

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 26 May 2021

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins)** took the chair at 14:15 and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (14:16): I bring up the 38th report of the committee.

Report received.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I bring up the 39th report of the committee.

Report received and read.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I bring up the report of the committee, entitled Report on House of Assembly petition No. 13 of 2020—Maintenance of the Current Composition of the Teachers Registration Board.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Ministerial Statement

KANGAROO ISLAND PLANTATION TIMBERS

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:19): I table a copy of a ministerial statement made in another place today by the Deputy Premier on the subject of the Kangaroo Island Plantation Timbers project.

Question Time

SA HEALTH

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding the health system.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As members of the chamber will recall, a recent call to silence ambulance officers earned a swift rebuke from the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, who said:

Although it is true to say that public officers should abide by the code of conduct applicable to their employment, it is unhelpful for senior public officers to invoke the name of ICAC in an attempt to control the behaviour of their staff.

We then saw respected Professor John Mendoza quit SA Health when he had to choose between staying silent or calling out major problems in the health system. Now, we see the chief executive of CALHN again cautioning staff against criticising the health system. My questions to the minister are:

1. Is there a culture of covering up problems and silencing critics in the health system?
2. Given reports from people like Professor John Mendoza that they couldn't access the minister when they worked in SA Health, how exactly can staff get action on problems they see in the system?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:21): I assure you that SA Health staff are very intelligent and they know how to access an email address and, to be frank,

how to construct it. I often get communications from SA Health employees. So in spite of Professor Mendoza's comments that he couldn't get access to me, my office could find no record of a phone call or a request for a meeting.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:21): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding disability. Following disturbing reports in the media today of staff shortages in a large non-government disability support provider, what assurance can the minister provide to families with loved ones in state-run care that every shift is covered in every home with appropriately qualified staff in line with the NDIS plan of every resident? Will the minister release documents that show the levels of actual staffing and not just rostering in state-run disability care?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:22): I thank the honourable member for her question and for her interest in this important area. There has been a lot of reform that has taken place in the state accommodation services since this government came to office and we are very keen on the ongoing continuous improvement within our services. Reforms include rectifying deficits in clinical oversight, poor understanding of compliance, lack of specific leadership over service practice, a lack of client empowerment and engagement, and an inadequate threshold for critical client incident reporting to myself as the minister.

This government has implemented a range of initiatives in response to these deficits, including a restructure to include dedicated liaison staff for families and clients, capacity-building officers to support and empower clients to make their own choices, and quality and safeguarding officers to improve practice within the service. I think I have spoken about this particular issue before, but in June 2020, the Department of Human Services implemented a zero tolerance to abuse to people with disability policy, which included a training and education program for frontline workers.

Our reforms mean that staff, families and clients are much more likely to report issues now than they have been in the past. We have also undergone reviews and continuous improvement of our clinical incident process. For instance, the criteria has been broadened so that I am notified of any incidents that have been reported to other statutory organisations or, indeed, SAPOL and the like.

The feedback from clients and families and staff is that they feel much more supported than they ever have in the past and, while they used to pick their fights in terms of things that they weren't happy with in our service, they now know that they can report any matter to us and that will be taken seriously and improved.

We are very proud of the reform work that has been done to improve the state-run accommodation services. There has also been an audit done against the standards of the NDIS. Unlike most or many services, we also have an unannounced visit system with our internal audit service, so we believe that the standard of care is as good as any.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:25): Supplementary: in the minister's response, is she saying that she can give this assurance that every shift is covered in every state-run care facility?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:25): I am sure that the department has all of these matters adequately covered. We do have a large number of employees employed within our accommodation services, and we have a much better rostering system than in the past. There is occasional need to use agency staff, but I am very confident that our services are meeting much higher quality standards than they ever have in the past.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:25): Further supplementary referring to the original answer, where the minister referred to staffing: will the minister release the documents that show the levels of actual staffing, and not just rostering, in state-run disability care?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:26): I don't think that's necessary. We have our own quality systems in place.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The opposition has asked a supplementary question. You might like to give—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! You might like to give the deputy leader the courtesy of listening to the answer.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: We have a range of quality systems in place. I am not sure what value the Deputy Leader of the Opposition could add by examining our rostering system.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:26): Further supplementary: why doesn't the minister see value in transparency?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:26): Because these matters are properly managed and—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —we have audit systems and we are managing more services than were ever managed by the Labor Party—ever.

RURAL HEALTH WORKFORCE

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:27): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding health. Can the minister advise exactly what he has done to address the critical doctor shortage at the Maitland Hospital, which has been described by local staff as being at crisis point. What steps has the minister taken to repair the relationship breakdown between hospital staff and Country Health that has resulted in confusion and delays for patients? Is the SA Health locum required to see all patients who present to the embattled emergency department or only category 1 and 2 patients?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:27): The Maitland Hospital is one of many in the Yorke and Northern Local Health Network. Beyond the local health network of Yorke and Northern, there are five other regional local health networks. Each of them has a number of hospitals. In total, I think they are in the order of 60. I am not sure whether 60 hospitals is the—anyway, there is a large number of hospitals in country South Australia engaging a large number of GPs. I am not briefed on every relationship with every GP with every country hospital.

RURAL HEALTH WORKFORCE

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:28): Supplementary arising from the answer: has the minister—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bourke, you can start again, because I couldn't hear any of that. It will be helpful if your colleagues on the front bench remain quiet, as should the Hon. Mr Ridgway.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Has the minister been advised by the LHN of a critical doctor shortage at the Maitland Hospital?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:28): There are issues that our local health networks are managing with hospitals day by day. There is no doubt that there is a significant shortage of rural health professionals. That's why this government is delivering a \$20 million four-year program to strengthen and build our rural health workforce. I can assure you that the challenges faced by rural and regional local health networks are substantial, but they are significantly reduced by the progress already being made in the rollout of that \$20 million strategy.

RURAL HEALTH WORKFORCE

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:29): Supplementary: is there one full-time doctor at the Maitland Hospital?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:29): I've got nothing to add to my answer.

RURAL HEALTH WORKFORCE

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:29): Supplementary: so is it true to say, minister, that you don't know, and you don't care?

The PRESIDENT: Well, that doesn't arise out of the original answer.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: It doesn't arise out of the original answer.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:30): My question is to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer update the chamber on housing affordability in South Australia?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:30): The issue of housing affordability, given recent developments in the housing industry nationally and in South Australia, has attracted a lot of media comment for obvious reasons. Not only in South Australia but nationally we have seen significant increases in housing prices. The increased demand in relation to the HomeBuilder scheme and other associated stimulus measures have added considerable pressures to the housing market, including for those who own homes the attraction of seeing the value of their asset rise and rise significantly over the recent time period and, for those who don't, an increasing challenge in relation to housing affordability.

Therefore, I think it is worthwhile for members to be aware of the recent analysis done by the Housing Industry Association about housing affordability in Australia. The Housing Industry Association are accepted I think by all political parties as being independent analysts and commentators on the state of the housing market over a very long period of time. They have for many years produced a housing industry affordability index for every capital city in the nation.

Their most recent report, for the March quarter just concluded, shows, as has been evident from some of the public commentary, that housing affordability has fallen in all of the capital cities in the March quarter, primarily, as I said, as a result of the price of a typical home in all capital cities rising faster than the capacity of borrowers to repay a typical loan, even with the advantages in recent years of historically low interest rates.

However, what I think is of great interest I am sure to all members in terms of the affordability index is that the Housing Industry Association concludes that Adelaide retains the rank of the third most affordable capital city in the nation, trailing behind Darwin and Perth but certainly significantly more affordable than our Eastern States colleagues, in particular Sydney, Melbourne and to a lesser degree Brisbane as well. So in terms of the housing industry affordability index, put simply the index for Adelaide measures 98.2, and the index for Sydney is 63.1 and for Melbourne is 74.1, so affordability for South Australian prospective home owners and households is significantly more affordable.

The other thing I would place on the public record is they have the advantage of being able to compare their affordability index for Adelaide this year, March 2021, with the affordability index for five years ago, March 2016. That shows that even with the recent trend in the last quarter or two quarters, the housing affordability index in Adelaide is much better now than it was five years ago.

Five years ago, the HIA's independent index had Adelaide at 90.7. That affordability index has improved now to 98.2 over the last five-year period. So I think it's useful to bear in mind that, whilst there are recent pressures as a result of a significant increase in home prices, relative to the last five years or over the last five-year period affordability, as measured by the Housing Industry Association, has significantly improved—over the last five-year period, from March 2016 to March 2021.

TIMBER SHORTAGE

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:34): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer a question about the state's timber shortage crisis.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: South Australia's building industry, which undertakes about \$16 billion worth of work every year and employs more than 65,000 South Australians across all sectors, as well as indirectly supporting tens of thousands more South Australian jobs, is rapidly approaching a valley of death due to a crippling national and international timber shortage.

The perfect storm brewing has been caused by the success of the HomeBuilder scheme, including more than 14,000 applications in South Australia, a spike of up to 400 per cent in some countries for the price of imported timber that Australia would normally take and delays in timber being imported into the country due to COVID restrictions.

There is a genuine fear in the building sector that the situation will have a catastrophic domino effect across the entire state with significant job losses and many small to medium-sized businesses going bust if the issue isn't addressed now. There are fears that many tradies won't have incomes after July and many businesses will be forced to start shedding jobs by September or October.

If timber can't be supplied to build houses, carpenters won't get paid for putting up plaster boarding and frames, bricklayers won't get paid for laying bricks and electricians won't get paid for wiring houses. The businesses that supply those tradies won't get any orders for materials and so it continues. With material price rises on the way, HomeBuilder projects for first-home owners are also likely to blow out.

So my question to the Treasurer is: what urgent action is the government taking to protect the state's building sector and improve timber stock in the state? Have you met with members of the building industry to discuss the crisis and, if so, what were the outcomes and were any proposals or initiatives put to the government which require its financial support and commitment?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:36): There is no doubting that the enormous success of the HomeBuilder scheme and other stimulus activities have placed pressure on the housing industry but, with the greatest respect to my parliamentary colleague the Hon. Mr Pangallo, I sense a touch of the *7.30 Report* in the use of the language that the honourable member is using to portray the challenges confronting the industry, because phrases such as 'the valley of death', 'catastrophic' and various other phrases I don't think accurately portray the state of the residential housing sector in South Australia at all.

Let me confirm to the honourable member that 12 to 15 months ago the same language was being used by representatives of the housing industry, and I think probably a touch more accurately, at the start of COVID. They lobbied furiously for action from the federal and state governments to provide stimulus activity for the residential housing sector and the enormous success of HomeBuilder, together with the First Home Owner Grant from the South Australian government, meant that we saw this enormous response from applicants and from the housing sector.

With great respect, I think what the honourable member fails to portray in his colourful language is that there are a significant number of builders—and this is part of the criticism from those who haven't been able to access timber, the smaller and medium-sized builders in particular—who have locked away agreed contracts, already have access to timber and will continue to employ carpenters, builders, electricians and plumbers, because they have locked and loaded all that they need, albeit it might be at a slightly higher price than they originally contracted for. Those particular sectors of the residential housing market, who I have ongoing discussions with, are going to continue in a state which I would refer to as 'going gangbusters'.

They will continue to operate fairly successfully because they don't have the sorts of problems that the honourable member has rightfully identified are confronting a number of builders who are not in that particular position. But to say that the whole sector is facing a valley of death and

we are facing a catastrophic situation overstates, in my humble view, the true state of the residential housing market in South Australia.

It is true to say that a number of small and medium-sized builders who have not been able to access timber for some of the reasons that the honourable member has mentioned, and for some other reasons as well—and also other products as well; steel, for example, is in short supply—are facing great difficulty. I've got no doubt that there are a number of those who, if they are not able to resolve it, may well find problems in terms of their ongoing viability.

I am not disputing that, but to portray the whole residential housing sector as confronting a valley of death and catastrophic conditions is not an accurate portrayal of the residential housing market in South Australia.

The Hon. C. Bonaros: You might want to tell that to the builders.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, I said that to the Housing Industry Association, the Master Builders and a number of others, so I am not saying anything here that I haven't said to people whom I have met in relation to it. The situation now, in terms of residential housing, is much improved on the situation we were confronting 12 months ago, and for anyone not to acknowledge that is to not acknowledge the reality of responses from the federal and state governments to what we confronted 12 months ago.

In relation to acknowledging that there are challenges in relation to timber shortages, steel shortages and a range of other shortages to which I have indicated—even simple things like kitchen sinks and a variety of other essential supplies for not just the residential housing market—we are finding the same challenges, for example, in the billion dollar plus school upgrade build that we are confronting at the moment, in terms of getting things like sinks and a variety of other things like that. So there are challenges that the success of the enormous stimulus activity, created by the state and federal governments, has created in South Australia.

In terms of the government response, yes, I have met with a number of the interested parties and stakeholders representing the building industry and others. The primary carriage for this has been, as I think the member knows, with the Minister for Primary Industries, the minister for forestry, my colleague Mr Basham. He and others have had ongoing discussions with representatives of the industry. I think the member will be aware that there has been a series of meetings between the government and stakeholders.

There have been media reports of a request to access a federal government—and I don't know the exact title of it—bushfire recovery fund, which appertained in particular to timber products and the forestry industry generally, which some of the Eastern States industry sectors had evidently accessed at an earlier stage. As I understand it, there is a request that's gone in to access that particular federal government pot of money. If it's specifically designated for this area, there would appear to be a very good argument that South Australia should also be able to access some of that money to assist the industry.

The PRESIDENT: The Treasurer will bring his answer to a conclusion.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, it's not a Dorothy Dixier; it was a very long question—

The PRESIDENT: No, you have been going for over six minutes.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —from the Hon. Mr Pangallo. I am sure I will get supplementaries. But to conclude, in terms of the discussions, the detail of those has been conducted by my colleague the Hon. Mr Basham, and I am sure there have been discussions about accessing federal funds. There may well have been requests, as I understand it, in terms of him having access to things like the regional development fund and a variety of other pots of money that he has available to him as the responsible minister. We will await the conclusion of those sorts of discussions, I guess, to see what may or may not eventuate.

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

TIMBER SHORTAGE

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:43): Why didn't the government make an application to the Forestry Transport Assistance scheme before the applications closed, and why are they only doing it now after the applications have closed? The scheme is currently available to New South Wales and Victoria.

The PRESIDENT: You have asked your question; the Treasurer can respond.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:44): I think I referred to that fund. I am not sure whether that is the correct title or not; I am not disputing it, but it is a pot of money. I thought it had something to do with bushfire recovery and it was limited in that respect. The member just referred to the transport assistance scheme. I thought it had something more to do with bushfire recovery, but I will stand corrected on that. As to whether we did or we didn't and why we did or didn't, I would need to take advice either from the Minister for Transport or the Minister for Primary Industries in relation to that particular issue.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding disability. Given the minister and her department promised to hire 200 disability support workers, including the first 100 in 100 days, how does the minister explain why only 39 people have been hired? Secondly, what is the annual percentage and number of turnover for staff in state-run disability care?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for her question and for her interest in this area. We did, as part of our workforce planning and support for the sector, put out a call for traineeships, which did receive significant interest. The trainees will be employed in our accommodation services and, on completion, will be available to other services, so that will assist other providers in this space.

We are managing this in a staggered manner so that we will recruit in cohorts. That will enable us to provide the appropriate level of support and supervision to those trainees as they go through. In terms of the statistics, I am not sure that I have the number with me, but we did actually have quite significant interest in it, so we are very confident that that will add to the particular workforce. I am not sure that I heard the second part of the honourable member's question. If she wouldn't mind repeating that, please.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS: What is the annual percentage and number of turnover for staff in state-run disability care?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: In terms of the turnover of staff, I would need to take that particular question on notice.

PREMIER'S COUNCIL FOR WOMEN

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:47): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding the government's support for women. Can the minister please provide an update to the council about the Premier's Council for Women and how this will support all South Australian women?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:47): I thank the honourable member for her question and for her interest in this area. The Premier's Council for Women is a very important role supporting and providing advice to the government, both to the Premier and to myself as minister for women, and indeed across government.

The Premier's Council for Women was established in December 2002 and has provided leadership and advice to the South Australian government on the needs and interests of women through the provision of well-informed and strategic advice on policies, programs and matters of significance to women. Secretarial support is provided through the Office for Women.

The existing Premier's Council for Women was in place during the COVID period and raised a number of issues, including women's economic security, particularly considering the COVID-19 recovery. We thank the members who have served on the committee. As I have spoken about I think previously in this place, the government has also, as part of our election commitments,

committed to develop an economic security and leadership strategy, which we have been consulting on. This is certainly going to be very important through the recovery phase.

We know that we have had some difficult times during COVID, particularly the unemployment rate but, as my colleague the Minister for Innovation and Skills has outlined, the April ABS data has demonstrated that employment has been bouncing back in South Australia. In terms of some 15,300 new jobs, 7,300 of those were employing women and 77 per cent were full-time roles. In South Australia we have the second highest level of women employed ever.

As well as thanking the outgoing members I would like, to congratulate the new members of the Premier's Council for Women who we have selected. Some names would be familiar to people. The chair is Ms Fiona Dorman, who is currently the president of the National Council of Women and deputy chair of the Australia Day Council. She has a science background and also has numerous successful South Australian businesses. Isobel Marshall is the 2021 Young South Australian of the Year. As well as being a tertiary student, Isobel is the co-founder and managing director of TABOO, a South Australian social enterprise that has the aim of eradicating period poverty.

Marli Smith heads procurement at the ASC, which is our largest locally-owned defence prime contractor. Kelly Baker Jamieson, who started Edible Blooms as a small startup in 2005, has been a Telstra Small Businesswoman of the Year. Karen Briggs, who is a Yorta Yorta woman, has a Bachelor of Design and has her own business, KLB Creative. Kirsty Mundy, who has over 25 years experience in the information technology industry, has worked in a number of global roles. They join Ms Maria Hagias, Jane Danvers, Shingi Mapuvire, Nerida Saunders and Michelle Veitch.

As we know, COVID has impacted a number of people differently. While a number of feminised sectors, such as education and health, have needed to continue employment, there are areas such as the event and tourism sectors that have been disproportionately impacted, so we are very keen in South Australia to drill down into the details of how we may improve the situation for working women going forward, and we look forward to releasing our economic security and leadership strategy in due course.

WATER QUALITY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:52): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question on the topic of safe drinking water to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The SACOSS report, Falling Through the Gaps, has revealed that there is 'a lack of direction and accountability' among government agencies when it comes to regulating water supply, and that reliable access to safe drinking water is inconsistent across our state. In particular, smaller regional and remote communities do not have reliable access to safe water services, as has been previously shown, and this is despite being charged standard prices for water that is not safe, as is the case in Oodnadatta.

South Australia Health is responsible for ensuring safe drinking water, and is ensuring that it is provided under those conditions regulated by the Safe Drinking Water Act 2011 and the associated Safe Drinking Water Regulations 2012. My questions to the minister are:

1. How is the safety of drinking water monitored and measured throughout South Australia?
2. Are you confident that your department has an accurate, complete and up-to-date understanding of the quality of drinking water in our state?
3. Will the government take up the recommendation of SACOSS of a statewide stocktake of current water supply arrangements for safe drinking water for South Australia?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:53): I thank the honourable member for her question. It is certainly history, as the honourable member suggested, that the Safe Drinking Water Act 2011 is the responsibility of SA Health, and it does regulate drinking water supplies. The government has a strong commitment to strengthening reliable and healthy water supplies across the state, and in that context in June 2020 the Premier announced that water supplies

to the regional communities of Oodnadatta, Marree, Marla, Terowie, Manna Hill and Yunta will be upgraded by SA Water to provide safe drinking water over the next four years.

Oodnadatta and the other five communities are currently supplied with water by SA Water that is suitable for domestic use but not for drinking, food preparation or cleaning teeth. The upgrades, costing \$41 million, will provide safe drinking water to nearly 350 properties over the next four years. The government is demonstrating its commitment to provide safe and reliable drinking water to country South Australians, and I am certainly happy to look at and consider the comments of SACOSS.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Human Services about disability. How does the minister respond to claims that trainees in state-run disability care are working unsupervised and that administrative staff have been working in direct care roles without clinical experience or training in manual handling?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:55): I would urge the honourable member to provide those details to my office immediately so that we can follow that matter up. We do know—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —that all of these things that are raised by the Labor Party—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order on both sides! The minister has the call.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —need to be run through the fact checker. I have every confidence—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the leader!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Wortley!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway! Minister, continue.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I have every confidence in this program, that it is being rolled out appropriately, and in the management—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —of our supported accommodation services. If the honourable member has allegations to make, he should provide that to my office so that we can investigate it.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:56): Can the minister explain how complaints are handled against state-run disability services? Do they go via the Quality and Safeguards Commission or does the department simply make judgements?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:57): We have a range of ways to respond to things. In the first instance, staff members should raise things with management. I think I probably have actually outlined these—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: If they are not staff members?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —matters in some detail in the past, but I am happy to repeat them for the benefit of the honourable member. Any matters which relate to a particular site should be raised with the staff. The staff raise them to management. Depending on the nature of their particular complaint, the matter may be raised as a critical incident or not. I have outlined those details in great detail in the past for the benefit of members in this place and I would refer them to have another look at what I have said in the past.

The PRESIDENT: The Leader of the Opposition has a supplementary.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): If someone has a complaint against a staff member, where do they go in the first instance to raise that complaint, given that the minister says the only avenue is initially with potentially that staff member they are complaining of?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:58): I thank the honourable member for his supplementary question. I think I may have heard him say in a disorderly manner when I was responding to the previous question that I put—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: It's out of order to respond to interjections.

The PRESIDENT: And you are out of order too.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —words in people's mouths. I think he has just done that to me. The management of that particular site can take those complaints. There is a management structure within the department that people can also take things through. I am also more than happy to take individual queries from people if they wish to contact my office, so there are many different avenues that people can take. They will all be triaged in the same manner and be managed appropriately.

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Considering the risk of people misusing prescription drugs, either illicitly or to try to manage a medical condition, and the ill effects on health, will the minister update the council on the government's efforts to reduce the number of lives lost each year in Australia through the abuse or misuse of controlled drugs?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:59): I would like to thank the honourable member for his question. The Marshall Liberal government is committed to reducing the harms caused by preventable deaths, presentations to emergency departments and hospitalisations because of the abuse or misuse of prescribed medications. The Marshall Liberal team in opposition made an election commitment to provide \$7 million to implement real-time prescription monitoring for Schedule 8 medications, and as part of the 2018-19 state budget the government committed \$7.5 million over three years to support a prescription monitoring solution for controlled drugs in South Australia. I am very pleased that I can advise the council that in March this year we delivered on that commitment.

ScriptCheckSA, as it's now called, was released in March, implementing a real-time prescription monitoring system for Schedule 8 medicines in South Australia. ScriptCheckSA is supported by extensive online training for prescribers, pharmacists, patient education and support services and additional addiction medicine treatment services for patients identified to be at risk of harm from prescribed monitored drugs.

To help manage the anticipated short-term increase in demand for addiction medicine services after the release of ScriptCheckSA, Drug and Alcohol Services SA has established specialist opioid and chronic pain problem clinics in metro south, north and central and increased addiction medicine specialist and pharmacist telephone support for the Drug and Alcohol Clinical Advisory Service and the Alcohol and Drug Information Service. In addition, a specialist registered nurse has been recruited to work with the existing GP support program.

ScriptCheckSA will be an essential tool for health practitioners, providing real-time information to identify at-risk patients to support clinical decision-making so they can make safer decisions when prescribing or dispensing monitored drugs. ScriptCheckSA provides an instant alert

to prescribers and pharmacists through their clinician software if patients have previously been supplied with a high-risk medicine.

South Australia is only the second jurisdiction, following the release of Victoria's SafeScript, to deliver a real-time prescription monitoring system to prescribers and pharmacists. A national real-time prescription monitoring solution is continuing to grow and will further help address prescription forgery, misuse and doctor shopping related to controlled drugs in Australia.

I would like to pay tribute to the leadership of the federal government, which has been demonstrated by the establishment of the National Data Exchange, which captures information from state and territory regulatory systems, prescribing and dispensing software and a range of external data sources to provide real-time detection and alerting for regulators, pharmacists, doctors and other health professionals. To provide users with access to national data, each state and territory real-time prescription monitoring system must be integrated with the commonwealth National Data Exchange. ScriptCheckSA was integrated in November 2020.

The individual and public health risks associated with the harmful use of prescription drugs through dependence, misuse or diversion are an increasing concern to regulators, health practitioners and members of the public across Australia. The Marshall Liberal government acknowledges the importance of ensuring the safe use of opioids to promote optimal patient outcomes. I have no doubt that real-time prescription monitoring will save lives and, more importantly, help prevent further overdose fatalities in South Australia. I take this opportunity to thank all the teams involved in delivering this outcome, both from within government and in the health sector.

SOLAR ENERGY

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:03): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer, representing the Minister for Energy and Mining, questions about the capacity of the grid to absorb the electricity generated by rooftop solar.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: In March, the minister announced the planning for the fifth grid-scale battery in the state. There has been much speculation that at certain times rooftop solar is generating too much electricity, causing instability in the grid with the need to turn off rooftop solar input at such times. In addition, a report in *The Advertiser* yesterday indicated:

A plan to make it compulsory for all new airconditioners, pool pumps and electric hot-water systems capable of being turned off remotely was endorsed by Energy and Mining Minister...a year ago.

I note that in Queensland the Premier and relevant minister, also in March, announced that their battery planning:

...will mean that the excess renewable energy generated by Queenslanders will be stored for sustainable use...this technology means we can 'bank' the excess renewable energy generated allowing a continued growth in roof-top solar on the way to achieving Queensland's renewable energy target.

My questions for the Treasurer are:

1. Has the Department for Energy and Mining developed plans to store and better manage electricity from rooftop solar in strategically placed grid-size batteries to optimise electricity management at peak-use times and manage grid stability at other times?
2. Is there concern about loss of confidence in people installing rooftop solar with speculation that this capacity may be turned off at times?
3. Will further use of grid-size batteries with possibly a small levy on existing and future rooftop solar owners allow more equity for those who have not installed rooftop solar?
4. Will a focus on grid-size batteries pre-empt the investment by individual households in small-scale batteries, again fuelling equity and grid management concerns?
5. Can the government guarantee that South Australia's battery strategy is such that strategic placement of suburban-size batteries will absorb the present and growing rooftop solar

generation so that the surplus is delivered back into the grid and the turning off of rooftop solar is avoided?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:06): I am happy to refer the honourable member's questions to the minister and bring back a reply.

HOMELESSNESS ALLIANCES

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:06): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Human Services regarding human services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: Specialist homelessness services such as Ladder at Port Adelaide, youth110 in the CBD and domestic violence services were funded outside the recent tender process. These services provide both physical accommodation and specialist onsite services for people experiencing homelessness. This is just like St Vincent de Paul and Catherine House, which provide crisis accommodation and specialist services on site. However, St Vincent de Paul and Catherine House were not funded outside of the most recent tender process. The services now face sacking staff and closing crisis beds. The minister's own department has published guidelines for recording homelessness data, and I quote:

Examples of Short Term or Emergency Accommodation in South Australia: Crisis Accommodation/Shelter, (i.e. St Vincent De Paul, Catherine House, Youth 110 and Domestic Violence Shelters etc.)

That is on page 4 of that document. My question to the minister is: why were two services that provide both accommodation and specialist support treated differently to similar services that even the minister's own department puts in the same category?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:07): I thank the honourable member for his question and for his interest in this particular area. He is correct that there was some \$20 million of the existing \$70 million worth of services that was not part of the tender. My understanding of the reason for that is that these matters are contractual, that going forward we wanted to line up the contracts with the National Housing and Homelessness Agreement (NHHA), and so that is the reason why some of them weren't part of that.

One of the benefits that probably needs to be explained as well with these contracts going forward, and something that has been brought to my attention many times over the years, is the lack of certainty of funding for these organisations. We know that the last reforms to the homelessness sector—in fact, I don't even know if you would label them reforms, but the last time that any changes were made to those particular contracts and systems was some 10 years ago.

Since that time, they have just been rolled over on an annual basis, which has led to this situation that we have here with a system that is incoherent and very difficult to navigate for clients. One of the benefits for organisations going forward is that the contracts are at two years and can be renewed for two years and two years, to line up with the agreement.

The honourable member, in some of his preamble, talked about jobs. If he would like to go to the home alliance website, there's a number of positions that are actually being advertised at the moment. We know that this was always going to be the case, that there would be some changes in the sector, and that was going to cause some disruption. I think we have gone into this with our eyes open.

I would encourage anybody who is interested in working in this sector, a sector that we want to retain that level of expertise, to look at those particular alliance websites to see what opportunities there are. The alliance lead himself has said that we want to retain people in the sector, so we are very keen on hearing from people as to how they might work in the system going forward.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (15:10): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer please inform the chamber about any information he has at hand on jobs growth across various sectors in the South Australian economy?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:10): I thank the honourable member for the question. Certainly, recent information provided by, again, the Australian Bureau of Statistics, provides some useful and informative information in relation to differential impacts across industry sectors in South Australia over the last 12 months or so, post the initial onset of the COVID pandemic.

What those figures show, for example, in the latest week of the Single Touch Payroll figures, which were ending 8 May for these figures, is that there has been significant growth, when compared to March last year—so essentially a 13 or 14-month period—in industry sectors such as education and training (up 12 per cent) and financial and insurance services (up 9 per cent). At the other end, the biggest declines were in accommodation and food services (down 7 per cent) and information, media and telecommunications (down 6.2 per cent).

Interestingly, a chart headed 'Imputed change in SA employment by industry', from March through to May, in terms of total numbers within those industry sectors, shows that industry sectors that have gained employment in that particular period significantly in the first instance include health care and social assistance, not unsurprisingly; education and training; the construction sector, the third biggest in terms of imputed gains in employment; professional, science and technical services; financial and insurance services; and administrative and support services.

At the other end, in terms of the biggest losses in that chart, are, again, accommodation and food services; transport, postal and warehousing; agriculture, forestry and fishing; and then smaller reductions in manufacturing, retail trade, wholesale trade, and information, media and communications.

There is a final bit of information which adds to the challenges that we as a state and we as a nation are confronting in relation to the specific circumstances of international travel bans. In that area of professional services—which is probably included in the financial and insurance services or professional, science and technical services area—one of the representatives of one of the leading professional services firms in South Australia, speaking nationally, indicated that they could employ up to 70 what he referred to as highly qualified middle management auditors within their professional services firms at the moment, because they have a supply of young auditors coming through their firms.

At the top end, they lose auditors as they move on to other businesses or their own business, and they have this need, as I said, at the moment for up to 70 well-qualified middle level management auditors within that professional services firm. He says that in the past they have always had this problem, but they have been able to fill the void by employing, in particular, trained people from the United Kingdom and from other parts of the world who are attracted to Australia.

They certainly believe that when international travel opens up we will see a significant number of trained people, not just expats but certainly including expats, from the UK and the United States in particular, who will want to come to South Australia and to Australia because of the safety record that our nation, and in particular our state, has in terms of managing COVID and various other challenges like that.

The issue of international travel we know is important in relation to a number of industry sectors but is also important in terms of some of these highly skilled sectors where there is clearly a reservoir of people wanting to come to Australia and in particular to South Australia because of the job opportunities and also because of their view of the livability of South Australia, particularly given our performance in relation to managing COVID.

SKYCITY ADELAIDE

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:15): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer, representing the Attorney or in his own capacity, a question about a review being undertaken at Adelaide Casino.

Leave granted.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Adelaide Casino—SkyCity Casino. Yesterday, in this place, I asked the Treasurer a number of questions about the operations of SkyCity Adelaide Casino and

specifically if the government was aware that shortly after the release of the Bergin report into the operations of casinos in Victoria and Western Australia the commissioner for consumer and business affairs here—that is, the state's gambling regulator—commenced a review of SkyCity's operations.

The answer the Treasurer gave on numerous occasions was that if there was, and I quote, 'anything further that's useful that I can bring back to the house, I'll be happy to do so'. He also repeated that he had answered questions in this place but also publicly about this issue. My staff and I have checked and the only comments that we can find that the Treasurer has made on this issue is that the commissioner has advised the government that he doesn't believe an independent inquiry is necessary but hasn't made any public comments on the review the commissioner is undertaking. So my question to the Treasurer is:

1. Is he aware of the commissioner's review and his reasons for undertaking that review?
2. Can the Treasurer please provide specific details about the terms of reference or objectives of that review and the commissioner's reasons for conducting the review?
3. When are the findings of this review due to be handed to the government, and will they be made public?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:17): I can't really add too much more than what I said yesterday, but in relation to the further questions the honourable member has raised, which might appertain to the nature of a review the commissioner is undertaking, I am happy to seek advice via the Attorney-General of the commissioner to see whether there is anything useful that he might be prepared to provide to the chamber which would assist the honourable member in answers to her questions.

ADELAIDE CASINO

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:17): Supplementary: who exactly decides what information is, as the Treasurer says, and I quote, 'useful' or not useful in this area to members of the public and to members of this place?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:17): If the member is referring to the question yesterday, I made it quite clear that if I determined there was anything useful I could add that was my decision, so I think that's pretty clear. But in relation to the question today, which is in relation to the specific terms of reference the commissioner is undertaking, that's not something that I have direct knowledge of.

The only one who would usefully add anything in addition to that I assume would be the commissioner, so that's why I undertook, being the open and transparent government we are, to seek the information via the Attorney's office from the commissioner, who is obviously considering this particular issue. To answer the honourable member's question directly, he would be the one who could usefully add something in addition to what might be publicly available.

In relation to my questions yesterday and what I have said publicly, I can assure the honourable member that her staff have not worked assiduously enough if they haven't seen publicly reported comments from me, because I have made comments to the media as a follow-up to the earlier questions and statements I have made not only in this house but also on the public record—part of the public record.

In relation to the second part, it's the commissioner who would make the decision as to what usefully can be added. In relation to the first part, where I indicated yesterday that if I could find anything useful in addition to add that I hadn't already indicated, that's a judgement call for me.

ADELAIDE CASINO

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:19): Supplementary: can we clarify for the record that that useful information will actually include the findings of the review that is being undertaken?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:19): Again, the useful information in relation to me will not be that, Mr President. In relation to the commissioner's report, what position he or the Attorney-General adopts in relation to what information is made available will be a judgement call in

the first instance for the commissioner and then for the Attorney-General. I am not in a position to give undertakings or guarantees on behalf of the commissioner on that particular issue at this particular stage.

HOMELESSNESS ALLIANCES

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:20): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding housing. Given the minister's comments yesterday about homelessness crisis beds, and I quote, 'We actually have increased the number of crisis beds in South Australia and those services remain,' will the minister now tell the council exactly how many crisis beds are in the system today, how many will exit after 1 July and exactly where they will be?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:21): I thank the honourable member for his question and for the opportunity to provide some more details in relation to this matter. As I have said before, the alliance organisations were required to demonstrate through the tender process that they could cover all the service types that were in the tender and that they could deliver services to all the priority cohorts.

I will provide a bit of information. It includes generic—which I think is a terrible term but we use it anyway—adults and families; secondly, to youth, which is people aged under 25 years of age; thirdly, to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples; and, fourthly, to people experiencing domestic and family violence. Of the four regional cohorts, clearly they need to be able to provide services to those particular cohorts.

We also have the specialist domestic and family violence stream, which operates on a statewide basis with a number of organisations that would be well-known to honourable members, including such organisations as Women's Safety Services, Nunga Mi:Minar, Yarredi in Port Lincoln and a range of other providers. The successful tender alliances are currently working through a range of those details. They know what their obligations are and we will be able to provide more details in due course.

Matters of Interest

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:23): Green steel and other advanced manufacturing possibilities, like hydrogen, can exist and will exist right here in our state as long as we have governments willing to support them. The fact is, right now, we do not. So much of what Australia currently consumes is manufactured overseas, particularly in China. More than this, what we do export from here is low complexity. Our highest exports are coal, iron ore, petroleum and gold. We dig it up, we let other nations have it at a bargain price, we ship it off and then we literally buy back the products that other nations make.

In a world now looking to a carbon neutral future, these exports must be ringing alarm bells. Not making things well just does not make good sense. This is really important because we have a couple of elections coming up that are setting the agenda for a pandemic recovery. Computers, parts for office machines, toys, medical instruments, vaccines and medicines are products we could make here, products that would make our economy more complex and therefore more competitive, but in large part we do not do it and that is just flat out stupid.

The pandemic and the pandemic recovery are laying bare fundamental flaws in our economy. We simply do not make enough things, and in times of crisis we are reliant on the unreliable. Even before the pandemic we ignored the warning signs. Workers in many industries have long felt the lash of economic reform without incentives to move to more advanced jobs. What do I mean by this? The loss of making cars out of our nation is a perfect example. Canada, Germany, China and many other nations all make cars and their parts.

In a nation that now sits on billions of COVID debt for many decades to come, we have to ask ourselves: what was the actual value of telling car manufacturers to go somewhere else? What advanced manufacturing replaced this critical turning point in our nation's history? Put simply, it is always hard losing your job, but it is made a whole lot harder when the only job to move to is less complex and more than likely pays a lot less.

Reform is possible, but only when a government is actually looking to make the pie bigger and making sure that everyone gets a share of it. Cutting taxes for companies will not work if there is no incentive for the company to reinvest what it saves right here in Australia. Putting up tariff walls will not work if it means that no-one will buy the exports that we can make. What does work well is procurement, for one. We should use what we make.

Right now, 270 kilometres of high-voltage transmission lines are being run from Cultana to Port Lincoln, a \$300 million project that will not even use one bar of Australian steel. The excuse of ElectraNet, which is building the project, is that unfortunately local steel could not meet the criteria. The steelworks at Whyalla is literally right next door to this project. This is bizarre, given that the same company will use local concrete. Why? They say it is because it has the best cost structure. The concrete is presumably shipped all the way from Port Adelaide. A cost structure that can ship concrete but cannot accommodate driving next door to pick up Australian steel—that is just not good enough.

It is incredibly important to have foundation industries from which you can build the rest of your manufacturing sector, big industries like energy, aluminium, steel, chemicals and fertilisers. These are basic foundations that are critical, but we will not have these foundations if we use imported versions of what we make here. I am not aware of even one major project currently underway through the Marshall Liberal government that is using Australian steel or concrete. It is shameful. We need to have a vision for the future of jobs and industry that goes beyond building a basketball stadium in the city.

When last in government, Labor invested in creating hydrogen production; it is at Tonsley. We are now going further. South Australian Labor is committed to building, owning and operating a 200-megawatt hydrogen power plant. That is owning our own power again. It is putting ourselves back in the driver's seat to make power for homes and industry and to create jobs by using what we make here. It is the kind of vision that means we can rejuvenate manufacturing, grow new jobs and industries, make it here, make it well and make it available to Australians first.

FEDERAL BUDGET

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:28): I rise to speak on the exciting impact of the Morrison government's recent federal budget on the growth and future prosperity of South Australia. The reach of the federal budget ranges across many sectors and will create jobs and provide for and improve the wellbeing of all Australians, including the vulnerable and disadvantaged families.

The Marshall Liberal government's own economic recovery and jobs growth plan is well on track, evidenced by the recently released ABS job statistics that indicate record high employment numbers in South Australia, the creation of 15,000 jobs in the last month and an unemployment rate that continues to decline to a level now at 5.7 per cent.

In partnership with the Morrison government and on the back of the federal budget, South Australia's successful recovery from the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic continues to demonstrate very positive signals. To commence, transport and infrastructure investment in South Australia by the Morrison government includes:

- \$148 million towards the Augusta Highway duplication;
- \$64 million of additional funding to finalise the sealing of the Strzelecki Track;
- reinforcement of the \$2.6 billion contribution to the planning, design and construction of the north-south corridor from Darlington to Anzac Highway;
- the Truro bypass;
- the Heysen Tunnel upgrade at a cost of \$48 million; and
- an additional \$60 million for the Gawler rail line electrification.

These projects are designed to improve safety, access and efficiency on either critical roads to popular tourist destinations or to important regional and remote locations.

The Augusta Road duplication follows a \$63 million commitment already made for a total of \$211 million, which will be boosted by 20 per cent funding from the Marshall Liberal government. It will incorporate the highway duplication from Port Wakefield to Lochiel and complement the Port Wakefield overpass link to Yorke Peninsula and the dual carriageways through Port Wakefield. This will significantly improve the flow of traffic and safety of an important transport route. There are also advanced plans for duplication of the high traffic thoroughfare between Crystal Brook and Port Pirie.

The \$64 million funding contribution to the sealing of the Strzelecki Track represents the unfunded component and now brings the total investment to \$164 million. The sealing of this road is essential for the major oil and gas producers in the Cooper Basin and opens wonderful possibilities in that region for tourism.

The announced Truro bypass project will improve freight productivity and improve road safety for all road users, including trucking, tourism and local commuters. Costing \$202 million, the federal government's contribution will be \$162 million, with the Marshall Liberal government again contributing 20 per cent (or \$40 million). Construction will commence in 2022 and it will be completed by 2026. This complements projects to improve the Sturt Highway from the Riverland to Gawler that includes overtaking lanes, partial duplication in high traffic areas in the Riverland, new and upgraded rest areas and junction improvements.

The north-south corridor between Darlington and Anzac Highway is now well documented and is the next stage of the north-south expressway. Consisting of four kilometres of tunnels in the six-kilometre motorway, this project is expected to create 4,000 jobs.

There is also significant national investment of \$275 million to establish Australia's hydrogen industry. This has benefits for South Australia, with Port Bonython near Whyalla identified as a potential export hub, considering its deep water port, loading facilities, an available land resource and skilled workforce. The hydrogen industry is expected to provide significant jobs growth and economic benefits for decades into the future.

Whilst the preceding announcements represent investments in specific infrastructure projects in South Australia, the Morrison government is totally committed to health services and to the wellbeing of all Australian residents and businesses. Initiatives announced in the budget on a national level include but are not limited to:

- support for women in the form of a \$3.4 billion package, specifically focused on safety, health and economic security, ensuring women's rights to respect, equality and inclusion;
- further concessions on childcare expenditure for families valued at \$1.7 billion;
- extension of the low and middle income tax offset;
- a \$17.7 billion package to the aged-care sector, including 80,000 home care packages, increased nursing staff and increased oversight of aged-care facilities;
- further injection of funds into the National Disability Insurance Scheme;
- a \$6.3 billion commitment to mental health services, including the establishment of a National Suicide Prevention Office;
- investment in apprenticeships and skills packages;
- first-home buyers and single parents will benefit from reduced deposit requirements to build or purchase homes;
- over \$20 billion in tax revenue will be conceded by the extension of initiatives provided to every business in Australia, allowing the instant write-off of asset purchases and the carryback of losses against previous year's income.

The bottom line is an \$87 billion spend to create 250,000 jobs and reduce our national unemployment rate to below 5 per cent, with an ultimate target of 4.5 per cent.

Time expired.

UNPAID CARERS

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:33): I rise to shine a spotlight on the essential work of more than a quarter of a million unpaid South Australian carers who support the most vulnerable and those in greatest need in our community, and the necessity for those carers to receive the level of support necessary to undertake this vital role. Eurocarers, the national carer network in Europe, noted the 'inherent as well as an indispensable part' carers play in the 'provision, organisation and sustainability of health and social care systems'.

Anyone can find themselves a carer providing unpaid care to a family member who is frail, aged, having a disability or chronic or terminal illness. Attention has been directed at delays in the rollout of the NDIS and availability of home care packages, but little community attention has been directed at the unpaid carers who are needed to make these services work. COVID-19 has presented additional challenges.

National Carers Week in October each year provides an opportunity to raise community awareness of carers and the diversity of their caring roles. In October last year, in time for National Carers Week, a survey was completed revealing some disturbing information. One half of all carers were sole carers, without assistance from any other family members or friends. High levels of stress, social isolation, financial hardship and disconnection from services planning were cited as issues.

In Europe, the same set of challenges for carer wellbeing were listed, including the difficulty in balancing paid work with carer responsibilities. The national survey revealed that carers felt a lack of inclusion and consideration in the health system and other delivery services. For example, nearly two thirds of carers reported that hospitals did not ask them about their needs. Nearly 40 per cent did not consider that hospitals provided sufficient information, and nearly one half felt there were insufficient carer support options and facilities. Hopefully, SA Health has responded and improved support for and inclusion of carers.

Level of carer payments and allowances, carer superannuation and carer leave are overdue federal reforms, requiring the encouragement of state ministers. However, the state government can extend state-based subsidies. Further work is needed investigating carer concerns and wellbeing, and how best to provide measures to support their vital role in our society. Service agencies, hospitals and GPs need to better direct carers to supports that can be accessed through the carers' gateway.

The aged-care royal commission noted that the needs of informal carers should be recognised as part of the assessment needs of the older person. Respite care must be seen as a core part of the aged-care system so that carers have regular breaks and attend to their personal wellbeing. This will sustain and support the caring role. Carers South Australia, established in 1990 by carers to represent their interests and needs and be their voice, is a not-for-profit incorporated association, with funding from state and federal government.

Carers SA is a representative organisation and service provider, offering a range of services to family carers through the state, and forming part of a national network of carer associations advocating on behalf of family and friend carers. The community and government need to recognise the key role Carers SA plays in leading change and empowering carers.

Parliament should add its recognition of this important process of Carers SA's engagement with the SA government and its health and service agencies to provide better and more relevant services to improve conditions under which carers operate, and support and further acknowledge their vital contribution to the South Australian community. The SA Carers Recognition Act needs to be upgraded to a SA carers inclusion and support act to mandate the inclusion process and level of support required.

MILLICENT BUSINESS COMMUNITY

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:37): I rise today to speak about a wonderful initiative in Millicent. Sukhchain Dhaliwal is well known to local people through the New Heaven Indian restaurant in George Street, which he runs with his wife, Kamaljit. The restaurant has won multiple awards and also features strongly in the Millicent Business Community Association annual

outstanding business awards. I was at the 2019 awards when New Heaven restaurant won the hospitality tourism section, and I can also vouch for the excellence of the meals at the restaurant.

Sukhi (as he is known) is now also part owner and manager of the Millicent IGA. He often talks of his gratitude to the people of the local area for their support and love since he moved to Millicent, and he now wants to give back to the community. So he is providing free meals for people in need. On Mondays each week people can go into the IGA building and pick up pre-prepared meals without charge. Ingredients are donated by IGA and New Heaven, and Sukhi and his team prepare the meals. The fridge is in a public area, so people who need a free meal do not need to approach anyone or feel self-conscious.

I am told that about 30 meals were provided in the first week. That has now risen to a regular amount of around 60 meals every week. Sukhi says that, as the free service has become more known, it has really highlighted how many people there are in need in the region. He knows there may be a few people who take a meal who do not really need a free dinner, but he says that is much better than not providing a dinner for those who do need it. I want to congratulate Sukhi and his team for this generous initiative.

This initiative also highlights the importance of small business in regional towns such as Millicent. Sukhi saw a need, saw the opportunity to help and made it happen, yet the Millicent IGA is one of the businesses being put at risk by the Marshall Liberal government's insistence on total deregulation of shop trading hours. Sixty per cent of their turnover comes from Sunday trading because Woolworths cannot open on that day, and it is well known locally that one of the two independent supermarkets will be forced to close if Sunday trading changes.

What this government needs to realise is that there are ramifications for local communities when small businesses are forced out. Small businesses invest in their local neighbourhoods. Small businesses have their profits go to other local small businesses; they do not go to the big multinationals. They support other small businesses and back their local communities, as Sukhi is doing. This parliament should be backing him in return. That is the heart of strong communities.

OUR REGIONS MATTER

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:40): A South Australian-first blueprint to drive economic growth in the state's regions and create jobs across a range of industries has been released by the Marshall Liberal government. The Our Regions Matter blueprint focuses on five key areas to drive growth: regional voice, regional creativity, regional leadership and skills, regional services and regional investment. Premier Steven Marshall, who recently released the blueprint and launched the Our Regions Matter website in Port Lincoln, rightly said that South Australia's regions are the economic powerhouse that drives prosperity for the entire state.

Our regions are responsible for contributing around \$29 billion per year to the South Australian economy across a range of industries, including farming, fishing, mining, manufacturing and tourism. In fact, there are nearly 150,000 people employed in regional South Australia and it is important we do everything we can to drive economic growth in our regions, creating local jobs. That is why we as a government are investing over \$3 billion across more than 1,000 projects across the regions, to create thousands of jobs and better the lives of regional South Australians.

To achieve this there is a particular focus on health, education and sport. The release of this South Australian government-first regional development strategy will allow the Marshall government to work positively and strategically with communities to grow our regions. This strategy is supported by our new Our Regions Matter website, which allows residents to search the investments being made to improve services in their own communities and businesses. This focus is allowing us to further explore and determine which regions to establish and create jobs.

Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development David Basham is leading the state government's commitment to improving life in regional South Australia. This commitment recognises the importance of our regions to the state economy and identifies key areas to focus on to help deliver key projects and create local jobs.

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: But it doesn't fund them.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: There is much more I could say but I will leave it at that. I will continue with this detail and provide some detail to the Hon. Ms Scriven next time.

JUSTICE, MS M.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:42): I rise to speak about the passing of a respected community leader: Mel Justice, the Principal of Aldinga Beach Primary. Mel passed away suddenly on the morning of 14 April this year and her passing has been felt greatly by the Aldinga Beach community and of course by her friends and family. I want to in particular acknowledge the presence of her partner, Charlie, her sister, Kylie, and her good friend Brett, who are here in the gallery today.

Mel was born in Holbrook, the eldest daughter of Iris Nobbs and Phillip Justice. She went to the local primary school and later Billabong High, both public schools. Mel was a strong believer in public education. She later left Holbrook and went to study teaching at university. Family was very important to Mel. She helped care for both her father and her mother during ill health and was a loving and supportive sister to Kylie. She also had a big network and family of friends.

Mel had a deep respect for Indigenous culture. This comes from her family background. Her late mother, Iris, was born on Norfolk Island. As an educator, Mel was able to encourage this respect for First Nations people among her students. Following her death, many in the Aldinga Beach school community have recognised the significant contribution that Mel made in this regard, ensuring that Aboriginal culture was genuinely embraced and accepted within her school.

Mel had a rich and diverse professional life. In 2001, she took a break from teaching and completed a Diploma in Natural Resource Management. She worked briefly as a kitchen hand in a nursing home with her sister, Kylie, and she later moved to the South-East with her then partner Annmarie and secured a role as a biodiversity officer.

Mel later returned to Adelaide and went back to teaching, initially as a relief teacher at Christie Downs Primary School. For almost 15 years, Mel worked across various schools. She gained a reputation as an educator who worked with students who experienced social disadvantage. She took on a literacy role at Aldinga Beach Primary School and later went on to become the deputy and then the school's principal. She was the principal of Aldinga Beach Primary School for the last four years, a role that I know she really loved.

Following Mel's passing, Anne Millard, the Executive Director of Partnerships, Schools and Preschools, wrote an article for department educators, and stated:

...for many that knew Mel she was justice by name, justice by nature. Social justice and equity were at the core of everything Mel did and stood for.

Knowing Mel, I can certainly confirm that that was true. The qualities that made Mel a wonderful teacher—her genuine care and interest in people, her amazing capacity to listen and her innate wisdom—also made her a great friend and I will certainly miss our many conversations about love, life and politics over the years, and of course her wonderful sense of humour and infectious laugh.

It is testament to the big impact that Mel had on her community that there has been such a strong reaction to her death from teachers, parents and children at the school. At a recent service celebrating Mel's life, students spoke passionately about the positive impact she had on them. Flowers, candles and cards were also laid out at the school oval in memorial to Mel's life. As is often said, a good teacher is like a candle: it consumes itself to light the way for others, and this was certainly true of Mel. She was a teacher who was committed to changing lives and to helping young people reach their full potential.

In recent weeks, I have had the opportunity to reflect on my friendship with Mel. We met through our mutual friend, Brett Bartel, about 15 years ago and we had many good times over the years. I always appreciated her sympathetic ear and wise advice. I recall a discussion after the 2016 federal election when I had lost my Senate seat. At that time, I was contemplating giving up on electoral politics and I remember that Mel discouraged me from this. I am certainly thankful to her for saying the right thing at the right time and I know she would have been excited to see me here in the parliament giving things another go.

Mel was a proud member of the LGBTI community in our state. She was a regular attendee at Picnic in the Park. She resisted many efforts to join the Feast board. She was also a big lover of the WOMADelaide festival and really looked forward to that event. It would be remiss to talk about Mel's life without mentioning her love of dogs. Her first dog, Pablo, was a loyal companion for 12 years. She later had Gypsy and more recently Jackson and they were a big part of her family.

When someone dies suddenly and at such a young age—Mel was only 54—it is natural for those who are left behind to question why. They say that a life that touches others goes on forever. Mel's time with us was too short, but she made a big impact and it is only appropriate that her impactful life is recorded in the *Hansard* of our parliament.

WAGE THEFT

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (15:48): Last week, I joined community groups, unions and workers calling for wage theft to be criminalised. Organisations like SA Labour Info Hub and individuals gathered on the steps of Parliament House to listen to industrial organisations, workers and advocates who work to assist those affected by wage theft.

Those gathered on the steps expressed their frustration with the lack of action from both the state and federal governments. We listened to stories of the significant social and economic impact of wage theft on people in this state. We heard of workers being paid less than \$5 an hour; workers being forced to pay high rent to their employer for accommodation; employers keeping workers' possessions, such as passports, as a way of control; and workers being sexually harassed and exploited.

Ultimately, the stories we heard illustrated that wage theft is used as a form of control, a way to take advantage of workers, and has become a business model for employment practice in our state. A worker even said she was made to feel like a second-class citizen.

The lack of action from the federal and state governments has not gone unnoticed. The federal government has recently backed away from its commitment to criminalise wage theft through its infamous omnibus bill, whereas the Marshall Liberal government has chosen to ignore the issue altogether. Substantial evidence has been presented to this parliament through the wage theft committee; however, this government refuses to acknowledge that wage theft is a problem needing to be addressed. Treasurer Lucas will not even accept the term 'wage theft'.

The media, the committee and the workers who spoke at this rally can attest that the existing structures and existing agencies like SafeWork SA and the Fair Work Ombudsman are not addressing the issue. Not only do these agencies not have the resources to deal with the issue of wage theft, they currently do not have sufficient powers to either police or regulate work systems and practices that exploit and abuse workers.

Our existing agencies cannot provide support for working people commensurate with the size of the problem. There is a growing sentiment within South Australia from workers, small businesses and the community that wage theft should be criminalised to deter employers from undercutting workers and creating a non-competitive business model. The Marshall Liberal government should see this rally as a call to action and be prepared for more public uproar on the issue until action is finally taken.

Motions

CYCLING INFRASTRUCTURE

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:51): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes the rejection of the east-west bikeway by the Adelaide City Council, after years of deliberations;
2. Notes the \$3 million funds deed with the state government is due to expire in June;
3. Recognises that around the world cities are investing in cycling infrastructure to improve transport options to make cities more liveable, safe and appealing; and

4. Calls on the Marshall government to show leadership and ensure that the unspent funds are allocated to essential cycling infrastructure across our city.

The motion that I am moving today is calling on the Marshall government to allocate the \$3 million that had been promised for the east-west bikeway to cycling infrastructure in the city, because we know that the Adelaide City Council, under the leadership of the failed Team Adelaide faction, resolved not to deliver the east-west bikeway.

I am relieved to note, though, that recently the state government have announced they will be spending this money on cycling infrastructure in the city, and the Greens certainly welcome that commitment. Might I say that it is a disappointing turn of events that we have seen in Town Hall over the last few years where we have seen backflip after backflip, U-turn after U-turn, when it comes to laying down basic cycling infrastructure in our city. It really is a travesty, when you consider what has unfolded in the Adelaide City Council when it comes to transport infrastructure.

I refer to a question that was asked by Councillor Phillip Martin about the costs associated with the investigations of the east-west bikeway project for the years 2016-17 to 2020-21, and the response is on the public record. He asked the council how much money was spent on planning this east-west bikeway, the east-west bikeway that was felled by the Team Adelaide faction, under the leadership of Alex Hyde, who is at the far right of the Liberal Party and works for Nicolle Flint.

He asked the council how much money was wasted by the Adelaide City Council in terms of its failure to progress cycling infrastructure. The answer he got back was staggering: \$422,000. That is \$422,000 of ratepayer funds thrown into the wind because of the ideological opposition of the hard right of the Liberal Party that dominates Town Hall. It is an embarrassing failure of leadership at this time of climate crisis that the council has failed to deliver the east-west bikeway. We have countries around the world rolling out cycling infrastructure, from Paris to Berlin, Melbourne and Sydney, and yet it is all too hard in Adelaide. That smacks of a failure of leadership.

Whilst I welcome the fact that the government has said they are going to spend this money on cycling infrastructure, it is vital that they ensure that the money is actually spent and that we have a meaningful investment in cycling infrastructure in our city, so that we can deal appropriately with the climate crisis, so that we can protect the safety of cyclists and so that we can promote health and wellbeing. I think residents in the City of Adelaide expect this but also residents in our state more broadly want to see this kind of leadership. I call on the Marshall government to step up here and ensure that this project gets back on track.

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

Parliamentary Committees

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: SURGICAL IMPLANTATION OF MEDICAL MESH

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:55): I move:

That the final report of the committee, on its inquiry into issues relating to surgical implementation of medical mesh in South Australia, be noted.

On behalf of the Social Development Committee, I have a number of people and organisations to thank. Firstly, it goes without saying, thank you to the individual witnesses and their families who have given this committee their time and insights and provided accounts of their journeys with medical mesh, which at times have been most traumatic for them.

As a committee, we acknowledge the devastating impacts medical mesh has had on their lives. Through their written and oral submissions, the committee has been able to understand the deeply personal nature of the damage that mesh can cause in the human body and how the experience of this for many sufferers needs to be given proper recognition and an appropriate response by the relevant authorities.

The committee thanks the commonwealth government agencies and the staff who have been working on the legislative policy and regulatory changes that have rapidly occurred during the time that this inquiry has taken place. A particular thank you is due to Ms Tracey Duffy in the Department of Health and the commission members of the Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health

Care. Thank you also to Professors Ahern and O'Connell from Monash University for giving evidence concerning the Australasian Pelvic Floor Procedure Registry.

A thank you must also be made to Dr Malcolm Frazer and Ms Nicole Germano from Queensland Pelvic Mesh Service. The committee would also like to thank our own state's pelvic mesh clinic, Dr Roy Watson and the staff who work at the clinic, who provided oral evidence and written responses to several questions that were taken on notice.

The committee would also like to thank the professional colleges, medical associations, non-government sector, universities and research institutes and their learned representatives, whose evidence was educative and much appreciated by the committee. We also thank the advocacy groups who have assisted many of the mesh-affected women and men in this state and supported them through their pain and in making their submissions to the inquiry.

As Presiding Member, I would also like to thank the committee members and the secretariat for their work on this review. Specifically, there has been a great deal of effort, but it has been quite a multipartisan committee, which I have enjoyed. It has been an issue where politics has largely been removed from the discussion and the committee has pressed forward with a joint goal, which has been most worthwhile. I should also note that the initial reference for this particular inquiry was initiated by Ms Dana Wortley, the member for Torrens in the other place, and she should be acknowledged for her contribution.

Further, I would like to add that I excluded myself from some of the proceedings back in February 2020 during the committee's hearing of oral evidence from individuals who have been injured by medical mesh, as a result of a potential conflict of interest on account of my having been employed with Johnson & Johnson for some 16 years. I made a statement regarding this at the time, and I can assure members that I think that was the appropriate thing to do.

I am pleased to be noting the report today on behalf of the committee. Briefly, the Social Development Committee started the inquiry into the surgical implantation of medical mesh by advertising across the state and calling for submissions in July 2019. The committee received 69 written submissions and held 15 hearings, with the report being tabled today the result of a very lengthy inquiry dating back to July 2019, so almost two years.

During this time and largely as a consequence of the report of the Community Affairs References Committee in the Senate on the number of Australian women affected by transvaginal mesh (TVM), many changes have occurred in the regulations and the use of medical mesh. Some of that committee's recommendations are still to be fully implemented but the majority have been, both federally and in South Australia.

After taking into consideration the evidence presented by the many stakeholders and examining some of the emerging national and international policies and regulations concerning the use of medical mesh in pelvic organ prolapse (POP), stress urinary incontinence (SUI) and hernia, the committee has made 17 recommendations to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

I will not go into any more detail—there is so much more I could say—except to say that the report has now been publicly tabled. I do recommend the report to members of this chamber who have an interest in this area and indeed to members of the public who may be interested. I think the report will provide a good basis for understanding the issue and for looking at what I believe will be a good and worthwhile path ahead.

The committee has made some recommendations, which I would consider quite strong recommendations. As I said, the inquiry was held in a multipartisan fashion; that is, there was little focus on politics and much more focus on getting a result for people who have really suffered.

I think the final point to make here is that there is no doubt at all that, whilst this particular form of surgery has been very successful for a lot of people, there are a significant number of people who have suffered intensely as a result of these implants or devices being inserted into them, and the response from the medical profession as a whole has been suboptimal, not just in South Australia but right around the world.

The committee attempted to take the best possible evidence it could in order to, firstly, perform an overview of the situation and outline some of the terrible suffering that has occurred as a result of these procedures but also to provide 17 recommendations on what should be done from here. I am pleased to inform the chamber that in many cases these recommendations have already partially been taken up or at least been seen as an obvious next step by those towards whom the recommendations are directed.

The report is well worth a read. I commend it to the house. I look forward to any feedback from other members.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.T. Ngo.

Bills

WALKING AND CYCLING COMMISSIONER BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:02): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to establish a walking and cycling commissioner and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:03): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this bill is to establish a walking and cycling commissioner to encourage walking and cycling as modes of travel; promote the health, environmental, social and economic benefits; and prepare and promote strategies to make walking and cycling inclusive for everybody in South Australia.

At a time when places around the world are rapidly investing in cycling infrastructure and incentivising that infrastructure and active transport, South Australia is lagging behind. In London and Manchester, where walking and cycling commissioners have been appointed, there are plans to transition from passive to active transport and create sustainable cities of the future. Indeed, London has had a Walking and Cycling Commissioner in place since 2016. Bold targets, such as 80 per cent of all trips into London to be walking, cycling or public transport by 2041, are being set and, similarly, in Greater Manchester there is a goal of 50 per cent by 2040.

Last July, British Prime Minister Boris Johnson—and I am not usually a fan of his, but he has done some good things when it comes to cycling—committed £2 billion for a walking and cycling revolution to deliver thousands of miles of new protected bike lanes, cycle training for children and adults in the first ever zero emission transport city.

Scotland is also taking the opportunity, coming off the back of COVID-19 lockdowns, to restructure their transport system to prioritise health, the community and the environment. Their Active Nation Commissioner has stated that the restructure is not anti-car or anti-economy but rather it is pro-people. That is the thing I think we need to remember when it comes to transport policy in our own state, this is about being pro-people, protecting our environment and advancing community health and wellbeing.

In Austin, Texas, Adelaide's sister city, we have seen more affordable, accessible and safe transport choices due to the fact that 14 per cent of constituents' annual income was spent on travel costs. Adelaide is not far off this number, at a staggering 13.7 per cent. Resulting action in Texas, including investment in bikeways, has seen families downgraded from two to one-car households, saving thousands of dollars and therefore increasing their spending capacity. That is money that can be spent on our local shops, our retail sectors and other struggling industries.

Why is this needed in South Australia? Adelaide is no longer the 20-minute city, with commuters spending up to 60 per cent of their morning commute in congested traffic. We also have more car parks per capita than any other capital city. Adelaide is in danger of becoming a city in a car park rather than a city in a park. It seems ludicrous that South Australia spends the least in the country on cycling infrastructure—0.6 per cent of road spending—spending just \$4 million in

2015-16 on cycling infrastructure, meanwhile spending \$569 million on roads, so \$4 million on cycling compared with \$569 million on roads.

More money on roads and more money on parking is not the solution. We need a rethink and we need to rethink the way that travel occurs in our state and my hope is that the establishment of a walking and cycling commissioner would be a good first step. We have already seen the city council fail to implement the east-west bikeway, despite years of discussion and despite the commitment of state government funding. This has failed the 2,000 cyclists who enter the east and west sides of the city each work day and the 60 per cent of the population who would ride and cycle more if separating cycling infrastructure was delivered. They need this infrastructure for their safety.

Not only would this improve the health of our communities by encouraging physical exercise, it would also free up parks in the city as commuters turn to cycling instead of cars. It is time for us to have a strong independent advocate who can make the case for government investment and policy change to encourage active transport. At this time of climate emergency, at this time of climate crisis, it is vitally important that we promote active transport, and the establishment of an active, dedicated commissioner could be the reset on transport policy that our state so desperately needs.

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

Motions

NATIONAL ROAD SAFETY WEEK

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:08): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes National Road Safety Week was hosted in Adelaide this year from 16 to 13 May;
2. Expresses its deepest condolences to the families, friends and loved ones of the 977 people who lost their lives on South Australian roads between 2001 and 2020;
3. Notes a further 7,391 people suffered serious injuries;
4. Also notes 576 of the 977 lives lost were on South Australian regional roads;
5. Further expresses its deepest condolences to the families, friends and loved ones of the 43 people killed on our roads so far this year;
6. Calls upon the state government to introduce tougher laws and penalties targeting dangerous drivers and high-risk behaviour, including drug driving and driving whilst disqualified, as a matter of urgency; and
7. Calls upon the state and federal governments to take immediate action to improve the condition and safety of our regional roads.

I rise to speak on this motion highlighting National Road Safety Week, hosted in Adelaide from 16 May, and in doing so I commend the work of everyone involved, including the MFS, the RAA, SAPOL and other ambassadors from the Think! Road Safety partnerships. I would like to particularly acknowledge the great work of the RAA in its pursuit of safer roads, safer vehicles and safer drivers. I do not know about others, but I know that I attribute much of the information I rely on in these discussions to the RAA because of the important role they play, not just for their members but for all of us and all road users when it comes to road safety-related matters.

I am pleased to say that, just this morning, I had the opportunity to meet with Mr Charles Mountain and his group—Emily, Paula, David and Samuel—to speak about some of the key road safety concerns that I have and that were part of this campaign. I am grateful for their ongoing research and advocacy for the benefit of all South Australians, and I am grateful to be able to brief them on the various bits of legislation that we have been working on in this place.

The eight-day campaign began with a very powerful and moving visual display at Elder Park, with 977 empty chairs, each one representing a life lost on South Australian roads between 2011 and 2020. I happened to be going past Elder Park that day and saw the chairs. There was no doubt that it was a sobering sight. It was also a testament to all those involved in setting up these events in relation to the great advocacy work they do. I know that if I stopped, if they gained my attention on that day, then certainly the same could have been said for others who were passing Elder Park. We

know that the work of these groups is absolutely critical. We know that they need to continuously think outside the box to capture our attention. We know that all of this requires a constant effort to keep us engaged and alert.

It is hard to fathom the absolute grief behind each and every one of those empty seats. They represented 977 men, women and children who did not return home to their loved ones. I spoke last year in this place, following the tragic death of Chief Superintendent Joanne Shanahan, which was something that touched all of us very deeply, and that is just one person amongst the 977 who have been killed on our roads. Of course, there are many more who died on our roads who do not make the headlines on our front pages and whom we are not familiar with, personally or otherwise.

There were powerful messages flashed on big screens around Elder Park, such as: 'We miss you every day,' and, 'As each year passes, we wonder what you would have been doing and what a wonderful father you would have been.' Another was: 'One weekend our family was coming together for your wedding and the next weekend for your funeral.' There was also this simple yet powerful statement: 'The gap left in our family will never heal.'

Over the same decade, a further 7,391 people suffered injuries as a result of road crashes. A serious injury could be a brain injury, paralysis, amputation or a loss of sight, for example. This year, 2021, 43 more lives have been lost on our roads. That is 43 more empty chairs. Nationally, about 1,200 people die on Australian roads each year and a further 44,000 people are seriously injured. Males are consistently over-represented in the tolls. Nationally, traffic injury is the biggest cause of death of Australian children under 15 years and the second biggest cause of death for all Australians aged 15 to 24.

This year in South Australia, 35 males have already died on our roads, compared to eight females. The biggest contributors, according to SAPOL, are the fatal five: drink and drug driving, speeding, not wearing a seatbelt, dangerous road use and distraction. SAPOL says that distraction has contributed to 56 per cent of the lives lost on our roads this year.

It is fair to say that we are all at our wits' end at the senseless loss of lives as a result of road crashes. SAPOL and our first responders, who see the carnage on our roads firsthand, are absolutely at their wits' end, and I think many of us are asking what can be done to prevent more needless and tragic deaths on our roads. We have heard whisperings of impending double demerits for not wearing a seatbelt. I am not sure whether we are likely to see that or not, but I do know that statistics tell us that the seatbelt cohort represented 28 per cent of last year's road toll.

Then there is other high-risk behaviour which also endangers others. Surely, one would think that we should be focusing on those higher categories of offending. If you text and drive, you are not only risking those words being your last but you are risking the lives of everyone around you. Hoon driving, drink-driving and drug driving, they are a whole other level of dangerous behaviour. It is encouraging to hear the government has introduced a bill this week increasing penalties for hoon drivers. I have not seen the bill itself to comment any further on the specifics, but it sounds like we might be headed in the right direction. That is indeed encouraging.

I also look forward to the government introducing tough new penalties for drug driving, as was committed in this place during the transport bill debate. Twenty-two per cent of drivers and riders killed in South Australia in 2020 tested positive to drugs. Research conducted by Monash University Accident Research Centre for the Australian government's Office of Road Safety found that 37 per cent of all drivers and motorbike riders who died on Australian roads in 2017 had illicit drugs in their system.

The figures that we have been provided with, especially very recently, are staggering. Each and every day when we drive on, walk near or cycle on our roads, we run the gauntlet of sharing the road with drivers who are drugged up to their eyeballs. Stamping out this potentially deadly driving has to be the number one priority for all of us. Parents are being caught driving with drugs in their system, dropping off their kids at school. Every time we have a long weekend, every time we have a public holiday, every time there is a new start to the school term, we see these statistics provided to us by SAPOL, and they are absolutely alarming.

The question we have to ask is: what is it going to take? Is it going to take yet another tragedy because, as I said, we had 977 chairs at Elder Park and a further 43 lives lost this year. The numbers

are just staggering. Consultation on the 2021-2030 draft National Road Safety Strategy has just closed. It sets a 10-year target of a 50 per cent reduction in fatalities and a 30 per cent reduction in serious injuries. I think it is incumbent on all of us to think about how we intend to reach these targets as a collective. This is not just about the government or the opposition or the crossbench. I think we are all duty-bound when it comes to reaching these targets.

The strategy identified nine priority areas, including risky road use, which encompasses drug driving. Investment in our regional roads was also highlighted as a key priority, as it rightly should be. Of the 977 lives lost on our roads over the past decade, 576 of those were on country roads, or nearly 60 per cent of all road fatalities. One final mention goes to the over-representation of motorbike riders in our road fatalities. There have been nine deaths so far this year—that is, nine out of the 43 that I mentioned, or about 20 per cent. If you consider that motorbikes only make up about 4 per cent of road users, it is overwhelmingly disproportionate.

Last year, 19 motorbike riders lost their lives and 116 were seriously injured on our roads. I recently met with the mother of one of those young riders included in last year's statistics, a teenager named Harry, who I spoke about in this place recently. She was overwhelmed because she learned in the aftermath of the passing of her son that he was able to get his learner's permit for his motorbike after riding for just 10 hours in a car park under controlled conditions at 25 kilometres per hour. From there, he went directly onto our roads. There was no on-road component, no night-time or varied road conditions—just the bare minimum, 10 hours in a car park.

It is worth highlighting again that, if you are one of these riders, there is no requirement for you to have a driver's licence and undergo the same conditions that you would undergo in terms of gaining a motor vehicle driver's licence, not at all on par with learning to drive a car. As we know, a motorbike is not as forgiving as a car. I think it is fair to say that, if I did not know that every motorbike rider does not have that basic level of experience on the road, then it is fair to say that a whole lot of other road users also do not know that the motorbike rider next to them on the road may have as little as 10 hours of experience in a car park under controlled conditions at just 25 kilometres per hour.

As I have said in this place, I do not think it is widely known how inadequate the requirements are to get a learner's motorbike licence in South Australia, because, if you stop and think about it, it makes absolutely no sense. I am delighted that the government has taken on board the concerns we have raised in this place and committed to a regulatory regime aimed specifically at motorbike riders, and we will certainly hold them to their word in relation to that.

There is no question that we have made substantial gains in reducing lives lost and serious injuries on our roads compared with previous decades—that is a given. However, despite those gains, we know that a lot more needs to be done. We all have a role to play in this space, as legislators and as road users. I know from the time I have invested in this space, speaking to SAPOL, to the RAA, to other stakeholder groups and also to grieving families, that there is a lot more we can do and there is a lot more that we must do.

My plea to all members of parliament across the political spectrum is that we do this as a collective. This is one issue that does not need political flourish, it just needs a little bit of political will amongst all of us. So let us provide the appropriate frameworks, in line with expert advice from bodies like CASR, RAA, SAPOL and other ambassadors, people who deal with this day in and day out and are in the know, because the more we do the more they can do to educate our road users appropriately and prevent needless and senseless deaths on our roads.

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

PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:22): I move:

That this council—

1. Condemns the loss of 242 Palestinian lives, including 66 children, during the recent 11-day bombardment by Israel of heavily populated Gaza;
2. Condemns the loss of 12 lives, including two children, due to Hamas rocket fire in Israel;
3. Welcomes the announcement of a ceasefire on 21 May 2021;

4. Calls for an immediate halt to illegal settler expansion in the occupied West Bank and Jerusalem;
5. Recognises the right of the Palestinian people to exercise their inalienable rights, including the right to self-determination without external interference, the right to national independence and sovereignty and the right to return to their homes and property from which they have been displaced;
6. Notes the recent Human Rights Watch report, entitled 'A Threshold Crossed: Israeli Authorities and the Crimes of Apartheid and Persecution';
7. Calls upon the federal government to assist with the immediate delivery of critical humanitarian assistance to the Palestinian people, particularly those living in Gaza; and,
8. Calls upon the federal government to advocate for equal rights for Palestinian and Israeli people.

I rise to speak on this very important motion, recognising the right of the Palestinian people to exercise their inalienable rights, including the right to self-determination without external interference, the right to national independence and sovereignty, and the right to return to their homes and property from which they have been displaced. In doing so, I note the presence here today of Ms Abbie Hamdan, who is the co-founder of Australian friends of Palestine.

The longstanding oppression and suffering of the Palestinian people intensified earlier this month with the 11-day bombardment of Gaza by Israel, and the numbers speak for themselves. According to the United Nations Human Rights Centre, 12 Israelis, including two innocent children, and 242 Palestinians were killed. Sixty-six innocent Palestinian children—23 girls and 43 boys—were indiscriminately killed; 12 of these children had not even reached their fifth birthday. Eleven have been identified as part of a trauma support program run by the Norwegian Refugee Council.

One can only imagine what they had already endured in their short lives. The latest attacks followed the intensification of Israel's policy of settler expansion, with Israeli courts recently ruling that settlers could move into Palestinian homes in Sheikh Jarrah, a neighbourhood of East Jerusalem. While Israel has claimed its recent airstrikes were targeted, it is unfathomable that bombarding such a densely populated area could achieve anything but indiscriminate destruction—and that it did.

There are over two million people living in 365 square kilometres. According to the Ministry for Health in Gaza, 1,948 Palestinians were injured, including 610 children and almost 400 women. At least 77,000 civilians have been displaced, forced to seek protection by fleeing their homes. An estimated 258 buildings were destroyed, including media outlets and police stations, while a further 770 homes are now uninhabitable.

The United Nations reports that 53 schools, six hospitals and 11 primary healthcare centres were extensively damaged. The central COVID testing laboratory is all but gone. Gaza's top neurologist and the head of the coronavirus response at Gaza's biggest hospital are among the essential workers killed. Electricity grids were also targeted in the Israeli airstrikes, with five of the 10 powerlines running electricity from Israel damaged. Prior to recent attacks, daily power outages were already commonplace. Five hours of power in a day was a good day.

In her address to the United States Congress on 13 May, Palestinian American representative Rashida Tlaib broke down as she quoted Eman from Gaza, who had written two days earlier, and I quote:

Tonight I put the kids to sleep in our bedroom. So that when we die, we die together and no one would live to mourn the loss of another one.

On 15 May, a now orphaned baby boy was pulled alive from the rubble at a refugee camp where seven of his family members had been killed. Ten-year-old Palestinian boy Aziz Al-Kolk, who was found after six hours under rubble, told his uncle when he reached the hospital, 'I know that I'm the only survivor, because I saw my mum and dad bleeding to death.'

Just the other day, I saw a photo of two little boys. They were brothers. Each thought that the other was dead before they found each other in the hospital. The look of relief but more so the indescribable anguish on both of their debris-covered faces was overwhelming enough to reduce anyone to tears. A video surfaced on social media last week showing members of the Israel Defense

Forces blindfolding a boy who could not have been more than 12, perhaps younger, and using him as a human shield as they threw grenades at Palestinian homes—little, innocent lives.

Thank goodness, for now, a ceasefire has been announced, but what does that actually mean? The Sheikh Jarrah expulsion orders are still pending. The Israeli settlement expansion continues. It is concerning that Israeli security forces have launched a wave of arrests since the ceasefire announcement, with the police force calling it Operation Law and Order.

The *New York Times* reported yesterday that more than 1,550 suspects have been arrested in Israel. Around 30 per cent are Jewish Israelis who joined in recent protests. By Monday afternoon, at least 74 Palestinians had been detained on charges ranging from vandalism to online incitement. There are reports that Israeli security forces used stun grenades and rubber bullets against Palestinians outside the Al Aqsa mosque in Jerusalem on Friday, following the ceasefire.

Despite the ceasefire, the Palestinian people continue to live without basic human rights in an open air prison. The sweeping restrictions on movement continue. Even before the latest attacks, the UN estimated that more than 96 per cent of the water supply in Gaza was unfit for human consumption and water pollution was the leading source of child mortality. Even before the latest attacks, Palestinians were only able to access running water every other day.

In 2011, UNICEF published a report detailing the deliberate flushing of toxic chemical industrial waste into Palestinian villages. For years, Palestinians have been living without proper sanitation. On Tuesday, UNICEF released a report warning attacks on water and sanitation facilities were a much greater threat than violence to children in conflict zones. In April, Human Rights Watch summarised the dire situation in its report entitled 'A Threshold Crossed—Israeli Authorities and the Crimes of Apartheid and Persecution', and I quote:

About 6.8 million Jewish Israelis and 6.8 million Palestinians live today between the Mediterranean Sea and Jordan River, an area encompassing Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territory (OPT), the latter made up of the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, and the Gaza Strip. Throughout most of this area, Israel is the sole governing power; in the remainder, it exercises primary authority alongside limited Palestinian self-rule. Across these areas and in most aspects of life, Israeli authorities methodically privilege Jewish Israelis and discriminate against Palestinians. Laws, policies and statements by leading Israeli officials make plain that the objective of maintaining Jewish Israeli control over demographics, political power, and land has long guided government policy. In pursuit of this goal, authorities have dispossessed, confined, forcibly separated, and subjugated Palestinians by virtue of their identity to varying degrees of intensity. In certain areas, as described in this report, these deprivations are so severe that they amount to the crimes against humanity of apartheid and persecution.

While the world watches, human rights abuses continue to go unchecked. The US funds Israel's military to the tune of some \$3.8 billion annually. There are unconfirmed reports that the US State Department approved an export licence for the sale of \$735 million of weapons to Israel last Friday. These are weapons that are and will continue to kill innocent children. So where are the sanctions, such as those imposed on Syria, Russia, Iran and North Korea, and where is the international pressure?

It is really important to note that this is not about religion. This is about equal rights for everyone, regardless of their nationality, religion or race. As the outstanding and inspiring South African anti-apartheid revolutionary political leader and philanthropist, Nelson Mandela, once noted:

We know too well that our freedom is incomplete without the freedom of the Palestinians.

I think it is clear when I watch on that it is the faces and videos of innocent kids that I hear the loudest because their bravery in the face of what can only be described as a living hell is absolutely heartbreaking and overwhelming. I want to quote something and it reads:

I started to think: why are we so different from other children in the world? Why are we detained when we're young and made to suffer, while others are happy playing sports, and with many opportunities that we don't have? Why are they like that and we like this? To this day, no-one can answer me.

These are the words of a 17-year-old boy who featured in a film a couple of years ago about imprisoned Palestinian children. Obaida Akram Jawabra had been imprisoned three times by the time he was 14. He talked in that film about what it is like to be arrested by Israeli forces and what it is like to be bound and gagged and tortured on parts of your body that are not obvious to the naked eye. During the interview, the young man said:

I feel freedom, but it is not complete freedom. We first have to be liberated from the occupation before I can feel that I am truly free. You have personal will, you can do whatever you want. This was something that I missed when I was in prison. But we're not liberated, so how can I be fully happy? Only part of my happiness has been truly fulfilled.

It breaks my heart that on 17 May this year, Obaida was killed. He was shot dead by Israeli forces at the Al-Aroub refugee camp, north of the occupied West Bank. Kids like this deserve better. Everybody deserves better and they deserve to live freely to know the opportunities and the freedoms afforded to children everywhere else in the world. This is not about religion. This is not about anti-Semitism. This is about what is fundamentally right.

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

ASIA MINOR GENOCIDE REMEMBRANCE DAY

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (16:36): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises 19 May as a Day of Remembrance for the genocide by the Ottoman state between 1915-1923 of Armenians, Hellenes, Syrian and other minorities in Asia Minor;
2. Congratulates the International Association of Genocide Scholars and the many other nations that have officially recognised that the Armenians, Hellenes, Syrian and other minorities were subjected to genocide at the hands of the Ottoman Turkish military in Asia Minor;
3. Joins the members of the Armenian-Australian, Pontian Greek-Australian and Syrian-Australian communities in honouring the memory of the innocent men, women and children who fell victim to the first modern genocide;
4. Condemns the genocide of the Armenians, Pontian Greeks, Syrian Orthodox and other Christian minorities, and all other acts of genocide as the ultimate act of racial, religious and cultural intolerance; and
5. Calls on the Turkish Republic to accept responsibility for the genocide of 3.5 million in Asia Minor according to the International Association of Genocide Scholars, more than 353,000 Hellenes of Asia Minor and Pontus, 1.5 million Armenians and 500,000 Syrians, the displacement and suffering of millions more and calls on the Turkish Republic to finally apologise for this act of genocide it perpetrated beginning in 1915.

I rise to speak about and remember the Armenians, Syrians and Pontian Greeks in Asia Minor who were needlessly killed by the Ottoman Empire. Following World War I, the then Ottoman Empire committed acts of violence that can only be categorised as genocide on the Asia Minor population. Although the Turkish government ostensibly denies having committed genocide, there can be no doubt that between 1915 and 1923, on the grounds of ethnic cleansing, millions of innocent people were killed.

Pre 1915, Hellenes, Pontians, Armenians and Syrians made up 20 per cent of the Asia Minor region's population. Post 1923, they made up just 2 per cent of the population. The targeted campaign of genocide on these groups was nothing short of inhumane and devastating. Turkish officials accept that atrocities occurred during this time, but argue that there was no systematic attempt to destroy the non-Turkish people of the Asia Minor.

Several senior Ottoman officials were put to trial in Turkey in the period between 1919 and 1920 in connection with the atrocities. A local governor, Kemal, was found guilty and hanged for the mass killings of Armenians in the central Anatolian district of Yozgat. The young Turks' top triumvirate fled abroad. They were sentenced to death in absentia. Academics and historians have questioned the judicial processes of these trials, the quality of evidence presented and the degree to which Turkish authorities may have wished to appease the victorious allies.

The United Nations Genocide Convention defines genocide as a series of acts committed 'with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group'. Such acts include killing, causing bodily harm, inflicting conditions calculated to bring about physical destruction, imposing measures intended to prevent births and forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

The Turkish government's actions at the time meet this test. Although not formally recognised as a genocide, several countries and world leaders recognise this event as one of the most significant tragedies of modern history. The latest to do so was the President of the United States, Joe Biden.

America joins Argentina, Brazil, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Russia, Uruguay and nine other countries which formally recognise the genocide.

Only when we recognise what has happened in the past can we build upon our understanding and prevent failures in the future. For humanity's sake, I urge everyone in this chamber to join these nations and support the day of remembrance for those killed for being different. For their loss and in their memory, I move this motion. I would also like to acknowledge the representatives of the Pontian SA Brotherhood in the chamber, representatives of the Cyprus community and the Armenian community, and *Neos Kosmos* as well. Thank you for attending today.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:40): I rise to speak in support of the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos's motion recognising 19 May as a day of remembrance for the genocide by the Ottoman state between 1915 and 1923 of Armenians, Hellenes, Syrians and other minorities in Asia Minor. It is also a very important date in the Greek calendar in terms of the Pontian Remembrance Day.

The systematic killing of Christian Ottoman Greek populations during and in the aftermath of World War I has often been referred to as the first modern genocide. Historians have estimated some 353,000 Pontians died between 1914 and 1923. Last Wednesday, 19 May, the Hellenic parliament lit up in remembrance, as it has done since it voted formally in 1994 to recognise the genocide. Greece's President, Katerina Sakellaropoulou, said in a statement:

We honour the memory of the hundreds of thousands of Pontian Greek victims who were exterminated in an inhuman and heinous way a century ago.

At the same time, we acknowledge the heroic lives of the Greeks of Pontus who were saved and contributed the most to the recovery and progress of the motherland, and to the economic development and the richness of our cultural identity.

Today is a vivid and enduring reminder to the entire international community of the great importance of morality, responsibility and forgiveness for the peaceful coexistence of peoples.

Formal recognition of the Greek genocide is gaining momentum, inspired by the recent US recognition of the Armenian genocide. The importance of that formal recognition of genocide was highlighted by resolution of the International Association of Genocide Scholars in 2007, which in part said that the denial of genocide is widely recognised as the final stage of genocide, enshrining impunity for the perpetrators of genocide and demonstrably paving the way for future genocides.

I, along with other members of our communities, both here in South Australia and around the world, look forward to formal recognition by many more nations, so that the sorts of atrocities inflicted not only on Greek people but on our Hellenes, our Armenians, our Syrians and our Cypriots are all recognised and never happen again and, where they continue to happen, in the hope that they cease.

I think it is really important to highlight with this motion my view and my stance, and that is that this is not intended, as some commentators have suggested and as commentary that I have read in social media suggests, to divide us. We are very fortunate to be living harmoniously in Australia today. We are very fortunate to be joined today by a diverse range of members of our communities.

These discussions are not designed to cause division between Greeks and Turks or Cypriots and Turks or Syrians and Armenians and Turks. What they are intended to do, especially in the diaspora, is to recognise the events of the past for what they are so as to help us move forward, and we all know that unless we recognise the events of the past that moving forward becomes a very difficult feat indeed. With those words, I would like to thank the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos again for moving this motion and commend it to the chamber.

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

INTERNATIONAL MIDWIVES AND NURSES DAYS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. S.G. Wade:

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.

(Continued from 12 May 2021.)

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:46): I rise to speak on behalf of SA-Best in support of the Minister for Health's motion recognising the good work of our nurses and midwives. Earlier this month, the world came together to celebrate International Day of the Midwife, followed closely by International Nurses Day. I, for one, like many in this place, appreciate what our nurses and midwives do for us each and every day.

As I have said before in this place, it takes a special sort of person—indeed, a special sort of person with unconditional empathy for people from all walks of life—to work in these roles. It takes a special sort of person to be present at the start of life, and it certainly takes a special person to be present at the end of a life when a person closes their eyes for the very last time, and to do so day in and day out. Nurses and midwives do not just attend to the physical care of a patient. As we know, their roles are all encompassing, and I am just not sure how they manage to do what they do, but I am forever grateful.

Last year, the World Health Organization designated 2020 as the International Year of the Nurse and the Midwife and, in recognition of the dedication of nurses, midwives and other healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic, 2021 has been designated by WHO as the International Year of Health and Care Workers.

The spotlight is shining brightly on healthcare workers, and it has been, as we all know, a particularly challenging year. Worldwide, over 2,700 nurses are reported to have died from COVID-19 related illnesses, and these are just the reported deaths. As at the end of 2020, more than 1.6 million healthcare workers had been infected with COVID-19 in the 34 countries that recorded data.

There are reports of widespread stress and burnout in the nursing profession, labelled by the International Council of Nurses as the mass traumatisation of the global nursing workforce. It has been suggested the effects of the pandemic may have a lasting impact on the nursing profession for future generations. I do not think we need to think too far outside the box to know that that is more than just a mere suggestion.

While we have been asked to adapt to a new normal, with increased reliance on PPE and physical distancing, healthcare workers have been asked to carry most of the load. They have put themselves at great risk to ensure adequate health care is provided to those who need it. The COVID-19 pandemic has certainly brought the issue of mental health to the forefront of everyone's minds, and now more than ever we must ensure the mental health and wellbeing of our healthcare professionals is supported.

This year's International Nurses Day theme was a vision for future health care. We know what it should look like: fit for purpose hospitals; properly funded services; workplaces free of bullying, harassment and racism; reduced workload pressures; secure working conditions; proper pathways for specialisation and continuing education and training; and the promotion of the wellbeing of all healthcare workers.

The \$700 million earmarked—I am going to move on from that. I will move on from that because I do not want to politicise this contribution. I do not think this is the time or the place. There are currently 33,000 nurses and midwives across the public and private sectors in South Australia. With our ageing population and predicted shortfall in the nursing workforce, that sector needs to look as attractive as possible to meet future demands.

Nothing could be further from the truth at the moment. When we look at social media, when we open the papers, we know that our nurses are under probably the highest levels of stress, especially given COVID, that they have ever been under and it is incumbent on all of us to do our bit to ensure their safety and to ensure that we are meeting all those goals that I have just alluded to.

Overcrowded hospitals and emergency departments, long wait lists, workload pressures and insecure working conditions are not attractive to anybody and we need to be doing everything we can, all of us need to be doing everything we can, to make sure that we are providing them with the safe workplace that they deserve and to do so for all the reasons that I have outlined.

As I said, it takes a special sort of person to be present at the start of life, it takes a special sort of person to see us at our worst in life and it takes a special sort of person to see us when we finally close our eyes for the very last time. These are the individuals who undertake that role and do so every day of the week for our benefit. With those words, I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (16:51): I rise today to support the motion by the Hon. Stephen Wade. Nurses and midwives hold an exceptional role in our state to the public and within each of our personal lives. They help us through some of the best times and some of the worst times. Unfortunately, the past year and a half has been some of the worst times for nurses. Nurses and midwives have been at the coalface of the COVID-19 pandemic, putting their lives at risk to save others.

This year, the World Health Assembly has made 2021 the Year of Health and Care Workers in recognition of the dedication and sacrifice of the millions of healthcare workers at the forefront of the COVID-19 pandemic. While nurses are getting high praise from us, they face great challenges with their working conditions. At a time when frontline clinicians were bravely continuing to show up for work, the Marshall and Morrison governments failed to step up and support our health heroes. Sadly, during the pandemic our nurses were left without adequate support, leaving many without work, despite putting their hand up to work and become part of the COVID-19 response.

It is maddening to see the government present a motion like this to this council when nurses and midwives were not offered comprehensive paid pandemic leave or guaranteed job security, if they were casual workers, during the pandemic. There was no added support given to those who worked either. The government failed to provide impactful cost-of-living relief to nurses and midwives during this difficult time, such as a waiver on annual licensing fees or on universal free hospital parking schemes.

Violence against frontline workers has been highlighted recently and several severe cases were of particular note during the pandemic. Nurses and midwives face serious risk to their own health and safety, with significant threats of violence within their workplace. No matter the workplace, no-one should feel unsafe and vulnerable at work. Events of violence have been escalating and even with particularly horrendous incidents against our frontline workers over the beginning of the pandemic period, the government has remained inactive.

The opposition has been consistently calling on the government to bring in protection for our nurses with additional security measures. Unfortunately, very little has been done by the government over these two years, but we will continue to advocate. The pandemic has not only grown our immense appreciation for the work nurses and midwives do but has highlighted how important our public healthcare system is. Having a strong public healthcare system makes for great outcomes for both patients and hospital staff.

Nurses and midwives are providing the best care they possibly can for patients in a system that is stretched to breaking point. We have a duty to ensure that these workers keep the state safe and healthy. Thank you to all those nurses for the remarkable work they do. Happy International Nurses Day and International Day of the Midwife.

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

MILISITS, MR VILMOS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. F. Pangallo:

That this house—

1. Acknowledges the passing of Vilmos Milisits OAM;
2. Acknowledges his outstanding contribution to South Australia and Australian businesses;
3. Acknowledges the international success of his bakery business, Vili's;

4. Recognises his generosity and support for many individuals, charities, clubs and businesses; and
5. Conveys its sincerest condolences to his wife, Rosemary, their children and their extended families.

(Continued from 5 May 2021.)

The Hon. J.S. LEE (16:56): I rise today to wholeheartedly support the motion moved by the Hon. Frank Pangallo to acknowledge the sad passing of a remarkable South Australian, Vilmos Milisits OAM. I join the mover, the Premier in the other place, the Hon. Stephen Wade and other honourable members to pay tribute and respect to Vili and to convey my heartfelt condolences to his beloved wife, Rosemary; their children, Alison and Simon; their grandchildren, Luke and Josh; Helen Rice; and the extended family during this sad time.

It was a great honour to join His Excellency the Governor, Premier Marshall, many dignitaries, family members, business members and community leaders at a moving state memorial service to honour the legacy of Vili Milisits on Friday 30 April 2021 at the Adelaide Festival Theatre, a venue which he would have approved of.

I did a quick Google search on the name Vili Milisits OAM and some 53,000 results came up on the screen. It goes to show that Vili was well known and much respected, and not only because he was a successful business leader. He was much more than that. Vili was well loved because of who he was and what he stood for. Vili's belief that success comes from hard work, commitment and care has been quoted many times. He represented all the above and lived his life to the fullest. His legacy will continue to inspire us forever.

He was a proud Australian and a role model for many refugee and migrant communities. He called himself Hungarian by birth but Australian by choice. I am sure we all agree with Graham Cornes, who was MC at Vili's memorial service at the Adelaide Festival Centre, when he said, 'Vili had a special touch of magic and he was a man with boundless generosity.'

I have had the pleasure of knowing Vili and Rosemary for a long time. I remember meeting him at a business seminar organised by the former Department of Industry and Trade when Vili was a keynote speaker, sharing his success story with the business community about his bakery business and his export strategies promoting South Australian products to the world. Vili's products can be found in many different stores throughout Australia, from the local deli to the major supermarkets, and Vili is not just a household name in Australia because Vili's bakery has expanded beyond Australia and has been supplying quality bakery products worldwide to 24 countries in Asia, Europe and the Pacific.

Vili's story of success, from humble beginnings to an iconic South Australian business, is one that moves many hearts. With hard work, commitment and passion, Vili and Rosemary, life and business partners, established a business that was to eventually become one of south Australia's greatest success stories. Deeply grateful for the opportunities given to them in Australia and aware of their community needs, Vili and Rosemary recognised the importance of giving back to the community that supported them on their journey. They have actively contributed to the development of their industry and to the prosperity of the working community.

Until the time when he became seriously ill, Vili was working five to seven days a week alongside his staff, showing the same passion and care for his products that he did almost 50 years ago when he first began. He was passionate about his business and, more importantly, he was passionate about people. He worked in the bakery and served food at the cafe during lunch and enjoyed chatting with his customers.

I want to provide a time line about Vili for the public record. In 1948, Vilmos Milisits was born in Hungary. In 1956, the Milisits family moved to Australia as refugees, escaping political unrest in Hungary. Vili left school at the age of 14 to work at a cake shop in Burnside, before starting his own venture on Manchester Street in Mile End, where the original Cafe de Vili's now is. In 1967, Rosemary and Vili Milisits were engaged. They met whilst Rosemary was working as a nurse. Rosemary joined Vili soon after at their first continental cake shop in Adelaide. In 1978, Vili's continental bakery was established.

In 1995, former Premier of South Australia the Hon. Dean Brown and Wolf Blass launched halal products for export. The building itself was reopened by former Premier the Hon. Dean Brown.

During the time of the Grand Prix that same year, Vili was working alongside the government in conjunction with the Australia Malaysia Business Council, which promoted a trade delegation to Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. I remember that time very well because I also worked at the Grand Prix that weekend. It was evidence that Vili was a strong marketer. He recognised there was a potential market overseas and he seized every opportunity to promote South Australian products.

In 1997, Norwood won the SANFL premiership. From his early days, Vili was a great supporter of the Norwood Football Club. As a young 12 year old, he became a Norwood supporter. He picked up cans and bottles at the oval for pocket money. Later on, he became a major sponsor. The SANFL premiership for Norwood was something that he recorded as one of the highlights of his life. In 1998, Vili was involved in the Variety Bash. He supplied the biggest cake to the variety club in celebration of the 20th anniversary.

Vili cited 2000 as a very memorable time in his life because he met Muhammad Ali. During the Sydney 2000 Olympics, Vili met Muhammad Ali during an Adelaide visit. Rosemary and Vili said they were gifted a boxing glove from Ali's match in Manila. That was something they treasured. Vili's cafe in Mile End displays many memorabilia items collected over the business's lifetime, and one of those is that famous boxing glove.

Vili judged many food and fibre awards. He also appeared in *Who* magazine for an article the 'Upper Crust'. His contribution to SA business development and the food industry is a formidable force that we will and should always recognise. He has been flying the flag for South Australian products, and the famous 'Couldn't you go a Vili's' posters were a fantastic marketing slogan. He won many Premier's food awards, and he and Rosemary have been recognised as proud Australians, and were both awarded in 2005 an OAM for their contribution to business development and the community.

He loved being a talking head, so he appeared on radio supporting community radio station Radio Adelaide, promoting the English language as well as other languages, with 'Australia Here We Come!', which was a special radio program promoting refugees and migrants as part of Refugee Week. In 2006 he appeared in *SA Life* magazine, which was a very proud moment where he featured. In 2008 he was the winner of the inaugural Governor's Multicultural Awards for the private category.

Vili never forgot the second chance he was offered in Australia as a Hungarian refugee, and he paid it forward throughout his life. Vili and Rosemary employed 360 staff with HR policies that support youth and mature age employment. Disadvantaged people made up 10 per cent of their workforce. They have employed people from multicultural and disadvantaged backgrounds, new arrivals to this country, young offenders and Indigenous people, which they were most proud of.

Some of you may know that in 2010 local artist Dale Chen painted an Archibald Prize painting, and Vili was part of the Archibald Prize and was very proud of that moment. There are significant time lines that I mentioned today that were captured at the state memorial service to remember a giant, a legend with a big heart. One of the songs that was played in the afternoon memorial service was *I am Australian*. I recall one of Vili's best mates Michael Pratt (Pratty) sitting in the row just behind me, and he said, 'Jing, can you please make sure you sing the song because Vili will be singing with you.'

Vili and Rosemary have sponsored many of my multicultural events, where we invited hundreds of people to enjoy Vili's pies and pasties, while sharing the Australian culture with migrants, and we would always sing the song *I am Australian*. I know that is true because Vili and Rosemary have generously supported the community, which has acknowledged his great work and will remember him. I still remember that Vili was always laughing and singing:

We are one, but we are many
And from all the lands on earth we come
We'll share a dream and sing with one voice
I am, you are, we are Australian.

Vale, Vili, you were one of a kind. We will miss you dearly. Your loving memories and legacies will live in our hearts and minds forever. Thank you, the Hon. Frank Pangallo, for moving this motion so

that we all have the opportunity to pay tribute to Vili for his enormous contribution to the community, to South Australia, and to the business sector. I wholeheartedly commend the motion.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (17:09): I rise to support this motion recognising Mr Vilmos Militsis AO. First, I acknowledge Vili's family and send my sympathies on their loss of a much-loved husband, father and grandfather. Members and others have spoken of the passing of an icon, a great South Australian businessman, an entrepreneur and creator of a local and global company operating in over 20 countries. Vili contributed much to our state's business sector and productivity. For these things he will be celebrated and missed.

Like Vili, I came from a warring homeland: for him, Hungary in 1956; for me, Vietnam in the eighties. Like me, I expect this taught Vili how fleeting life is, driving a desire to grasp opportunities and waste no time. As I was once also a new migrant to Australia, I know that coming to this country can be very, very tough. It would have been especially harsh in the fifties with rampant racism and high unemployment. Social security was limited and, if you did qualify for benefits, there was a long wait of up to a year.

Migrants might have worked two or even three low-paying, hard, physical jobs, maybe labouring on worksites, in factories or on farms. They worked to survive and provide for their family here and to send money back home. I expect that in the Australia of the fifties they were also shunned by locals for taking their jobs, as were later migrants from Asia, like me.

Days were tough and lonely at times, but migrants did not pack their bags and go home. They made their own path and many, like Vili, seized their chances. I think the local migrant culture and daily challenges likely encouraged Vili in his actions to leave school early and start his apprenticeship. Vili then took that opportunity and, through his hard labour, created an empire. He worked tirelessly for hours to make the most of his chances and build something for his family and its next generations. This is a story common to many first-generation pioneers in Australia's migrant communities.

Also common within our different migrant communities is a strong desire to contribute to Australian society. We work to give back to our new home, compelled to repay the faith shown in us by our new community. Through their business, Vili and his wife, life and business partner, Rosemary, had capacity to give to the community and they did, generously. Their philanthropy has been well canvassed by other members. It included giving to charities, sponsoring sporting clubs and mentoring students. Pioneers like Vili work hard to create something in their new home. In building something for themselves and their family, they add another layer to our dynamic, intercultural community. They work hard for themselves and, through their hard work, create opportunities for others.

The Hon. Frank Pangallo MLC told the chamber about how Vili and Rosemary helped people from many cultures to find work as they struggled to find their feet in South Australia. They provided jobs and support for political refugees, including Vietnamese boat people when they first arrived in Australia in the late seventies. If it were not for that compassion and help in the early days, the Vietnamese community may not have had the foundation to grow and thrive in South Australia.

It is indisputable that Vili was a successful businessperson, but for me what stands out most strongly from his legacy is how he welcomed and supported people different from him but who faced the same challenges he once did. It is his contribution to building the inclusiveness and interculturalism of our state that I most admire and celebrate. Moreover, through Vili and his wife, Rosemary, supporting people from other cultures and giving them opportunities to establish themselves in South Australia they have helped build migrant communities and added to the dynamic multicultural state we enjoy. For this, Vili, thank you. Vale, Vili Milisits OA.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:15): I think I could go a Vili's right now actually. I would like to thank the members who made heartfelt contributions recognising the enormous contributions Vili Milisits made to South Australia: the Hon. Stephen Wade, the Hon. Jing Lee and of course the Hon. Tung Ngo. I would like to acknowledge members of the Milisits family and friends who are watching us on the live stream: wife, Rosemary; son, Simon; daughter, Alison; and also Pauline Clune, Vili's carer. I am sure they have greatly appreciated these words today. He was a state treasure and I am sure his memory and his outstanding achievements will be long lived.

I spoke about the unfortunate setbacks and delays that Vili received for his life-saving lung transplant surgery because of flawed medical reports about Vili's mental state and his intellectual capacity and what Vili and his own family perceive to be age discrimination in our health system. My speech attracted much attention and there is something that I found very informative and valuable that I would like to share with the chamber today. There is one particular email that I would like to acknowledge that has now raised an issue very pertinent to Vili's case that has been overlooked by our health system and that I intend to raise with the AMA and other medical bodies as a matter of urgency.

Based on her elderly mother's shocking experience with SACAT, Ms Evie Arharidis revealed the inherent problems existing with neuropsychology capacity testing. She points out that these tests, like those Vili undertook, are more directed at educated people from Anglo-Saxon backgrounds and have been developed within the matrix of the Western English-speaking world, rather than those from ethnic cultures with limited education, as many of the postwar migrants from Europe were or those from Asia and Africa. There are no tests specific to them.

Vili was a migrant, of course, with little or no English or proper education by the time he landed here as a child and when he left school aged 14. Ms Arharidis wrote:

It seems the ethnics, in our case European Australians, are getting the raw end of the deal and there is a lack of services that assist people of non-English speaking backgrounds in such convoluted complex matters when it comes to SACAT and the capacity tests that they are forced to undergo are set up and designed for educated Anglo-Saxons before the system will fail them. This puts them at risk of losing their voice and their assets to the government. In Mr Milisits' case, it denied him the chance of having surgery much sooner, which sadly cost him his life it seems.

There is credible scientific basis to what Ms Arharidis is saying. She informed me of the important and world groundbreaking work Melbourne University Alzheimer researcher and neuropsychologist, Dr Mathew Staios, is doing in Victoria and the United States. Dr Staios has found that the tests now being used are inappropriate tools to gauge cognitive impairment in elderly individuals from ethnic backgrounds with low English skills and minimal or no education. More importantly, they are three times more likely to result in misdiagnosis.

Dr Staios is now developing a whole series of tests based on assessments he sourced from Greece, using Greek migrants living in Melbourne, which has more than 250,000 people of Hellenic origin. His research and subsequent results will hopefully lead to a total revision of these cognitive tests and make them a lot fairer for those from different cultural backgrounds. Let's not forget that agencies like the Public Trustee and the Guardianship Board rely on these assessments in determining the legal and mental capacity of individuals.

I will restate that had Vili been given a transplant by the Alfred or another hospital nine months or so earlier when he had been considered an excellent candidate for transplantation, he might still be with us today. In his preposterous diagnosis of Vili, Adelaide neuropsychologist Dr Andrew Rothwell surmised that Vili had an IQ of 84 and was six times more likely to have dementia. His report was later discredited by two other neuropsychologists, which, sadly, came too late.

This is also no reflection on St Vincent's Hospital in Sydney, which came into the picture very late in Vili's desperate battle with deteriorating lung conditions. They were exceptional in their care. South Australia's Agent General in the UK, Bill Muirhead, sent me an email, which I shall read part of:

Thank you for shining a bright light on this incomprehensible and sad episode. I'm sure it exacerbated Vili's already serious medical condition during his remaining months.

You have done a great service in telling this shocking story. Vili would be happy that you have hopefully helped stop something similar happening to others.

What is disappointing is that this experience highlights inadequate resourcing in South Australia's health system when it comes to major transplant surgery. Unlike Perth, Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane, Adelaide does not have the capacity or the facility at any of our hospitals, including the Women's and Children's Hospital, to carry out heart or lung transplants. Instead, South Australian patients must be placed on waiting lists compiled by interstate providers. Why can we not have a

specialised major transplant unit like St Vincent's or Alfred or the Mater right here in Adelaide? I think we know the answer—probably, it is cost.

At a time when it looks like the government may soon need to allocate resources into voluntary assisted dying, I sincerely hope that one of these days our health minister takes the courageous and groundbreaking step to spend money and show more support for initiatives that will also save and prolong lives, like making defibrillators and CCTV in aged-care facilities mandatory in South Australia. With that, I commend the motion to the chamber and again I thank all the members for their wonderful contributions.

Motion carried.

Bills

GENDER EQUALITY BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 May 2021.)

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:23): As I said when I last spoke on this bill, it 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.

As I have said, 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.

The South Australian Equal Opportunity Act has effectively promoted equality of opportunity for all South Australians and given us remedies where this has been denied or people have been unfairly discriminated against on the basis of age, gender, disability or other characteristics, such as being pregnant. The act was designed to address discrimination and while it has made an important contribution to gender equality, it was not designed to plan for, promote, foster or enable gender equality.

This bill sits alongside the Equal Opportunity Act, but unlike that legislation this bill is adaptive, it is agile and it is aspirational rather than preventative and reactive; that is, it is not a remedy to right wrongs or address instances of discrimination based on gender. Rather, it is a forward-looking, future-building strategy with the tools and processes to have a real and incremental impact on gender equality in the public sector. It provides the framework and structure to progress gender equality in a tailored and meaningful way in the public sector, rather than as a prescriptive, punitive or one-size-fits-all approach.

The gender equality commission this bill creates will have an empowering brief to work with the public sector bodies and entities to foster and enhance gender equality in the most effective and appropriate way for that workplace, according to the context in which it is being implemented. The bill is designed to address gender equality, because like racial equality it is unfinished business in Australia.

'What is the problem?' I hear some of our commentators ask. I am sure there are still people, some people, even in this place perhaps, who will say this bill is not needed, just as some members claimed that women's suffrage was not necessary, that women should not be served in front bars, be admitted to universities, continue to work after marriage, be permitted to fly planes, serve in combat roles in the defence forces or be assured of protection from sexual harassment in the workplace. Some people are probably still welded to a stereotypical view of a world divided between

home and child-caring women and men as breadwinners. Thankfully, most of those stereotypes are gone and we now recognise parental leave as relevant for both parents.

However, some will claim gender equality disadvantages men. To claim this is to fundamentally misunderstand the intent of this bill. This bill is about gender equality for all. Some will believe, or at least perceive, that the Equal Opportunity Act already deals with gender equality and that the level playing field has been, or is being, levelled, or they will frame the problem as insurmountable, asking how you can recruit if the pool you are recruiting from is too shallow.

The simple counter to this argument is that this bill aims to make the pool bigger and accessible to everybody, so all those with merit can jump right in. No-one is being given a leg up; they are just not being held down by one leg. There is a real problem, which Virginia Haussegger AM recently eloquently defined:

Gender equality progress in Australia is in trouble. Despite Australia's leadership in developing some of the best anti-discrimination legislative frameworks in the world, the current climate of bias and backlash is proving immune to regulatory control. Australian women and girls are failing to flourish as well as they should, particularly given our decade long world number one ranking in female education.

Over the past 14 years, Australia has fallen from a rank of 15th to 44th on the World Economic Forum's Global Gender Gap Index. We know from Peter Drucker, the father of modern management theory, that what is measured improves, and in large part this bill is about setting targets, planning and strategising, and measuring outcomes to make sure it does happen.

While we have made some gains, occupational gender segregation has remained persistent over the past 20 years. Avivah Wittenberg-Cox, a noted gender consultant, calls it 'gender asbestos':

There is massive corporate mis-adaptation to today's talent realities and the subsequent inability to retain and develop women as well as men. I call this 'gender asbestos'. It's hidden in the walls, cultures and mindsets of many organisations. But ridding the structure of these cultural toxins will require more than pointing accusingly at the mess. It requires a detailed plan for how to move forward and a compelling, attractive portrait of the result.

The undeniable fact is women still earn an average of 14 per cent less than men, and although the private sector is beyond the scope of this bill, I would like to point out the number of women running top ASX-listed companies has actually gone backwards in recent years.

In Australia, despite women being the majority of law graduates they are still significantly under-represented at the most senior levels of law firms and the judiciary. Females make up less than a third (31.8 per cent) of Supreme Court and similar level judges across Australia. However, in an encouraging development women are close to achieving gender parity in local and magistrates courts, making up 46.7 per cent of magistrates. This is quite a turnaround. It took until 1965 for Australia's first female judge, Dame Roma Mitchell, to be appointed to the Supreme Court of South Australia and until 1974 for its first female magistrate: Margaret Sleeman in New South Wales.

Women make up almost a third of the Federal Court judges—19 out of 58—a rise of 15 per cent since 2011, but there is still a long way to go. Chief Justice Murrell recently said it was important for all courts to strive for equality:

Not just gender equality but all groups within the community, or a reasonable representation of all groups within the community. It inspires community confidence in a court if the bench is seen as representative of the community.

Her comments come after national data recently revealed female barristers received 27 per cent of briefs in 2018-19 and just 20 per cent of court fees paid to barristers. Law Council of Australia President Pauline Wright said it was encouraging to see the number of female judges and magistrates increasing, although more work needed to be done. She said:

Promoting diversity in the judiciary is not some esoteric ideal—a judiciary that properly reflects the community it serves enhances public confidence in the administration of justice, including respect for the rule of law.

This bill is to ensure public sector professions that currently show a real gender imbalance towards women, such as teaching, take steps to attract and retain men and non-binary genders in these roles so students learn from all genders and importantly see all occupations and careers as open and available to them.

I remember former Victorian police commissioner Christine Nixon addressing a group of women lawyers about how she fostered gender equality in the Victorian police force. When she asked the rank and file why there were not more women in the force she expected a range of answers but not the one she received. Her officers told her it was 'the wall' that kept women out.

The commissioner thought that must have been police speak for the glass ceiling until she found out that the actual real physical wall that recruits had to scale to pass the fitness test to gain entry to the police force was physically impossible for most average height women to successfully climb over.

The commissioner's response was delightfully simple and effective. She ordered the force to get rid of the wall literally, and the gender balance of the Victorian police force rapidly changed. It is interesting that until she asked the question and actually did something about it the wall had been accepted as the literal and figurative barrier to joining the Victorian police force.

Ruth Bader Ginsburg in an interview in 2015 identified this kind of unconscious accepted bias as an insidious and persistent issue. She said her best example was the symphony orchestra and recounted this delightful and powerful story:

When I was growing up, one never saw a woman in the symphony orchestra, except perhaps playing the harp. People who should have known better like The New York Times critic, Howard Taubman said, 'You could put a blindfold on him and he could tell you whether it's a woman playing the piano or a man.'

Someone had the simple idea, 'Let's drop a curtain. Let's drop a curtain between the people who are auditioning and the people who are judging.' And almost overnight, there was a sea change. Once the curtain was dropped, the testers couldn't tell whether it was a man—or a woman. And they made their judgments based on the quality of the performance.

Some years ago, when I was telling this story, a young violinist told me, 'You left out something.' 'Well, what? What did I leave out?' 'You left out that we auditioned shoeless, so they won't hear a woman's heels behind the curtain.' That device of the dropped curtain isn't so easy to duplicate in other areas.

This bill is about taking down those barriers to gender equality. It is also about setting targets so that, for example, the \$1.2 billion in federal funding recently allocated to apprenticeship training does not only go to the traditionally 75 per cent male trade trainees in public sector agencies, but the trades are treated as ungendered and that the government recruits according to the targets that they have set themselves.

I look forward to the day, which will come, we all know it will come, when women see careers in mining, government and politics as ungendered, because sadly the evidence from current gender equality statistics is that it is largely women, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, questioning, asexual and other gender groups who bear the brunt of gender inequality. If you remain unconvinced, you need do no more than look around this place where we sit today.

The South Australian parliament has the worst female representation in the country and will not reach gender parity until 2050, if we keep going at the current rate. Just 29 per cent of our MPs are women and the number has decreased since 2006. I am sure Muriel Matters and Mary Lee would be horrified to learn that we have gone from first to last in Australia in regard to women's representation and that we are actually going backwards.

Sadly, there are many examples across a broad range of contexts that I will not go into detail about today. The COVID-19 health emergency has only exacerbated an already disparaging gender equality outlook and has had a negative impact on any traction that we had pre-COVID-19. Early statistical data shows us that women have borne a disproportionate burden during this national health emergency and will continue to do so.

Again, the focus of my bill is crystal clear. It is to pursue gender equality because gender equality benefits all genders. It contributes generational change for our collective greater social and economic good. The bill is based on the following objects and principles: that all South Australians should live in a safe and equal society, have access to equal power, resources and opportunities and be treated with dignity, respect and fairness. Gender equality benefits all South Australians regardless of gender. Gender equality is a human right and precondition to social justice. Gender equality brings significant economic, social and health benefits for South Australia. Gender equality is a precondition for the prevention of family violence and other forms of violence.

Advancing gender equality is a shared responsibility across the South Australian community. All human beings, regardless of gender should be free to develop their personal abilities, pursue their professional careers and make choices about their lives without being limited by gender stereotypes, gender roles or prejudices. Gender equality may be compounded by other forms of disadvantage or discrimination that a person may experience on the basis of age, disability, ethnicity, gender identity, race, religion, sexual orientation and other attributes. Women have historically experienced discrimination and disadvantage on the basis of sex and gender.

The bill has two main elements to achieve the objectives that I have just referred to. Firstly, it provides for the appointment of a public sector gender equality commissioner to oversee and ensure implementation of the bill. The commissioner will oversee compliance and enforcement. A notable feature of the bill is the commissioner will be able to deal with disputes arising under an enterprise agreement or a workplace determination dealt with under the Fair Work Act, where the dispute relates to a systematic gender equality issue and the dispute is referred to the commissioner in accordance with a term of the enterprise agreement or workplace determination by a person covered by the enterprise agreement or workplace determination.

Secondly, the bill gives relevant entities very clear obligations to set and meet gender equality targets. A relevant entity is defined as a public sector agency within the meaning of the Public Sector Act, the South Australian Courts Administration Authority, local councils and entities prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of further paragraphs.

The bill requires that each time a relevant entity develops or reviews a policy, program or service that has a direct and significant impact on the public, it will assess the relevant venture against criteria that inspire equality. Relevant entities will also be required to conduct a workplace gender audit by 2021 and then once every four years thereafter. Following the audit, the bill requires that a gender equality action plan be submitted to the commissioner on or before 31 October 2021 and once every four years thereafter.

Every relevant entity will also be required to publish the action plan on its website. The plan must consist of the results of the audit and strategies and measures for promoting gender equality, based on the results of the entity's audit. Every second year after the relevant entity has submitted its action plan, it must submit a progress report to the commissioner. The Governor will be able to make regulations so that a relevant entity can tailor the provisions to best suit them. The bill gives considerable flexibility and freedom of design to avoid it becoming an erroneous or irrelevant obligation or administrative burden.

Targets and quotas are set by regulation and will be tailored to an industry or sector. Organisations will be required to make reasonable progress against them. Targets and quotas are needed because they do work. To be clear, there are a lot of things the bill does not seek to do. It is not an affirmative action initiative. It does not arbitrarily set targets or even provide the parameters for this because it is intended to be highly customised to the gender equality challenges that the agency faces. These will vary greatly, and the bill is responsive to this. It does not dispense with merit, skills, abilities and attributes as prerequisites to employment.

Promoting diversity goes hand in glove with promoting merit-based appointments because it ensures decision-makers are presented with the widest range of suitable and talented candidates for consideration. As Avivah Wittenberg-Cox said, stop asking, 'What's wrong with women that they're not making it to the top?' and start asking, 'What's wrong with workplaces if they can't retain and promote the majority of educated Australians?'

Gender equality is not just about women; it is about all genders having equality of access, opportunity and advancement. This bill is aimed at empowering the public sector agencies identified to build on the struggle of those who have come before us and to create a better world for those who come after us.

I, like many others in this place, want to see all genders as equal participants in all aspects of economic, social and political life, able to make their own choices and decisions in regard to their work and family lives. This bill is intended to ensure we are not judged by our chromosomes and can live our lives without discrimination, without harassment, without bullying and without violence. I believe that we can create a more equal and just Australia and that putting gender equality front and

centre is key to this. With those words, I commend the bill to the Legislative Council. I look forward to what I am sure will prove to be a lively debate during the committee stage.

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

Motions

WALKER, MR M.

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. F. Pangallo:

That this council—

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

(Continued from 17 March 2021.)

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (17:43): Murray loved Adelaide, and in return we loved Murray. It has now been 36 years since he uttered those famous words, 'The Australian Grand Prix is go,' and from that point onwards the love affair could not be denied. One of the main objectives in bringing Formula One to Adelaide was to increase Adelaide's profile in the world. With the arrival of Murray, that box was ticked from day one.

Murray spoke volumes for Adelaide. He had nothing but praise for the facilities and organisation of our great event. He made sure that South Australians were aware and appreciative of how good we could be and what great things we had to offer the world. For 11 amazing years, our city streets became familiar to billions of people, and at the helm was a man with an electrifying voice, spruiking how brilliant our city and our state were.

While the Adelaide races were notable, particularly in 1986 with a blown tire from Nigel Mansell or in 1994 with a controversial collision between Damon Hill and Michael Schumacher, it did not really matter what happened on track. We could always count on Murray to make the race exciting, for Murray had a talent that we are likely to never see again.

In noting that his background came from motorcycle racing involving his champion father Graham, he was essentially the voice of the enthusiast. In this day and age, commentators seem to always come from those who have partaken in a particular sport—just listen to Triple M. While he did race bikes in his past life, Murray came from a different era, where his knowledge, prowess and likeable personality more than made up for the fact that he had never actually raced in Formula One. In total, he covered more than 350 Formula One grand prix and delivered his last live commentary of the grand prix in 2007, which was for BBC radio when he was 83.

Murray led an interesting life. By the time he took up commentary on a full-time basis, he had enjoyed a successful career in marketing, which he retired from at age 59. In this period, he had held significant accounts for multinationals such as British Rail, Vauxhall and Mars. Never one to take the spoils from others, he denies conceiving the slogan, 'A Mars a day helps you work, rest and play'—sorry to do an advertisement—saying he was only an administrator on this project. Prior to this, his war service saw him command a Sherman tank and participate in the Battle of the Reichswald. He left the Army having attained the rank of captain.

Even though the race moved to Melbourne, Adelaide's love affair for Murray never waned. Continual references to our excellent street circuit in his commentary, even while in Melbourne, eventually made way for his return visits as part of the Adelaide 500. Taking nothing away from the great drivers of the V8 series, on a number of occasions Murray was actually the true star of the track.

Many of us were so happy to have our old friend back and keen to hear what he thought of our touring car event and, well, he did not disappoint. He referred to the Adelaide 500 as the best touring car race in the world. Coming from someone who had once travelled every corner of the

globe, his endorsement was really something special and, in some ways, helped take away part of the pain we felt from the loss of the grand prix.

Just as we have immortalised the memory of the great Barry Sheene through the naming of the pit straight, let's hope that when the race returns we can go that extra step and commemorate something special to the wonderful life of Murray Walker. Bartels Road, representing the longest section of the track, I think would be a logical choice. Hopefully, it is not too long before we see cars fly down Walker Straight as our way of saying thanks to this great man.

While I mention the love we had for Murray, my thoughts are with his true love, Elizabeth, whom he married in 1959, and the special role she played in his life. On behalf of a very grateful South Australia, I thank you both.

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

GENDERED VIOLENCE PREVENTION

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. C. Bonaros:

That this council—

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

(Continued from 17 March 2021.)

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:47): I rise to briefly speak in support of this motion. I have spoken on a few similar motions and also moved ones myself in this place in recent times, and of course I have introduced a bill to impose a positive duty on employers to prevent sexual harassment and discrimination. The Greens always have and always will condemn all forms of gendered violence, discrimination and harassment, and we stand by the calls of this motion for an end to gendered violence in all workplaces, especially this one.

I want to take this moment to commend all those who marched in the March 4 Justice rally in March this year, who stood against sexual harassment and assault, and who stood together regardless of political affiliation or walk of life. They stood against that harassment not just in politics but in all areas of our lives. I am, and so many others are too, absolutely sick and tired of having to have this fight. How many more will be hurt and have that hurt publicly picked apart before we change?

Our collective anger runs deep—not just present in our lives now but back through generations, through the halls of this place and through other unsafe workplaces, back through our homes and our community spaces. We are done being silent on this issue. We are sick of it getting swept under the rug. We have had report after report outlining in excruciating detail the harassment and abuse that women are being subjected to, and the lack of meaningful action continues to stoke our collective rage.

So, in particular, I wish to highlight paragraph 5 of this motion, calling for a review of the way that sexual harassment crimes are reported, investigated and prosecuted in our nation. This is of utmost importance. We know that so many sexual assaults are never reported, and fewer still even prosecuted. We have heard time and again how hard it is to get justice following a sexual assault. It is well past time we fixed our laws to ensure justice and compassion for survivors.

I note as well the call for the implementation of all the recommendations, both from the Equal Opportunity Commission's Review of Harassment in the South Australian Parliament Workplace and from the Australian Human Rights Commission's Respect@Work report of the National Inquiry into Sexual Harassment in Australian Workplaces. I think we have had a few such calls already in this place and certainly in other parliaments.

However, given the delays in even getting together a meeting of the committee that we have entrusted in this workplace with implementing those recommendations and reporting on our workplace, it seems clear to me that those commitments are not necessarily ones that will be heeded without reminders, such as, yet again, this motion.

It is time for all in this parliament and for the Marshall government to get on with it. I note that there are several of us in this council who will keep reminding all leaders of all parties in this parliament of their obligations, of their promises and of their duty to ensure that we have eradicated gendered violence in our community and in our workplaces.

The Greens will keep reminding them and committing this parliament to ending harassment and discrimination in this and every workplace, because these issues are not going away until we take serious action. And, by the way, the Greens are not going away any time soon, so we will be here to remind you until we get this job done.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (17:51): I rise today in support of the motion. I begin by thanking the Hon. Connie Bonaros for bringing the motion to this place and for her continued advocacy on gender equality, as well as her courage for speaking out on the issue of harassment within the workplace. The growing women's movement and the Enough is Enough protests have pushed both the state and federal government to address the issues. However, both continue to fail.

Since the start of 2020, we have seen an influx of motions put to this chamber and the other place regarding harassment and gendered violence. As this motion indicates, there is no one way to solve the issue of gender inequality, and governments need to act now. The responsibility weighs heavily on this parliament to create legislation that breaks barriers for women economically, socially and politically. We as a parliament also must take responsibility in the sense of changing social attitudes with the leadership we have, as individuals and as a parliament.

It is unacceptable to stand on a moral high ground and frown upon other workplaces that have issues of harassment when we cannot even address this issue within our own workplace. If we cannot address the issue within our own workplace, how can we expect the public to end harassment and gender-based violence? The responsibility falls on everyone in this place to address the issue of harassment within parliament. However, it is just the few who time and again stand to raise these issues.

No real change has come from the Equal Opportunity Commission's Review of Harassment in the South Australian Parliament Workplace. For instance, the Joint Committee on Recommendations arising from the Equal Opportunity Commissioner's Report into Harassment in the Parliament Workplace has still not met—nearly two months on from its establishment in mid-March.

Through my years dealing with workplace issues through union work and on the Employment Tribunal, I have never seen a workplace so complicit in dealing with issues of this severity. Members may think that they are higher than the law and that they are immune from the repercussions of their actions, but they forget that the public's eye is on them and that women vote too.

There is no doubt that the political environment that we each work in is unusual. It is one that encourages competitive and egocentric behaviour. Somehow this is translated into members and staff seeking to undermine others through inappropriate behaviour. This behaviour has become normalised throughout our society and systemic issues within our workplace, which has left survivors

hurt with little or no hope of remedying the situation. Women are continually oppressed by the social, political and economic systems within this state.

I understand the government is seeking to substantially amend the motion. The opposition will not be supporting the amendments. It is discouraging that the government is seeking to water down the motion by amendment, when the motion calls on the government to act. The supporters of this motion as it stands are tired of waiting for real action. It is time this government made some real effort to change this toxic workplace culture.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (17:55): I rise on behalf of the government to speak to the motion. Firstly, the government strongly supports paragraphs 1, 2 and 3; that is, acknowledges the people who marched, condemns all forms of gendered violence and calls for an end to gendered violence in all workplaces, including in our parliaments.

I note on behalf of the government the government's unequivocal public condemnation of gendered violence: the Attorney-General's ministerial statement of 4 May, which comprehensively outlined what this government has done, what the government continues to do and options for future reform. The Attorney-General has made clear the government's position in relation to those particular issues.

In relation to paragraph 5 of the member's motion, the Attorney-General has indicated that she will review how sexual assault crimes are investigated and prosecuted, noting that consent laws were last reformed in 2008, and that she has written to both the Director of Public Prosecutions and the Commissioner of Police on the same.

The Attorney-General has also sought the views of the Director of Public Prosecutions and the Commissioner of Police on the policy in the Australian Capital Territory to proceed with a prosecution even when a victim has asked to withdraw the victim statement to police, and the Safe at Home Tasmanian scheme, which includes a pro-arrest, pro-prosecution policy to address domestic and family violence.

In relation to paragraph 6 of the motion, the government does not support this part of the motion. This is the advice of the Attorney-General: whilst the government understands the importance of and supports timely investigations with appropriate referrals, the way in which this has been drafted is too broad and does not cover situations in which survivors may require privacy or different supports. Members should be sensitive to victim-led responses.

In relation to paragraph 9 of the motion, again, the Attorney-General advises—and is supported by the government—that the government does not support this part of the motion. The government notes that the Hon. Ms Bonaros has now introduced her Gender Equality Bill, to which she has just concluded her second reading. The government reserves its position on the bill and notes legislative recognition of gender equality is already found within the Equal Opportunity Act in addition to significant public sector initiatives to promote gender equality in its ranks.

In relation to funding issues, the government notes and the Attorney-General indicates that the government is also proud of its record funding for domestic and family violence prevention. Since March 2018, the government has committed more than \$21 million in new funding towards a suite of new DV measures supporting South Australians.

An additional \$4.8 million federal government funding boost last year enabled the government to fast-track new measures during COVID-19, bringing total new DV funding to \$25.8 million. I think there have also been recent federal government announcements in the most recent budget. On behalf of the government, I formally move the amendments that are standing in my name:

Leave out paragraph 4 and insert new paragraph as follows:

4. Supports in principle the implementation of the 16 recommendations made in the Equal Opportunity Commission's Review of Harassment in the South Australian Parliament Workplace;

Leave out paragraph 6.

Leave out paragraph 7 and insert new paragraph as follows:

7. Supports in principle the implementation of the 55 recommendations in the Australian Human Rights Commission's Respect@Work report of the National Inquiry into Sexual Harassment in Australian Workplaces 2020;

Leave out paragraph 9.

Paragraph 7 calls for the full implementation of all the 55 recommendations in the Australian Human Rights Commission's Respect@Work national inquiry report. With great respect, I am not sure how many members in this chamber have actually read all 55 recommendations of that particular national report, but in looking at the federal government's response to a number of those recommendations, it is quite clear that with some of them the federal government has indicated it merely notes the recommendations and does not indicate support or otherwise, in particular Recommendation 27, which recommends:

A disclosure process be established that enables victims of historical workplace sexual harassment matters to have their experience heard and documented with a view to promoting recovery. The Australian Government should fund the Commission to facilitate this process.

For example, the federal government indicates they merely note that particular recommendation. They will:

...evaluate the effectiveness of existing counselling based services for victims, including those provided by state and territory governments, for allowing matters to be confidentially and anonymously disclosed and heard for the purpose of promoting recovery.

The Government will also ensure that employers have access to guidance materials to assist in supporting victims of historical workplace sexual harassment.

The federal government's response is listed under 'A Roadmap for Respect: Preventing and Addressing Sexual Harassment in Australian Workplaces'. Given the time, I do not intend to go through (a) all of the 55 recommendations and (b) all of the responses from the federal government. I am just noting that there are some, like recommendation 27 and others, that the federal government merely notes their response. For example, in recommendation 15 it is recommended that the Australian Government ratify ILO Convention 190. The federal government just says that is noted and:

...the government will consider this recommendation as part of usual treaty processes.

Given that a number of these issues are responsibilities of the federal government and that some of these are potentially shared responsibilities between federal, state and territory governments and will require discussion at national forums, whether it be at the national cabinet or with responsible ministers, some of them will be discussed by attorneys-general and some will be discussed by ministers with direct responsibility for support policies in terms of agencies, such as, I would imagine, in our case, the Department of Human Services and their equivalent agencies in other jurisdictions, and work health and safety ministers as well will all be part to various discussions.

But there are a number of recommendations, as I said, that are noted. There are a number where the federal government says that they agree in principle or agree in part, but when one reads the individual recommendations or the summation of the government's response it is not entirely clear. The federal government's position is very much up in the air. For example, for recommendation 16, which was to amend the Sex Discrimination Act to ensure a whole variety of changes, the federal government response was:

Agreed-in-Principle: The Government supports equality of opportunity and the express prohibition of sex-based harassment. Further, the Government will amend the Sex Discrimination Act to ensure greater alignment with model WHS laws and to make the system for addressing sexual harassment in the workplace easier for employers and workers to understand and navigate.

In conclusion, in relation to that particular report, the federal government, which has lead responsibility in a number of those areas, is either just noting or says it agrees in principle or in part but certainly is not endorsing all 55 recommendations of that particular report and certainly not going ahead with the full implementation of all 55 recommendations of that particular report.

Finally, in relation to the Review of Harassment in the South Australian Parliament Workplace report, received earlier this year, the first thing I do want to note and place on the public record again is one of the commission's conclusions, and that is:

That said, in the Commission's view, the primary data does indicate that harassment in the parliamentary workplace is too prevalent. It appears to occur at a rate similar to workplaces across Australia and to international parliamentary workplaces, and the risk factors associated with the workplace's culture and systems also point to a problem that needs to be addressed.

It acknowledges that there is a problem within the parliamentary workplace, but it is quite clear in saying that it is at a rate similar to workplaces across Australia; that is, yes, there is a problem within the parliamentary workplace, but it is at a similar rate to workplaces in the nation, whether they be, I imagine, private or public sector workplaces, together with the parliament.

I think too often in this particular debate, the parliamentary workplace is being made out to be much more toxic, much worse than what exists in many other workplaces, and that is not a view, certainly, that I subscribe to. I acknowledge the problems, as I acknowledge the problems exist both in public and private sector worksites.

In the public sector, we were the first government to commission the survey and then public reveal of the views of workers in the public sector. We are conducting a similar survey as we speak—I think it concludes in the next three or four days—seeking out information in terms of concerns within the public sector about bullying, harassment and other concerns that individual workers have within the public sector. So this government does not shy away from trying to address the problem: we seek to shine a light on it in the public sector and are prepared to work to do something about it.

In relation to the particular recommendations, I have spoken briefly before about the fact that, in my humble view, the reviewer in relation to this does not understand all of the practical realities of the parliamentary workplace. The parliamentary workplace, as defined by the commissioner in her report, is:

For the purposes of the Review...includes the people working (in whatever capacity) in or for Parliament House, electorate offices and Ministers' offices, and includes work related travel and events.

The commissioner goes on to make recommendations that we have one single oversight unit, stating:

That the South Australian Government form a centralised human resources function (the People and Culture Section) to provide services across the parliamentary workplace including:

Then there is a whole range of things, including:

- the development of a workplace training program
- a performance management framework
- the development of human resource policies and practices
- induction and exit practices
- a wellbeing framework that includes supporting staff in electorate offices
- other functions as recommended by the Review.

Mr President, as you would know as the Presiding Member and as a member of the Joint Parliamentary Services Committee, it is impossible in our circumstance—or it does not make any sense, let me put it that way—to implement this particular recommendation; that is, to have one centralised function which is actually going to control the staff within ministerial offices, the staff within electorate offices, the staff within the Legislative Council chamber, the staff within the House of Assembly chamber, the staff who are responsible for the joint parliamentary services, the protective security staff who report to the South Australian police commissioner, the parliamentary counsel who are public servants who come down here and work in Parliament House and are here on a regular basis, together with a whole range of other people who work here occasionally, in particular when parliament is sitting.

The reality is, to address this particular issue, the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee has already addressed in part the responsibility that it has; that is, a centralised functional unit which is going to be available to the joint parliamentary services staff, but is also on some sort of an arrangement with the presiding members in both houses to be made available to the Legislative Council staff.

The staff who work for members of the Legislative Council in Parliament House on a daily basis and the staff who work within electorate offices of the House of Assembly staff on a daily basis but also spend some time here when parliament sits, Mr President, are not the responsibility of you or the Speaker, or indeed the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee. They are the responsibility, through electorate services, of Treasury, and that responsibility will rest with myself and the Department of Treasury and Finance in terms of providing a centralised resource for them, and we will undertake that to try to better manage the concerns that electorate office staff might have.

In relation to ministerial staff, who are here generally when parliament is sitting, it is a completely different set of arrangements. They are section 71 or 72 staff employed under contract to the Premier, so a centralised staffing resource in Parliament House has no authority over ministerial staff. They are responsible, through their ministers, to the Premier, and that is where the focus of responsibility lies. The protective security staff in Parliament House, I assume, have direct responsibility through to the police commissioner in terms of any concerns they might have whilst they are working at Parliament House.

I provide some detail in relation to that to say whilst everyone says this should be implemented immediately, with great respect people have not thought through what that actually means and, if you were to do so, what the issues would be that would be created or how you would even achieve that legally in terms of the different responsibilities.

Electorate staff, for example, have a certain set of rules and public servants have codes of conduct that they are required to abide by. Parliamentary counsel, for example, who are public servants, have the public sector code of conduct, which they are required to adhere to. Ministers have a code of conduct. Members of parliament, under this recommendation, will be looking to see the adoption of a code of conduct that would relate to the members.

There will be varying codes of conduct or requirements that apply to different members of the parliamentary workplace that the commissioner has recommended. As I said, with great respect to the commissioner, she does not have the corporate knowledge or understanding of how the complexity of the parliament actually operates and how some of the recommendations will clearly be impossible to implement along the lines that are recommended.

In one of the recommendations, she recommends that this group of people within the parliament, I assume answerable to either the presiding members or to the JPSC if it is going to be located centrally, make recommendations in relation to resolving issues and provide guidance on parliamentary privilege. Good luck with that, as we have wrestled over decades, or indeed hundreds of years in other jurisdictions, about parliamentary privilege. We are going to appoint two, three or four people into an HR section on people and culture, and they are going to provide guidance to us all on parliamentary privilege and how that is going to be implemented. Good luck with that.

There are also other issues that, as I said, establish a process for the disclosure. One of the recommendations that I certainly support—I do not have any problems with it, but it will be interesting to see how it is actually implemented—is that the commissioner recommends on a number of occasions to provide that relationships between members of parliament and staff in the parliamentary workplace must be disclosed.

The commissioner returns to this, so I am assuming some concerns must have been raised to the commissioner in relation to relationships between members of parliament and parliamentary staff, because on page 89 the commissioner refers to it, and again on page 124 the commissioner recommends that people in this new people and culture section will establish a process for the disclosure of relationships between members of parliament and staff in the parliamentary workplace.

Given that the commissioner defines the parliamentary workplace as both parliament and electorate offices, clearly someone is going to have to have oversight of the personal relationships of members of parliament—people not just in parliament but also within electorate offices and also within ministerial offices as well, because the recommendation is there should be a disclosure of relationships between members of parliament and staff members in the parliamentary workplace, which is broadly defined.

The issue is going to be: where is this disclosure going to be, and how is that disclosure going to be maintained? Who will have access to the disclosure regime where the member of

parliament who happens to have a relationship with a staff member—where that is going to be disclosed and how it is going to be disclosed and the rules that relate to it? That is one of the recommendations of this particular report.

Again, I am not going to go through all the other recommendations where I think there is a challenge in terms of the parliamentary committee, which is going to be charged with responsibility at least within the areas it has responsibility for, considering the response to some of these particular recommendations.

With that, as I indicate, the government's position is, as outlined by the Attorney-General, to oppose a number of aspects of this particular motion and to seek to amend a couple of the others. I note from discussions I have had that the government does not have the support to have its amendments passed in this particular house, so I do not propose to divide, but it will be a challenge for all in terms of seeking to implement the terms and the nature of the recommendations that are outlined in this particular motion.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (18:16): Can I start by acknowledging the contributions of the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos and the Treasurer. Thank you for the contributions you have made. I think it goes without saying that the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos have probably outlined factors that I do not need to address, because I agree with them, but I would like to take the opportunity to address a few points made by the Treasurer in his remarks.

I am going to start by saying this: this is not my motion. It is a motion based on a petition that was put together by the March 4 Justice group. We know that back in March some 8,000 people marched here in South Australia and nationally some 110,000 people marched. There was a petition that was prepared and provided to the Prime Minister, and it detailed the expectations of what is being asked for.

That is what this is based on. I did not come up with a list of things and say, 'You know what? This is my wish list. This is what I think we should do.' I based it on what all those individuals who pounded the concrete out there said they wanted us to be doing. So I think it is important to acknowledge that we have not plucked these out of thin air. We have based them on what members of the public have said they would like to be seeing us doing, and we are merely a mouthpiece for them. I support them in everything they have called for, as do other honourable members who have spoken in here today.

I do want to address a couple of other points the Treasurer made in relation to this workplace and the call for an end to gendered violence in all workplaces, including our parliaments, and the recommendations made in relation to the review of this workplace. Perhaps if the Treasurer himself had been subjected to some of the sorts of behaviours that other people in this building had been subjected to over years, his view would be a little bit different, but I can tell you there are plenty of people in here who do not agree with the Treasurer's view, because he has been fortunate not to be subjected to inappropriate behaviours in this workplace—perhaps. I do not know; I am speculating, but I can only speculate, based on what he said, that that is the case.

To make that assumption and to take that view, in my view, is to miss the point entirely of why the legal profession and why the parliament have had the spotlight shone on them. Nobody is suggesting that other workplaces are not equal to or perhaps even worse than parliament or indeed the legal profession or indeed the judiciary. That is far from what we are suggesting. The reason the focus has been on our parliaments, on this parliament, on our federal parliament, on other parliaments, the reason the focus has been on our judiciary, the reason the focus has been on our legal profession is because of the work that they do. It is by virtue of their obligations that they ought to be doing better.

We are talking about our lawmakers, our legislators, people who make the laws, people who interpret the laws, people who apply the laws. I do not know how many times we have to say this, but if those individuals who work in those professions cannot get it right, then why on earth would any other workplace in South Australia or elsewhere feel compelled to sign up to measures that our parliaments, our judiciary and our legal profession do not bother to meet. That is why the focus is on

the parliaments of Australia. That is why the focus is on our legal profession. That is why the focus is on the judiciary.

As much as we would like to sweep it under the carpet or downplay its significance, the fact is that across the board, here and elsewhere, we have heard very alarming cases of extraordinary behaviour against members and against staff who work in those workplaces. There have been reports and reviews on this. I do not need to name them all. We all know what it is.

To try to make excuses for parliament in terms of, 'Well, we are not the worst offender in all this,' completely misses the point of why the spotlight is on parliament, why it is on the judiciary and why it is on the legal profession. The bar is higher and ought to be higher for those professions. They have a higher degree of responsibility by virtue of the work that they do every day. It is that plain and simple. I am hoping that has addressed that point appropriately for the Treasurer and others.

I think the Treasurer has made some points that we all acknowledge will take time to address in this place. We are not suggesting it is going to be an overnight fix. What we are asking is to give us a little bit more, give us more than, 'Well, we won't agree because the federal government has only taken note of that recommendation and they're not going to support it in principle. We won't agree because it's too difficult and good luck with that one because perhaps we don't have the answers of how we are going to fix this.' Give us a little bit more, show us that there is a little bit of an appetite to fix these things and you will get a better response across the board. It is that plain and simple.

I will not be accepting the Treasurer's suggested amendments. I will not be because, as I said at the outset, I did not draft these terms of reference based on what I think needs to be done. I based these terms of reference on what the tens of thousands of people—in South Australia some 8,000 people marched—thought needed to be done. It is their petition, their banners, their calls that we are trying to respond to here and I do not intend to water those down because this government does not think that we can set the bar a bit higher in terms of what we are actually aspiring towards.

There is obviously going to be give and take across the board, but we could at least start by setting that bar really high and if we need to make concessions, then by all means we will consider them when we get to them, but we do not need to lower the bar now, so there is no need to support those amendments. With those words and noting the time, I indicate again for the record that I will not be supporting the amendments by the Treasurer.

The PRESIDENT: The first question I am going to put is that paragraph 4, as proposed to be struck out by the Treasurer, stand as part of the motion.

Question agreed to.

The PRESIDENT: The question I now put is that paragraph 6, as proposed to be struck out by the Treasurer, stand as part of the motion.

Question agreed to.

The PRESIDENT: We now move to the question that paragraph 7, as proposed to be struck out by the Treasurer, stand as part of the motion.

Question agreed to.

The PRESIDENT: We now go to the question that paragraph 9, as proposed to be struck out by the Treasurer, stand as part of the motion.

Question agreed to; motion carried.

At 18:28 the council adjourned until Thursday 27 May 2021 at 14:15.