motions

DISABILITY INCLUSION ACT REGULATIONS

Orders of the Day, Private Business, No. 3: Hon. N.J. Centofanti to move:

That the regulations under the Disability Inclusion Act 2018 concerning NDIS Worker Check, on 17 December 2020 and laid on the table of this council on 2 February 2021, be disallowed.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (17:17): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; order of the day discharged.

DISABILITY INCLUSION ACT FEES NOTICE

Orders of the Day, Private Business, No. 4: Hon. N.J. Centofanti to move:

That the fees notice under the Disability Inclusion Act 2018 concerning NDIS Worker Check, made on 17 December 2020 and laid on the table of this council on 2 February 2021, be disallowed.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (17:17): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; order of the day discharged.

INTERNATIONAL MIDWIVES AND NURSES DAYS

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:17): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises both International Day of the Midwife on 5 May and International Nurses Day on 12 May;
2. Recognises the courage, compassion and ongoing work of nurses and midwives in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic; and
3. Thanks nurses and midwives for their outstanding service in hospitals, homes and the community to protect and maintain the health and wellbeing of all South Australians, year in year out, and during the COVID-19 pandemic.

I rise to express my heartfelt thanks to our dedicated and remarkable nurses and midwives in South Australia. This year, 2021, has been designated by the World Health Organization as the International Year of Health and Care Workers in recognition and appreciation of their unwavering dedication in the fight against COVID-19. In South Australia, like our European counterparts, we have also extended our acknowledgement and recognition of our nurses and midwives as part of the International Year of the Nurse and the Midwife 2020 into 2021.

As Minister for Health and Wellbeing, one of the privileges of my role is to meet and hear the voices of many nurses, midwives and carers working across the state. I was delighted yesterday to

join SA Health's Chief Nurse and Midwifery Officer, Adjunct Associate Professor Jenny Hurley, at a morning tea to acknowledge and celebrate International Nurses Day. This morning, I met with nurses at Strathalbyn and then later in the day visited the Repat to mark the placement of the nurses honour boards in the SPF Hall.

It is very important for us to take the time to recognise both International Nurses Day and the International Day of the Midwife. It gives us an invaluable opportunity to celebrate the achievements and to recognise the contributions that all nurses, midwives and carers have in ensuring South Australians receive high-quality and safe care.

As I said in this chamber last week, every year on 5 May the International Day of the Midwife is celebrated around the world. The theme for this year's International Day of the Midwife is 'Follow the data: invest in midwives'. It is significant in highlighting the wonderful work midwives do to ensure that women in their care have a positive birth experience. Midwives play a critical role in promoting healthy women, ensuring the health and wellbeing of women and babies and the whole family unit. Midwives also have an important role in health counselling and education, not only for women but also for those within the family unit and the community.

The date of 12 May is International Nurses Day, an annual celebration to commemorate Florence Nightingale's birthday. The focus for this year's theme is 'Nurses: a voice to lead—a vision for future healthcare'. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the nurses and midwives in South Australia and across the world for their understanding and caring, their selflessness, patience and dedication. They are the people whom we depend upon at some of the toughest times we experience in our lives. They are the people who are there for us and those closest to us in some of our most difficult times.

Earlier today, I had the privilege of launching South Australia's Rural Nursing and Midwifery Workforce Plan 2021-26, which provides a vision and road map for the sustainable and agile future-focused workforce that will be crucial in delivering services in the country into the future, recognising the essential and critical role of nurses and midwives, their contribution, value and impact on the delivery of health care across a wide range of geographical locations, contexts, settings and environments to ensure the highest quality of care for rural South Australians.

Every year, as part of the week of celebrations for the International Day of the Midwife and International Nurses Day, we have the SA Health Nursing and Midwifery Excellence Awards. Last Friday, it was my pleasure to represent the Premier and the government at this prestigious event. This was the emerald anniversary, the 20th annual Nursing and Midwifery Excellence Awards night. I extend my congratulations to all nominees, finalists, scholarship recipients and winners.

As part of the award celebrations, I had the pleasure of acknowledging, seeing and hearing the stories of our Australian nurses and midwives who volunteer as part of the international response to improve health, maternity and wellbeing outcomes and improve equity and access to health services around the world. The SA Nursing and Midwifery Humanitarian Awards, now in their third year, acknowledge the nurses and midwives who have gone above and beyond the call of duty, who have given back to their local or global community in an inspirational, selfless, caring and compassionate way. I thank them for making a difference in the lives of those in their communities and beyond.

If the council would indulge me, I would like to recognise each of the award winners from Friday night: the Mary Buckskin Excellence in Practice—Aboriginal Nurse/Midwife, Marilyn Thomas from the Central Adelaide Local Health Network; the Excellence in Person Centred Care Team Award, the Yorke and Northern midwifery practice; Early Career Nurse Midwife, Tulika Patel from Estia Health, Golden Grove; Excellence in Practice in Aged Care, Julie Webber from the Riverland Mallee Coorong Local Health Network; and Excellence in Practice—Registered Nurse, Leanne Davis from the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network.

The Minister for Health and Wellbeing Humanitarian Award went to Sophie Dohnt from the Central Adelaide Local Health Network; Excellence in Research and Knowledge Translation, Karen Royals from the Central Adelaide Local Health Network; Excellence in Education, Christine Fraser from the Aboriginal Health Council; Excellence in Practice—Midwife, Melissa McDonald from the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network; Consumer Appreciation, Mandy Kocher from Central

Adelaide Local Health Network; Excellence in Practice—Enrolled Nurse, Heather Braun from the Yorke and Northern Local Health Network; and Excellence in Leadership, Kristian Sanchez from the Central Adelaide Local Health Network.

I would also like to recognise the South Australian Premier's Nursing and Midwifery Scholarship recipients for 2021: Beth McErlan from the Women's and Children's Health Network, Leanne Davis from the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, Leanne Naaraat from the Department for Health and Wellbeing, Susan Dwyer from the Women's and Children's Health Network, Rajiv Chand from the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network, and Renee Giannopoulos from the Central Adelaide Local Health Network.

Once again, this year we pause to remember and pay tribute to South Australian nurse Kirsty Boden, the recipient of the Australian Bravery Decorations, the Bravery Medal, the Queen's Commendation for Bravery and the Red Cross Florence Nightingale Medal. In the 2017 London Bridge terrorist attack, Kirsty, without hesitation, ran into danger, offering her nursing expertise and qualities to save others. Kirsty's courage, dedication and her strong will to care for the injured as a nurse and as a caring person will always be remembered.

On behalf of the South Australian government and all South Australians, I thank all nurses for their dedication, compassion and commitment to making a difference every day in the lives of the South Australian community and beyond. I thank our nurses and midwives who lead, innovate and care for South Australians, demonstrating their values of generosity, empathy and integrity, and, importantly, the value of the art of the human touch in caring for the South Australian community.

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

Bills

EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES (MOBILE PHONES IN SCHOOLS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:26): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Education and Children's Services Act 2019. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:27): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill is born of continual frustration in what I see as the Minister for Education the Hon. John Gardner's failure to pursue progressive and innovative initiatives across the South Australian education system. Even when Australian and international academic research, his own staff, schools and students provide overwhelming evidence that he could and should roll out a proven and successful initiative to all schools, he sits on his hands, just as he did for a long time with the co-opted private members' bill on menstrual hygiene products, which would have provided free menstrual products in all schools across South Australia.

He has shown time and again that he prefers not to deal with these things consistently across the education sector, and as a result not to be at the forefront of transformational educational initiatives. In what I can only describe as a token effort to follow leaders in other jurisdictions, he has banned mobile phones in primary schools only. He knows mobile phones are least problematic in primary schools but has done nothing to address the issue in secondary schools.

We have all seen via the media how mobile phones can be used in schools, predominantly secondary schools, as insidious tools for harassment and bullying by students against other students. Whether being used to send harassing, threatening text messages or filming acts of violence and/or harassment and/or bullying, mobile phones can have and do have a very significant impact on the health and wellbeing of students. They also have the ability to be and are a major distraction from learning.

Minister Gardner's response for secondary schools is to leave the decision-making to the individual schools and wipe his hands of any responsibility or leadership. This approach is one that runs the risk of most schools missing out and being disadvantaged.

The bill is very short and simple. First, it provides for a trial of secure mobile phone storage devices in 20 government schools for a period of 12 months; secondly, it provides for an evaluation report on the outcome of that trial. Parents, students, educators and academics will be able to contribute to the evaluation.

Students can be exempted by the principal from participation in the trial if, for example, a student requires access to a mobile phone during school hours because of a health condition. If a phone is really absolutely needed during the day for a legitimate purpose—for example, if it is going to be used as a learning tool, a science experiment or a call to a parent—then it can be unlocked, used and then locked again. Importantly, the student does not relinquish possession of their phone at any time, removing responsibility for the student's property from the school or the teachers.

Unlike the minister's unsophisticated ban in primary schools the bill does not ban mobile phones. Indeed, in New York blanket bans were found to be less effective in terms of the approach adopted by schools. Roy Morgan Research reveals that 94 per cent of 14 to 17-year-olds now have smartphones. A Victorian survey revealed that nearly 80 per cent of 2,000 adults interviewed supported an absence of mobile phones from classrooms.

The evidence available from South Australia, interstate and overseas shows the overwhelming social, cultural and educational positive impacts of removing access to mobile phone transmission during school hours. It is this strong evidence base and the commitment to gather more data to drive policy on managing access to mobile phones during school hours that provides the basis for this private member's bill.

As stated in the bill, the purpose is to determine how effective such devices are in reducing the disruption caused by mobile phones in government secondary schools. Early results from 900 schools with mobile phone-free zones internationally showed that of those surveyed there was a 74 per cent improvement in student behaviour and 83 per cent in student engagement in the classroom. There was also a commensurate improvement in student interaction and communication in the yard at recess and lunchtime, along with more physical activity instead of sitting around passively with a mobile phone mindlessly scrolling and messaging.

Not surprisingly, bullying and social media postings throughout the day decreased in mobile phone-free zones. Further, filming schoolyard fights and sending provocative or sexting messages between students and groups inside and outside of the school are not possible during the school day. This also results in a lessening of that behaviour after school hours. Research shows that up to 25 per cent of students who were bullied during their school lives experienced long-lasting consequences which can lead to other risk behaviours such as alcohol and drug abuse, chronic health issues and a greater likelihood of other offending. The bill can only deal with mobile phones during school hours but as I said I am confident it will have a significant impact on reducing bullying and improving cyber safety.

While I congratulate and thank the Australian Education Union, the South Australian schools and teachers like Iain Love and Emma Oliver at Meningie Area School, Kate Higgins at Port Lincoln High School and John Pirie Secondary and Tintinara Area High School who as early adopters of the scheme have seen firsthand the enormous potential of mobile phone-free zones, I do not want to see South Australian public schools denied access to this initiative and therefore be disadvantaged because of a lack of leadership and drive from the minister and his department. We know from speaking directly to these principals and teachers that one of the things they have called for, which is exactly the same as in the debate that we had on sanitary products, was consistency across the board and across all schools.

Several private schools in South Australia are already onto this, with Wilderness School and St Michael's College implementing the initiative in 2020. The bill that I am proposing is to trial mobile phone-free spaces in 20 government schools, as I said, to evaluate whether the early learnings and experiences at the other 85 schools throughout Australia which have adopted this initiative should be rolled out to all South Australian schools.

It is important to note at this point that in other trials the success has been extremely overwhelming in other jurisdictions as well. In New South Wales every school that trialed this initiative has made it a permanent measure at their schools. Indeed, the New South Wales government has

completed a comprehensive review into the non-educational use of mobile phones in government schools in that state and intends to commission world-first independent qualitative and quantitative research into a range of mobile device usage in schools.

Creating these mobile-free spaces where students remain in possession of their phone is technologically quite easy to achieve. Under my proposal students remain in possession of their phone, as I said, at all times; however, as they enter the school yard, they place their phone into a special pouch which locks automatically and which the school provides to the students and which negates the phone receiving a telecommunications signal.

The pouches remain closed and secured in the student's possession while they are at school and throughout the course of the day, and they can only be opened with special magnetic devices strategically located throughout a school, predominantly at the entry and exit gates. If we were allowed to use props, I would show you one of these devices. I have it in my office. They are amazing. You put your phone in the pouch; it locks. You then press it against this little magnetic round disc; it unlocks and you remove your phone. Students keep that pouch with them all the time.

I should say at this point that so popular are these things in terms of focusing the attention of audiences that they are used widely now at concerts, at comedy shows, at fee-paying entertainment venues that people might attend, or, for instance, during the Fringe Festival. They are used by artists who want the full attention of their audience and do not want them to be distracted by a mobile phone and also do not want their audience, frankly, taking photos and looking at the performance through the lens of the phone rather than actually watching what is happening in front of them.

It is amazing technology. It is so simple, though, and considerable work has been done in terms of rolling that out in schools across Australia. Considerable work is done prior to implementation to train and support staff, students, parents and school councils, because the trial does involve a significant culture shift and some new processes on entry and exit. I know that the company that has the product I am talking about actually goes out to the schools and talks to the students, talks to the teachers, talks to the principals and teaches them all how to use it. The response to date has been very positive.

I visited Meningie school late last year, I believe it was, and spoke to teachers and the principal. The one thing that struck me was that there were kids outside shooting hoops, kicking balls. There were kids sitting around having a laugh at lunch, running around, playing, as you would expect in a school setting. Whereas, I am told that prior to the mobile-free zone those students would be sitting head down, glued to their screens, texting each other, even though they were sitting right next to each other, much as many of us do—all the sorts of behaviours that we know are not good for us and particularly are not good for us in a learning setting.

I did say to the media today that perhaps we could order 22 of the pouches and circulate them in this place and see how that goes. These mobile-free zones have been successfully implemented in over 1,250 schools in the US. They have also, as I said, been used at weddings, at concerts, at theatres, in courts and even in parliaments—those of Ontario, Israel and France. So it is not such a ludicrous idea, apparently.

Private enterprise has also recognised the economic and work health and safety benefits of having their staff free of all distractions during work hours. Indeed, some of the teachers at schools with mobile-free zones report that not only do they have more time now that they are not policing mobile phone use and incidents up to 600 times a week, but they also have adopted the technology to improve their own focus in the classroom.

In closing, I note—I hope I note—the support on this issue generally of the Hon. Emily Bourke, who spoke passionately last year about our addictions to mobile phones and what a distraction they can be in terms of the educational outcomes for our children. I note that she also noted leadership is not about choosing the most popular or easiest option, and I am looking forward to the support of both the opposition and, indeed, the crossbench and the government in what I see as a very straightforward and sensible reform.

To address once again the comments of the minister, the basis on which this ban was only extended to primary schools was that it was not needed in high schools, that those students are much older, that they can be more responsible and that they use phones as a learning tool. Well,

there are other learning tools that you can access in high schools. There are laptops, iPads and computers, and if there is a particular need to access a phone during a coordinated project or lesson, that can be arranged very easily simply by unlocking the phone for those students and then it can be locked again and those phones can be put back in students' pockets or schoolbags.

There is no justification for excluding high schools. Indeed, we know that the majority of the sorts of behaviours that I have outlined—the bullying, the harassment, the text messaging, the sexting, all those things—do not take place in the primary school setting. The majority of that behaviour takes place in the high school setting and we need to be focusing our attention there as well. With those words, I look forward to the debate of the bill.

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

GENDER EQUALITY BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:41): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to establish the office of the Commissioner for Gender Equality, to require certain entities to promote gender equality in the development of programs and delivery of services, to provide that certain entities prepare and implement an action plan to achieve gender equality in the workplace, to make a related amendment to the Fair Work Act 1994 and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:42): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

As South Australians we pride ourselves on a strong history of freedom, respect, dignity, tolerance and equality and the bill provides for an opportunity for South Australia to build on that legacy and continue to lead in many areas and on many fronts. The values espoused in this bill have their genesis in the tireless inspirational advocacy of South Australian pioneering trailblazers, such as Dame Roma Mitchell, Muriel Matters, Mary Lee and Don Dunstan.

The introduction of the bill could not be more timely, given the recent deaths of three outstanding crusaders for gender equality: the notorious Ruth Bader Ginsberg, Susan Ryan and Helen Reddy. These advocates saw their work as just the beginning. They wanted to see their work continue. They wanted to keep creating opportunities for positive change and they knew it would be generational. These leaders recognised that gender, race, religion, sexual orientation and, in some countries, class are intersectional forms of discrimination and harassment that hold our societies and economies back and they have worked tirelessly to address these issues.

They would have been proud of Kamala Harris, who in January 2021 became the first woman, first black person and first South Asian American person to become US Vice President. Watch out for broken glass as Ms Harris continues to smash those ceilings.

As members know, in 1894 the South Australian parliament passed the Constitutional Amendment (Adult Suffrage) Act. That legislation was the result of a decade-long struggle to include women in the electoral process. It not only granted women in the colony the right to vote but allowed them to stand for parliament. We were, as we have heard many times in this place before, the first state in Australia to grant both rights and the first in the world to do so, subject to one exception. Aboriginal women in South Australia could legally vote in South Australian elections from this time, but the 1902 Commonwealth Franchise Act removed Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people's right to vote in federal elections.

That right was not reinstated until the 1962 Commonwealth Electoral Act. That is, incredibly, within the lifetime of many members sitting in this chamber today. It is hard to believe it was not until 1959, some 64 years after the South Australian act was enacted, that Jessie Cooper became the first female member of the South Australian Legislative Council and Joyce Steele the first female member in the House of Assembly.

South Australia was also a leader in the nation with our anti-discrimination laws, passing the Equal Opportunity Act 1984, some two years before the federal Affirmative Action (Equal

Employment Opportunity for Women) Act in 1986. The bill was originally entitled the Anti-Discrimination Bill and was introduced by the Attorney-General at the time, the Hon. Chris Sumner, in the Legislative Council on 23 August 1984. Susan Ryan was the driver of the federal legislation. She was the first woman to serve as a Labor minister and was the only woman in Bob Hawke's cabinet.

Ryan, a self-described second-wave feminist, did the hard yards early on, securing long-denied rights and legal backing for Australian women and has served as an inspiration for many who have come after her. The fact that she managed to bring forth the Sex Discrimination Act in 1984 and the affirmative action act in 1986, two pieces of legislation that transformed the working lives of Australian women, is a testament to her courage and political skill.

The recent death of Ruth Bader Ginsburg, a US Supreme Court justice, only the second female ever appointed to that court and a tireless crusader for women's rights and gender equality, brought home how important it was to continue such groundbreaking work and pursue the efforts of gutsy, persistent achievers like her. We must progress their work, honouring the legacies of these trailblazers by pursuing the generational, incremental shifts towards fully realising gender equality for all, because, as 'The Notorious' RBG said, 'Real change, enduring change, happens one step at a time.'

My recent motion calling for the equal opportunity commissioner to independently inquire into the prevalence of harassment, including sexual harassment, in the legal profession in SA and to report to this parliament, which had unanimous support in this place, was one such step in bringing about the seismic-scale change in the legal profession. The review, as we know, heard from more than 600 people who were currently working or had recently worked in the sector. It found the extent and nature of harassment within the legal profession is alarming and must be addressed.

As the equal opportunity commissioner, the Attorney-General and the Chief Justice have acknowledged in response to that report, this is unacceptable and should not happen in a contemporary workplace. We have continued to see the flow-on impacts of that work in recent weeks. I am pleased the Attorney has committed to implementing the 16 recommendations of that report, but, as the Hon. Tammy Franks has pointed out on multiple occasions in this place, it needs to be done much quicker than it is being done at the moment.

The Attorney-General's call for the Equal Opportunity Commission to review harassment in the South Australian parliament in response to advocacy was another initiative to drive cultural and systemic change that I am sure will improve the working lives of members and staff in this place, if and when it is finally realised.

This bill is one more step towards our society and economy reaching its full potential. It responds to society's increasing calls for change from courageous people like Brittany Higgins and Australian of the Year, Grace Tame, to take up the challenge of addressing gender equality from where these trailblazing advocates left off.

The gender equality baton has been passed to us—the current generation of South Australian legislators—and I do not want to see that opportunity pass us by. As I recently commented to Jane Sloane, Senior Director of the Asia Foundation, an organisation that empowers women and promotes gender equality throughout Asia, it is not a baton I ever really expected to be passed, but I am pleased to see that it has been grasped by so many of us in this place and federally, and I think it is in very strong hands indeed. The appetite for real change is palpable.

The bill presents South Australia with the opportunity to once again lead the nation, to be proactive and progressive in a way that will benefit the whole community because everyone, irrespective of gender, race, religion, age, disability or sexual orientation, benefits from gender equality, and if this bill is passed we will be the second state in Australia to enact gender equality legislation.

Victoria passed mirroring legislation, which commenced earlier this year. That legislation was developed within a supportive framework of complementary legislation, including the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act, which came into full effect in 2008. We still do not have an equivalent bill of rights nationally or in South Australia, and this would be a most worthy goal for government to aspire to, but it is not the work of this bill.

The Victorian government has had the very good fortune to appoint one of our own, former South Australian equal opportunity commissioner, Dr Niki Vincent, to the role of inaugural Victorian public sector commissioner for gender equality. There has been a separate motion in this place about Dr Vincent, but in brief she served as the South Australian commissioner from 2016 to 2020. She was responsible for the general administration of the Equal Opportunity Act, and I look forward to working with her successor and a broad range of experts and stakeholders to see this bill come to fruition.

The bill aims to expand on the work Dr Vincent and many others have done in South Australia to strive for continuous improvement in workplace gender equality across the state in the public sector, including the Courts Administration Authority and local councils. It has a second complementary focus of achieving better results through improved policies, programs and services being delivered by these agencies. This means the services being delivered will be cognisant of gender equality principles, and hence of a higher standard and a better fit for the South Australian public accessing these services.

The two objectives of the bill work hand in glove and avoid becoming siloed, like so much well-intended legislation often does. It is intended to work within the existing legal framework, although as I have noted we do not have the legislative groundwork that Victoria had to build on. It is important, therefore, to outline the difference between the equal opportunity commission and this proposed gender equality commission. Equal opportunity and gender equality are two quite different but closely related things. I might at this the point seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Motions

ROTARY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (17:53): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises the Centenary Year of Rotary in Australia and New Zealand, launched at Government House in Canberra by the Governor-General His Excellency David Hurley and Her Excellency Linda Hurley, on 10 July 2020;
2. Recognises 21 April as the date on which the first Rotary Club in Australia was established in Melbourne in 1921, and the subsequent establishment of a club in Sydney in May of that year; and
3. Acknowledges the volunteer efforts, and successes, of Rotary members over the last 100 years, in providing aid of all sorts for those in need and expresses the deepest thanks and appreciation for their service.

It is without doubt that many of us in this place or the other would be personally familiar with Rotary, but what some may not know is how Rotary came to be. It was Paul Harris who founded the movement in 1905. Harris, who grew up in the care of his paternal grandparents, attended the University of Vermont and Princeton University and received his law degree from the University of Iowa in 1891.

In 1896, Harris settled into legal practice in Chicago. One night four years later, he arranged to meet a colleague for dinner. Going on foot, they went from store to store, stopping to talk with acquaintances of Harris' fellow attorney. Harris was enchanted by the camaraderie his dinner party shared with local shoppers and businessmen. It was this closeness that reminded Harris of growing up in Wallingford, Vermont—something missing for those young businessmen who came from smaller country towns, seeking a sense of belonging and mateship.

This is how Rotary was born: a desire to create the same level of simple harmony and fellowship for individuals seeking community, from an array of professional, religious and cultural backgrounds. Harris wanted to cultivate what he saw that night between men like himself and channel it for the betterment of not just themselves but their communities too. Fellowship is a need sharply felt today amongst the isolation and disconnection brought by events of the past year.

The second element of what honours Rotary comes across plainly in its famous sayings 'Service above self' and 'One profits most who serves best'. What enriches individuals and

strengthens burgeoning communities is charity and duty and for Rotary, they are the means by which peace and good health are enjoyed by all. Guiding virtues which saw the rapid spread and success of Rotary from a small gathering of four in a downtown Chicago office to international renown.

By 1921, Rotary had 80,000 members in the US, Canada and the UK. Special commissioners from Canada—James Davidson from Calgary and Layton Ralston from Halifax—were sent to Melbourne to establish the first Australian and New Zealand club. A charter was presented to none other than war hero Sir John Monash, who became the second president of the club and an ongoing Rotarian at the district level.

The two who travelled to Australia, Davidson and Ralston, were emblematic in their service in diplomacy and government, a spirit that Rotary was to find plentiful here at home. The first club was formed in Melbourne on 21 April that year. A club in Sydney was established the following month and, from there, two each across the Tasman in Wellington and Auckland.

These founding clubs, along with many others throughout Australia and New Zealand, now form a common legacy spanning 100 years of service to the local and global community. Today, Rotary is the largest non-religious organisation, with more than 1.2 million Rotarians in more than 35,000 clubs in over 200 countries. Australia is ranked 10th in members, proudly having 25,833 Australian Rotarians in 1,052 clubs. It was also in 1989 that a Rotary International constitutional change was made to eliminate the 'male only' provision for all of Rotary. Since that time, women have become members and leaders of clubs and districts throughout the world.

Touching on the works and legacies of these people, it cannot be forgotten that these men and women, through countless volunteer hours and \$2.1 billion in contributions, helped to all but eradicate the polio virus and, in doing so, set up a lasting international health infrastructure network for the future. With Pakistan and Afghanistan left reporting cases of the disease, Rotary still commits itself to a polio-free future, raising \$50 million yearly with every dollar matched twice over by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

But this is only one facet of Rotary, an organisation that not only fosters fellowship and peace but invests further millions worldwide to promote health and prosperity. Rotarians take action on a number of crucial issues by providing access to clean water and sanitation, preventing and treating many diseases and growing local economies. Together, the clubs form a network of volunteers and leaders ready to address pressing issues.

This centenary year for Rotary Australia was officially launched in Canberra by His Excellency General the Hon. David Hurley AC DSC and Her Excellency Mrs Linda Hurley on 10 July 2020. Rotary is not only looking back into the past but forward into the future, having launched their events: End Trachoma and Give Every Child a Future. In keeping with the Rotarian spirit, the Australian branch celebrates their milestones with more service for the community.

Our country is the only developed nation suffering trachoma, an infectious eye disease which can lead to blindness. Rotary aims to end that, making the nation trachoma-free this year. Rates have fallen drastically in the last decade, with 17 per cent of children in at-risk remote communities suffering from trachoma falling to 3.8 per cent in 2017. Rotary has seen free face washing programs embedded in regional schools, delivered 3,500 mirrors to homes in remote communities and donated water-conserving devices and electricity-free washing machines. Water in these remote communities is precious. Rotary, with their innovation and charity, have combated the issue with multiple projects, making their target of a trachoma-free Australia within reach.

Give Every Child a Future, in collaboration with UNICEF, sees 700,000 life-saving vaccines delivered across the Pacific community, protecting women and children against cervical cancer, rotavirus and pneumococcal disease. Cervical cancer disproportionately affects women in the Pacific Islands, with pneumonia and diarrhoea being leading causes of death in children under five. With a budget of \$5 million, Rotary will tackle these issues over nine countries and 330 islands, aiming to vaccinate 100,000 children in three to four years. Clearly, the bravery and courage to face such challenges are in no short supply among our Rotarians. Their work will see a lasting immunisation program built for future generations.

What a year for Rotary Australia to be celebrating 100 years of uniting people from around the globe who take action to deliver long-term solutions to some of our world's most persistent issues. Making a positive difference to the life of one person is a very good thing. Making a difference to a

whole community, a whole country, is another thing altogether. But, that is what Rotarians do. Rotary develops leaders who have the spirit of their community at their heart. They develop leaders who are committed to supporting those who need support. Rotary deliver more and add great value to our society.

Chair of the National Centenary of Rotary Committee, Mr Gary Browne AM, termed the leadership style of Rotary as 'value-based, action oriented', noting that it is those actions and their results which have built the reputation of Rotary globally. These are actions which have built strong trust and confidence in Rotary. Australian Rotarians and their 100-year history are part of that, and we are thankful for their boundless charity and devotion to fellowship, peace and good health from which we have all benefited.

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

MINES AND WORKS INSPECTION ACT REGULATIONS

Orders of the Day, Private Business, No. 9: Hon. N.J. Centofanti to move:

That the regulations under the Mines and Works Inspection Act 1920 concerning mine manager, made on 19 November 2020 and laid on the table of this council on 1 December 2020, be disallowed.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (18:03): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; order of the day discharged.

MINING ACT GENERAL REGULATIONS

Orders of the Day, Private Business, No. 10: Hon. N.J. Centofanti to move:

That the general regulations under the Mining Act 1971, made on 19 November 2020 and laid on the table of this council on 1 December 2020, be disallowed.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (18:03): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; order of the day discharged.

OPAL MINING ACT REGULATIONS

Orders of the Day, Private Business, No. 11: Hon. N.J. Centofanti to move:

That the regulations under the Opal Mining Act 1995 concerning mineral resources, made on 19 November 2020 and laid on the table of this council on 1 December 2020, be disallowed.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (18:04): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; order of the day discharged.

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 Planning and Development Fund (No. 2) Variation, made on 18 March 2021 and laid on the table of this council on 30 March 2021, be disallowed.

(Continued from 31 March 2021.)

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (18:04): Labor supports this motion to disallow the general regulations made under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 made on 18 March 2021 and laid on the table of this council on 30 March 2021. I also note that this is not the first time the Labor opposition has given support for this motion, or similar motions. In fact, we have on several previous occasions.

We support this disallowance because these regulations will allow the Minister for Planning to continue to use funds from the Planning and Development Fund to prop up his failed planning reforms. Members will be aware that under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016,

applicants who create new developments are required to pay into the Planning and Development Fund. They pay in moneys to enable projects to be undertaken to improve the public realm.

Money paid into the fund is derived from cash payments in lieu of open space for the development involving the division of land into less than 20 allotments and for strata and community titles. The Planning and Development Fund, more commonly known as the open space fund, is meant to be a resource for projects to make our streets and suburbs more livable by developing reserves, planting trees, constructing water harvesting projects and building playgrounds.

Instead, the Marshall Liberal government has been diverting resources from the open space fund to prop up the mismanaged planning reforms and the error-ridden ePlanning system. So far, this reform process has been plagued by a series of crises that have led to massive staff resignation, missed deadlines and massive budget blowouts. It is not surprising that the Liberal government is trying to cover up their budget overruns by raiding other budget lines, but in this case they are raiding a fund designed to improve the amenity of our communities.

The open space fund is there for the specific purpose of improving the conservation, enhancement and enjoyment of public open spaces and to provide communities with access to quality green public open space for the positive health and wellbeing of our communities. Open space and green parklands are what make our capital city so beautiful. They speak to the vision laid out by Colonel Light in 1837, and those principles speak to the enjoyment and lifestyle South Australians love. While we are one of the most livable cities in the world, our backyards, parks and reserves also foster communities by allowing neighbours, friends and families to connect.

Throughout much of 2020, when many in our communities were asked to work from home, community space became more valued than ever before. Open green spaces for community use that were within walking distance from home were cherished by local neighbourhoods, and data shows that, following COVID, people are choosing to move to greener spaces, particularly in the Adelaide Hills. We can see that people crave green space and are willing to move for it, but we need green space in all of our communities. That is what this fund was intended to do: improve and increase green open spaces in our communities.

The Auditor-General's annual report revealed that the planning department last financial year took \$12.9 million from the open space fund to pay for its new planning system. The transfer of moneys from the open space fund is on top of the nearly \$10 million taken from the fund in the previous two financial years to finance the new Planning and Design Code.

We heard in the Budget and Finance Committee that the government has earmarked more money from this fund to pay for its planning reforms. Evidence given in this committee confirmed that the government intends to use \$25.5 million in total to pay for their planning reforms. This, of course, has serious implications for the local government sector and the moneys available to continue to provide the green open spaces that communities rightfully expect.

I place on the record today Labor's support for this disallowance motion. Labor will not stay silent while the open space fund is being misused by the planning minister to prop up the budget shortfalls in the development and implementation of the planning code, which is why we will support this disallowance. We congratulate the original mover, the Hon. Mark Parnell, and the new mover, the Hon. Robert Simms on bringing this to the chamber.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (18:09): It is deja vu all over again. The government opposes the motion, but we recognise that we do not have the numbers in the council. Without repeating the arguments that have been oft mentioned by government ministers who have represented the government's position in the past, the government's position is legally allowed under the provisions of the fund and the government has acted lawfully on all counts.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (18:09): I thank the Labor Party for their support of this disallowance. While this is my first time speaking to this disallowance in former member, the Hon. Mark Parnell's name, members will note, as stated by the Hon. Emily Bourke, that this is the seventh time that this disallowance has been moved—the seventh time. I am hopeful that this will be the last time the Legislative Council agrees to disallow the regulation that allows the raiding of the open space fund, otherwise known as the Planning and Development Fund, for the purposes of general administration.

It seems extraordinary to me that the government continues to refuse to accept the will of this chamber and has done so six times now. I think it sets a very dangerous precedent for our

democracy when the upper house knocks back a piece of legislation and the government just ploughs ahead and says, 'Well, we don't care what they say. We are just going to go ahead and do what we want.'

The true purpose of this fund is to provide community facilities such as public parks, gardens, footpaths and cycle paths. It is not intended for general administration. That was never the intended focus of this fund. The fund is primarily comprised of cash contributions from developers in lieu of them providing physical land for public open space. The money goes into a pool and it is allocated to appropriate projects that help build our common public spaces, those that actually benefit the whole community.

It is really concerning to us in the Greens that during a time when we have parks and recreational areas that we need to support to achieve community health and wellbeing, the government is diverting those funds away, raiding this fund to put them into general administration, and, in particular, the administration of a government agency that is totally inappropriate and totally at odds with the intention of this scheme.

I might say, in concluding my remarks, that during COVID-19, many members of the community have relied on our public green space as a way of improving their community health and wellbeing. I think it is a terrible lack of leadership to see this fund being squandered in this way, and I urge the government to think again.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Committees

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION BILL

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

That the report of the committee be noted.

(Continued from 17 March 2021.)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (18:12): I rise to make some remarks in support of this motion. As part of the Liberal Party's election platform, we committed to developing a system of registration for social workers and to advocate for social workers to be included under the national registration scheme with oversight from the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency.

I note that the Australian Association of Social Workers have been advocates for a registration-based scheme and that they had an election forum prior to the election. From recollection, the Hon. Ms Franks attended that as well. I commend her for bringing forward the Social Workers Registration Bill 2018, which was introduced in September of that year.

The bill proposes to establish a framework for a state-based scheme and while the establishment of a national registration scheme with oversight from the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency (AHPRA) was consistently favoured in submissions to the committee, given the limited appetite for a national scheme across jurisdictions at this time, a state-based approach was agreed by the committee as appropriate in the first instance.

The government agrees to in principle support for the findings of the joint committee's report and the Social Workers Registration Bill rather than pursuing separate legislation. We also intend to align with the existing AHPRA scheme to support consistency and facilitate the preference for a national model in alignment with an election commitment. The lead minister on this is the Minister for Child Protection through the relevant ministerial body.

Such an approach would take into account learnings outlined in the report from national and international comparators including the New Zealand registration scheme for social workers and the Australian registration scheme for paramedics. The agencies which have the largest cohort of social workers in their ranks, I think it is well known, is the Department for Health and Wellbeing and the Department for Child Protection, with some in other agencies such as education and human services and other agencies. We look forward to the continued dialogue on this matter and commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (18:15): I thank the minister for her contribution and also her ongoing engagement with this issue. I echo in this chamber the frustrations of the Australian Association of Social Workers in their 20-plus year campaign to have a registration scheme in this nation or in this state for social workers. It would come as a great surprise, I think, to most of the public that anyone can call themselves a social worker and that there is only a voluntary way of ensuring proper professional practice through the membership of the Australian Association of Social Workers, or that same requirement or eligibility for membership.

There are many workarounds to ensure that workers in this field are acting appropriately and when they do act inappropriately that they are called to account, but the reality is that right now there is nothing to stop anyone who has no qualifications or expertise in social work calling themselves a social worker, presenting as a social worker and, indeed, inflicting potential harm upon vulnerable people or, should they be qualified, should that harm also be inflicted, being called to account. It is high time that a parliament acted.

This report recommends that this parliament act. I hope the Marshall government will act. They certainly have given an indication that they are willing to take some leadership here. Everyone, I would imagine, who has looked at this scheme and made contributions—and there has been extensive work put in to support the report that comes back to this parliament—everyone would prefer a national scheme but a national scheme has not happened in over two decades, so if a national scheme cannot be made possible, a state scheme must be progressed by the Marshall government, and maybe a state scheme will be what makes that national scheme come into effect.

I commend the report to the council, but also thank not just the members of this committee but those members of the community who have worked countless hours to hopefully see social workers registered in the near future in our state and better outcomes for those vulnerable clients in particular.

Motion carried.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2021

Second Reading

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (18:18): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the very brief second reading explanation and the detailed explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

The PRESIDENT: Is leave granted?

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: No, it is not granted.

The PRESIDENT: Leave is not granted. Leave has been denied.

The Hon. T.A. Franks interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I cannot do anything; leave has been denied.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Noting the Hon. Ms Franks has denied leave, I will read the second reading, and it is short.

A Supply Bill is necessary until the budget has passed through the parliamentary stages and the Appropriation Bill 2021 receives assent. In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the supply acts, there would be no parliamentary authority for expenditure between the commencement of the new financial year and the date on which assent is given to the Appropriation Bill. The amount being sought under this bill is \$6,161 million.

With fear and trepidation, I seek leave to include the explanation of clauses in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Interpretation

This clause provides a definition of *agency*. An agency is a Minister, an administrative unit, or part of an administrative unit, of the Public Service of the State or any other instrumentality or agency of the Crown.

3—Appropriation

This clause provides for the appropriation of up to \$6 161 million from the Consolidated Account for the Public Service of the State for the financial year ending on 30 June 2022.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (INTERVENTION ORDERS AND PENALTIES) BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

At 18:21 the council adjourned until Thursday 13 May 2021 at 14:15.