

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 13 October 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 Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the President—

Ombudsman SA—Report, 2020-21

By the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

Reports, 2020-21—

Electricity Industry Superannuation Scheme—Annual Report and Financial Statements

Funds SA

Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment

Police Superannuation Board

South Australian Parliamentary Superannuation Board

South Australian Superannuation Board

South Select Super Corporation

State Owned Generators Leasing Co Pty Ltd

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (14:17): I bring up the 46th report of the committee.

Report received.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I bring up the report of the committee on House of Assembly petition No. 62 of 2021, Climate Emergency.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Question Time

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The member for Mawson in the other place, Leon Bignell, has received concerning reports from locals on Kangaroo Island about COVID-19 vaccinations. Residents have claimed they cannot get their second dose of Pfizer or AstraZeneca since the vaccination clinic left the island on 9 October. GPs and chemists on the island have confirmed with local residents that they need to travel to Victor Harbor and it is not covered by the PAT Scheme that helps people pay for travel for medical care. My questions to the minister are:

1. Why are residents of Kangaroo Island being forced to undertake a round trip of more than 300 kilometres and catch a ferry across the Backstairs Passage, at a cost of \$296 per person and their vehicle, to get their second vaccination dose just weeks before COVID-19 is expected to re-enter South Australia with borders opening?

2. How will the minister ensure that residents can get their second vaccination and that there will be enough time to develop the maximum immune response before borders are reopened on this very important tourist destination to this state?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:20): I thank the honourable member for his question. It was great to be able to sit outside the coffee shop at Kingscote with the vaccine clinic coordinator a week or two ago when I was in Kangaroo Island and to share with her her excitement about the huge success of the vaccination program on Kangaroo Island.

My recollection is that the Kingscote clinic, in partnership with the Royal Flying Doctor Service, completed its second round of doses at the end of last week. The clinic coordinator highlighted to me that there will be some people who may choose to get their second dose on the mainland, and that could be through a visit to metro clinics or to the Victor Harbor clinics.

It is certainly my understanding that the Barossa Hills Fleurieu Local Health Network and their vaccination team will be looking for opportunities to continue the vaccination program on the island, not through a community-based clinic like we have had up until this point but through services such as pharmacies, pharmacy programs and the like.

There may well be an opportunity for future fly-ins. One of the particular challenges that I discussed with the clinic head was the fact that, with people coming in and out of the residential aged-care facility operated on the Kingscote hospital site, there will be a need for ongoing vaccinations there. In fact, the very day that I was there there was a pop-up clinic—no, that wouldn't be the word—you might call it a mobile clinic, people from the community clinic who were going up to the hospital to deliver vaccine doses.

The head of the clinic explained to me there may well be opportunities such as a day fly-in visit. There might be, as I said, operations through pharmacies—

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: When?

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —but the most recent clinic only finished at the end of last week. My understanding was that clinic was going well beyond the 80 per cent on the island. I thank the honourable member for the prompt to go and check the data in terms of what was achieved by the end of the clinic period. Certainly, the advice that I had from her was that there had been a very significant increase in bookings for that last week or so and they were intending to do everything they could to meet the demand.

I think this will be true with a number of clinics. Stand-up clinics have a purpose for a time and as people know that certain clinic options will no longer be available many of them will make the most of that access but I assure the people of Kangaroo Island that we will continue to look at opportunities to provide vaccines to their community.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): Supplementary from the answer that was given, and I thank the minister for the information provided. My supplementary question is: minister, so that the hardworking member for Mawson can advise his constituents—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Just a question.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —as of today where can people on Kangaroo Island go for their second vaccination dose on Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:23): I am not aware of any pharmacies on the island but I think it is scurrilous of the member to try to denigrate the hard work that has been done by those health teams to deliver a very effective—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Resume your seat, minister. Order!

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

The PRESIDENT: Resume your seat, minister. Point of order, the leader. I can't hear the leader.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The minister is completely misrepresenting what's been said.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The supplementary has been asked. The minister needs to answer that, and he will in his own way, but I am going to give him the time to get to answering the question you have asked.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I am more than happy to move on from the opposition's denigration of the hardworking team on Kangaroo Island. They have delivered a very effective program—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: You're the most useless health minister we've ever had. How's that for denigration?

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: There will be ongoing provision—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: There will be ongoing provision, hopefully through pharmacists on the island, but the people—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, have you concluded your answer?

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I wouldn't be heard. There's no point.

The PRESIDENT: Then I will ask you to continue your answer.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: No, I've got no intention.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): Final supplementary: can the minister confirm that as of today residents on Kangaroo Island will have to travel off the island to the mainland to get their second dose?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:25): No, I can't confirm that. I would like to check whether there are any pharmacies on the island that are involved in the program.

PUBLIC HOUSING

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:25): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Human Services regarding housing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. Wade: Deep and broad questions on the pandemic, haven't they?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The minister is out of order.

The Hon. E.S. Bourke: We don't get answers, so why would we ask them?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The minister's senior executives revealed last week—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Bourke is out of order. I struggle—

The Hon. S.G. Wade interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am struggling to hear the deputy leader because of members on the ministerial front bench and on the shadow ministerial front bench.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The minister's senior executives revealed last week that an extra \$50 million had been spent on public housing maintenance in the last financial year. Fifty million dollars could have repaired 1,000 to 2,000 existing empty public housing properties so they could be rented to homeless people. Instead, a recent freedom of information release showed 1,880 empty public housing homes. My questions to the minister are:

1. How is it possible to spend a record amount of money on maintenance that could have wiped out the list of empty homes but still end up with 1,880 empty homes?
2. How many house and land packages, for example, could have been purchased for \$50 million?
3. How many homes could have been built on Housing Authority land with \$50 million if the minister hadn't been selling off the land for so-called affordable housing projects?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:27): I am delighted to receive this question from the opposition, who spent 16 years presiding over taking maintenance money out of the Housing Trust budget, running a program called 1000 Homes in 1000 Days, in which they—

The Hon. J.E. Hanson interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hanson, order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —actually resulted in a net loss—

The Hon. J.E. Hanson interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —of properties from the system, \$1.5 billion of sales of public housing properties, 7½ thousand properties that would be quite handy right now, putting in the forward estimates a target of some 500 properties a year to go to the budget in other areas, when this benevolent Treasurer sitting next to us here actually reversed the funding arrangement.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hunter! Minister, resume your seat. The deputy leader has a point of order.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Point of order: the minister is mocking the Treasurer, which I think is unparliamentary and unfair.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is no point of order.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: What else was there? Failing to do an asset test of Housing Trust properties since 2003, which—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think the opposition might like to listen to the answer.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: They failed to do an asset condition inspection report of the stock of the Housing Trust since 2003, which was—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The next question might not go to the Labor Party if you continue with this.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: So no condition asset report in their term since 2003. Under their watch the Labor Party had no idea what the condition of those properties was and probably didn't want to know, to be honest, and a range of other issues that this government is working to rectify. In the last financial year we actually spent \$168 million on Housing Trust properties to bring them up to spec.

We have completed the asset condition inspection report—and I might add that one of the other points the Auditor-General made several years ago, under Labor's watch, was that there was an estimate of some half a billion dollars worth of backlog required. This was the condition of our Housing Trust assets, a significant number of properties, the largest landlord in the state.

We've been working assiduously to know what the conditions of those properties are. That has just recently been completed—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: What about putting people in a home?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: As a result of that there was some \$30 million, that was part of the evidence—actually, I'm not supposed to refer to that am I, Mr President; it is out of order to refer to committees of the parliament—

The PRESIDENT: You shouldn't.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I can advise that I am advised there was some \$30 million which, through the asset condition inspection report, has identified the works that need to be done. Some of those houses have been close to uninhabitable. Of course, there are a number of properties that are not just vacant but that are actually under offer, and we set aside a certain number for transfers, because if people are transferring from their property we try to make stock available for that process.

We are also working through the process—which the Labor Party has been highly critical of—where we had that accelerated process for the hard to rent properties. Some of the properties on that list are some of our most hard to rent properties in the system, and we are trying to make sure those properties are tenanted. Then there are a number that are off-line because tenants have left and they need to be repainted, and there are some that still need quite a bit of work to get them up to spec.

However, I won't be lectured by any member of the Labor Party on these issues—ever—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —because they did such a terrible job of managing this asset—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: They undertook no reforms—

An honourable member interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —to try to improve any of the tenancy system—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: We are fixing their mess.

PUBLIC HOUSING

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:32): A supplementary: when the minister refers to what she alleges is the poor record, can she explain the loss of 12,000 homes that disappeared in the eight years of the Liberal government when, as she referred to him, the 'benevolent Treasurer' was in charge?

The PRESIDENT: No, that's not relevant to the answer.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: She mentioned that, sir.

PUBLIC HOUSING

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:32): A further supplementary—

The PRESIDENT: You can try, yes.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Can the minister confirm that it was actually the Labor government that approved the property condition audit she referred to in her answer?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:32): From 2003 to 2018, that is how long it took for this to be done—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —and Labor had to be dragged kicking and screaming to do it. They had to be named—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I can't hear the minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —named and shamed by the Auditor-General—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: They had to be named and shamed—

An honourable member interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —named and shamed by the Auditor-General in order to identify that they need to look after these assets and actually know—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —what sort of condition they were in at all.

PUBLIC HOUSING

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:33): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Human Services regarding housing.

Leave granted.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: No; housing is quite important, thank you. In this place yesterday the minister said that the Liberals don't engage in a policy of 'spray and pray' when it comes to spending money on housing and homelessness.

Last week, the minister's senior executives revealed that an extra \$50 million had been spent on public housing maintenance last year, for a total of nearly \$170 million. The same executives then revealed that money had been spent on appliances, including dozens of air conditioners that could

not be installed. It was also revealed that money had been spent covering up critical air vents in apartments that had helped to prevent black mould. More money was then spent reopening the vents after complaints were received. My question to the minister is: how exactly can the minister claim that her policy isn't 'spray and pray' when her own executives admit to the wasting of public money on maintenance programs?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:34): I think the honourable member is misrepresenting the comments of the executives. In relation to the air conditioners, my understanding is that they have been purchased and there needs to be an upgrade of the SAPN system or whatever it is in order for them to be installed. I am sure that if those tenants were reading *Hansard* they—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —may well interpret the disparaging of these air-conditioning units as evidence—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —that the Labor Party doesn't believe they should have air-conditioning units installed, so they might just want to reflect on that.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: In relation to some of the walk-up flat sites, some of those sites are very challenging. They are quite old and so in terms of—and bearing in mind there is a huge diversity in our stock—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: There is a huge diversity in our stock and some sites present more challenges than others. There will always be issues with these matters. Need I remind the Labor Party about the memorial Mimili, two containers that contained asbestos that were placed on the lands at great expense and then removed at great expense, so I'm not going to be lectured by the Labor Party on any of these issues.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bourke has a supplementary.

PUBLIC HOUSING

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:36): How often does the—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader, your colleague on the front bench is trying to ask a supplementary and I can't hear her because of you.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: How often does the government buy things that can't be used, and are electrical systems checked before you purchase multiple air-conditioning systems?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:36): I thank the honourable member for her supplementary but she—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, leader!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —just needs to—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The leader will come to order.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —understand what a large portfolio of properties this is. When we come to walk-up flats—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! If you don't want the answer then don't ask the supplementary question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: No, that's it. If you don't want an answer that's fine.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Jing Lee has the call, and conversations across the chamber will cease.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding housing.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Lee will be heard in silence.

The Hon. R.P. Wortley interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley is out of order and should know better. The Hon. Ms Lee.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Can the minister please provide an update to the council about how the Marshall Liberal government is creating more jobs and opportunities for South Australians to get into the housing market?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The leader is out of order.

The Hon. E.S. Bourke interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: And the Hon. Ms Bourke.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:38): I thank the honourable member for her question. Indeed, I am very pleased that the latest range of properties which were released to market under our Affordable Homes Program sold out within 48 hours. We had 12 properties for sale at Dover Gardens, which are under construction from the builder Metricon Homes, EveryOne division. They were for sale at \$420,000 but eligible applicants using HomeStart financial packages could pay as little as \$318,150.

This is part of our package to deliver 1,000 affordable homes to market and has proven to be very successful. Also through our new website, HomeSeeker SA, which has been going, as the Treasurer would describe, gangbusters with the number of registrants, clearly there is a demand in this part of the market for people who are seeking to purchase homes at this property price.

One of the advantages for people who purchase these homes is they are not competing with investors. The price is fixed, so they are not having the experience that a lot of people do in other spaces where they have to bid up; it is a capped price. The advice is that HomeStart can assist people to bring that price down.

The HomeSeeker SA website has had nearly half a million page views, over 100,000 site visits and total subscribers of 2,000. We know that there is great demand in this space. It assists people to get advice about how to get their foot into the property market. We know that the people who purchase these homes through this program do actually tend to stay in them longer than they do for other purchases in the rest of the market. We know that there has been a number of single younger women in particular who have been snapping them up, and we look forward to releasing more to market in future.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:41): In reference to the minister's answer about the jobs being created, is covering up air vents and uncovering them also part of the government's job creation program? What similar job creation programs are they envisaging?

The PRESIDENT: Again, I don't think that comes anywhere near the original answer, so I am going to rule it out of order. The leader has a supplementary.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): Is the minister able to inform the chamber what is the lowest income of any of the purchases for this latest round of affordable properties?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:41): We don't assess their incomes. I don't know whether HomeStart would have some of the data in relation to some of the ones who have been purchasing through HomeStart. As I have said in public before, I am not going to be giving advice to people about what sort of income they need to service a loan, because there are a whole lot of other factors that are involved in this, which include people's outgoings, which are very important as to whether they service a loan, and they need to get that professional advice.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): Further supplementary: is it a requirement that a person provide their income and assets as part of being able to buy such homes?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:42): Yes, they do need to register, so the eligibility, from memory, for a single person is \$85,000 per annum or, for a couple, \$110,000.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): Final supplementary: can the minister take on notice and provide an answer to the initial question, please?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:42): I will see if we have that information and see what I can bring back.

RENTAL AFFORDABILITY

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:42): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Minister for Human Services on the topic of rental affordability.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: A survey released yesterday by the Anti-Poverty Network of South Australia has painted a grim snapshot of the renting experience in South Australia. The report found, among other things, that one in four people have less than \$14 a day, or \$100 a week, after paying their rent; 77 per cent said the cost of their rent often impacted on their ability to pay their bills on time or to eat; only 7 per cent received a rent freeze or reduction during the pandemic; and 46 per cent said their house did not have adequate heating or cooling. My questions to the minister are:

1. What action will the government be taking in relation to the report?
2. Will the minister advocate at cabinet for rent capping and rent subsidies to support people who are struggling to pay their rent during this economic crisis?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:43): I thank the honourable member for his question. Indeed, the matters of rental and issues in the rental market to a large degree rest with Attorney-General, who has responsibility for CBS, so some of those questions I will take on notice and see what response I can provide for him.

In terms of my responsibilities as Minister for Human Services under the SA Housing Authority, of course we have the Private Rental Assistance Program by which people can access bond and rent in advance. When they go to the housing office—or they can do this online these days—they can be assessed as to what is considered an affordable rental price for them, and they can be provided with that assistance.

People who are Centrelink beneficiaries in the private rental market also have access to commonwealth rental assistance. We saw, as all honourable members would know, legislation here during COVID to provide freezes in the rental market and some additional measures through the SACAT process to assist people who might be experiencing a potential hardship. Centrelink certainly provided support for people through the COVID process.

Some of the commentators are certainly remarking that the rental market is easing, not quite the same really tight situation we have seen. Of course, within our own public housing people's rent is capped at their income, rather than being exposed to the private rental market, so people have that particular financial advantage through being in a Housing Authority property. The other matters the honourable member has raised I will take on notice and bring back a response.

PUBLIC HOUSING

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:46): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Human Services regarding housing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: In this place yesterday, the minister said that the Liberals don't engage in a policy of spray and pray when it comes to spending money on housing and homelessness. This answer was in response to a question about why barely 10 per cent of a \$20 million Homelessness Prevention Fund had been committed to in two years. The minister wasn't able to say how much had actually been spent or how many people had actually been helped under the fund.

As we heard from the last question from the opposition, there have been recent revelations about why, in a rushed \$50 million maintenance boost last financial year, the waste included some botched work of buying some appliances, which then couldn't be used—I think air conditioners specifically. My questions to the minister are:

1. Exactly how much money was wasted on maintenance work that had been redone or appliances which then couldn't subsequently be installed?
2. What assurances can the minister provide that the amount of money which may have been wasted on the maintenance program in a single year isn't more than the total Homelessness Prevention Fund since it was announced two years ago?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:47): I thank the honourable member for his question, although I note he does misrepresent a number of things in his question. Here we have the Labor Party complaining about spending money on maintenance of public housing properties—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would advise the opposition to listen to the minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —complaining about spending money on Housing Trust properties.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I might have to email Sascha Meldrum and let her know that I have a DL for her for the upcoming campaign, that the Labor Party doesn't think we should be spending money on maintenance, but we know that anyway because they kept cutting it when they were in office. Just extraordinary, isn't it? This is the Labor Party who like to portray themselves as—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —looking after the most disadvantaged people in our society. Here they come—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Opposition Whip is out of order, as is the leader.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —complaining about spending \$50 million on maintenance—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —and knowing that they cut the maintenance back.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I think that's a fair indication, if the Labor Party were elected—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter will be silent.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —of what will happen to the assets of—

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: How much have you wasted?

The PRESIDENT: The deputy leader is not helping.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —the South Australian Housing Authority. The Hon. Mr Hanson's question might have a little bit of a problem with arithmetic, because it is a \$20 million program over 10 years and he is complaining about us allocating over \$2 million of it.

But that aside, one of the matters that had been raised was whether works were done on properties that were subsequently demolished, and the response on that is that there may be some properties that are brought up to spec for sale, which means that you will get a better sale price, but in terms of redoing works that is certainly not something that the Housing Trust undertakes.

I do hear these interjections about the air conditioners, which will be installed when the electricity has been upgraded.

PUBLIC HOUSING

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:49): Supplementary: minister, how much money would fit into the category of waste for maintenance work that had to be redone or appliances that couldn't be installed?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:49): There would be very little that is wasted in that regard. There will sometimes be things that need to be redone.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: But we have a huge amount of money that we are spending on maintenance, a huge amount of money—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Huge. Tell us the amount. Tell us the amount of waste.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: In terms of works that have to be redone, I would imagine that is quite small.

PUBLIC HOUSING

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:50): Further supplementary: what I am after—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Conversation does not help me listen to the Hon. Mr Hanson.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: Is the minister prepared to come back or take on notice an answer to a basic question, which is: how much money in waste, or would fit the category of waste, for maintenance work that had to be redone or appliances that couldn't be installed?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:50): The issue of the appliances I have already addressed. I will see what other information the agency holds that I can provide to the chamber.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (14:51): I seek leave to provide a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: There has been concern on the impact COVID-19 might be having on the engagement of South Australians with health promotion and screening. Could the Minister for Health and Wellbeing please update the council on Breast Cancer Awareness Month?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for her question, and I am happy to update the council on breast screening in this Breast Cancer Awareness Month. In doing so, I would like to pay tribute to the excellent work that BreastScreen SA does to screen South Australians for breast cancer.

Women in Australia have a one in seven chance of developing breast cancer before the age of 85, and it is the most common cancer affecting Australian women. Breast cancer can develop at any age, but around 75 per cent of breast cancers in this country are diagnosed in women over the age of 50. With that in mind, it's interesting to note that BreastScreen SA has experienced a sustained increase in demand for breast cancer screening since the beginning of the pandemic. Demand in the service is driven by South Australians and appears to align with a heightened awareness of health and wellbeing and the accessibility of screening for women when working from home.

BreastScreen SA offers a free mammogram every two years to women above the age of 40; however, this is particularly targeted at women aged 50 to 74 years. It's a population-based screening program adhering to the 2018 Australian government population-based screening framework. In the past 30 years, BreastScreen SA has provided more than two million breast screens to South Australians. In the financial year 2020-21, there were 89,847 mammograms conducted, a 7.7 per cent decrease from the pre-pandemic level participation rates of 57.9 to a preliminary figure of 50.2 for the two-year period ending 30 June 2021.

While the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted screening rates due to COVID-safe measures, BreastScreen SA has worked hard to minimise the impact of the pandemic by establishing two pop-up screening clinics for regional South Australians in Port Lincoln and Victor Harbor, with a third to open in Mount Barker. BreastScreen SA has introduced after-hours screening appointments at most clinics, while introducing priority appointments and increased capacity in the service's contact centre.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (14:54): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question on South Australia's readiness for the probability of the Delta variant before vaccination targets are reached.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: The rollout of vaccinations in SA is significantly behind Victoria and New South Wales. South Australia has a first dose of 72.9 per cent compared to Victoria of 85.8 per cent and New South Wales of 90.4 per cent. The second dose can only build after the completion of the first dose, with a several-week delay, depending on the vaccine type.

These figures reflect the motivation of a serious outbreak. I know the minister has recently answered a question on hospital beds, but my question is broader and twofold. My questions are:

1. Given the lagging vaccination rates in South Australia and the ever-present likelihood of an outbreak of the Delta variant on the scale experienced in Victoria and New South Wales, and given the ongoing existing severe problems with ambulance availability and ramping outside of EDs, what plans are in place for ambulance, ED and ICU to handle a significant COVID outbreak in South Australia?

2. What is the government doing to rapidly raise the vaccination rates in South Australia, particularly for vulnerable and key groups?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:55): I thank the honourable member for his question. It is a very relevant question. This period between now and the period where we reopen the borders is a very strategic time. It is really important that we maximise our vaccination rate and that we do so in a broad way.

The honourable member rightly points out that the outbreak states of Victoria and New South Wales are experiencing a significant increase in vaccination rates, and that is also true of the ACT. In fact, my understanding is that the ACT is second to Victoria in terms of vaccination rates, in terms of doses per hundred people. Certainly, the ACT has been very successful. One of the reasons for that is that it is a relatively compact geographic community in which it is relatively easy to provide at least geographic access to vaccinations.

We certainly have seen that SA, being a lower COVID state, has not experienced the outbreak impact that those eastern jurisdictions have, and thank God we haven't had COVID outbreaks. The honourable member is completely on track in terms of highlighting that every day is a risk. We have had almost a case a day in recent weeks, and any one of those cases could have led to an outbreak.

Let's remember that it was a limousine driver in Sydney who wasn't following, as I understand it, PPE requirements that led to what is now the New South Wales outbreak. We are relying very much on our hardworking contact tracing teams and public health teams to get on top of those cases, and they have done remarkably well, yet again, in the last month or so with those series of cases. It does behove all South Australians to take up the opportunity to get vaccinated, particularly if you are in regional South Australia and you are relying on mobile clinics.

The situation, though, is much less risky than New South Wales. In New South Wales, their outbreak started on 16 June and at that stage 4 per cent of the total population, 5 per cent of the 16+ population, had been vaccinated. As of today, South Australia is in the situation of having 56.5 per cent of second doses administered to 16 or older.

Already, to use it in crude terms—and this might cause Nicola Spurrier to blush, a politician trying to do epidemiology explanations, but my crude understanding of that is that it means that we have 10 times the rate of second doses. So if an outbreak was to come today, we would certainly be in a much better position than New South Wales was in the middle of June.

I strongly agree with the honourable member that vaccination needs to be a major focus in the coming period. In terms of reaching out to vulnerable groups I particularly bring the honourable member's attention to the program announced yesterday, a school immunisation program which has a particular emphasis on schools in lower socio-economic communities. Not only will we be vaccinating the students but each of those clinics will also have a weekend presence, I am advised—most if not all—so that members of the school community as well as the students themselves can come and get vaccinated.

The government continues to maintain a strong focus and awareness of the needs of regional South Australia. Eighteen of the public sector schools that are receiving those clinics are country

schools and my understanding is there are another six Catholic and independent schools in that program. In terms of other vulnerable groups, we are continuing to provide outreach to workplaces, particularly industries that might be susceptible to COVID transmission.

In that context, I was delighted on Sunday I think it was—it might have been Saturday—to launch the government's fleet of mobile vaccination clinics, what I dubbed 'vax vans'. They will be rolling out and the first two of those will be rolling out in the northern suburbs, again highlighting the fact that we are very keen to address lower vaccination rates in areas such as the northern suburbs. Those vans will be available right across South Australia to the local health networks to deliver services within their programs and will be coordinated by the SA Ambulance Service.

The PRESIDENT: The minister ought to bring his answer to a conclusion.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Thanks, Mr President. I am sure we will have plenty of opportunity to continue to discuss these issues, but the honourable member rightly highlights the importance of vaccination and it behoves each of us, as South Australians, to get vaccinated to protect ourselves, our families and our communities. I believe it is particularly important that we as parliamentarians take the lead in encouraging our communities and address what is dangerous misinformation. I would like to thank the opposition and other members of the parliament for supporting that public information campaign that vaccination is our pathway out of the pandemic.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:02): Supplementary question: would you consider giving our local pharmacists the option of immunising the community with Pfizer doses?

The PRESIDENT: I am not sure that that arose at all from the answer. Minister, do you wish to briefly address that?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:02): Yes I will. My understanding is that currently pharmacists only have access to AstraZeneca and to Moderna. I am not clear whether there is an intention to roll Pfizer out. Having said that, I think it is really important to appreciate that Moderna is also a very highly regarded vaccine. Again, I do not want to stray too far from my limited parliamentarian's knowledge—I am a politician not a clinician—but my understanding is Moderna is of the same family of vaccines as Pfizer. They are both mRNA vaccines—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —and apparently the opposition has lost interest already.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: They cannot maintain a concentration span anything slightly wider than a mosquito.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I would like to apologise to the Hon. Tung Ngo. At least he has managed to ask a more sensible question than his leader has been able to for the whole session.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, order! I am going to move on.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The Hon. Tung Ngo wants an answer to the question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I cannot hear.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: It is time to move on.

The PRESIDENT: Leader, you are out of order. Minister, I am sure you are going to conclude your answer because we need to move on.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I certainly am very keen to give the Hon. Tung Ngo an answer to a sensible question. I certainly agree with the Hon. Tung Ngo that not only will pharmacists continue to be important in terms of the rollout of the vaccine in the community, but I think they could have a very valuable role in outreach services. I was delighted to be able to discuss exactly that opportunity with the head of the Pharmacy Guild earlier this week.

PUBLIC HOUSING

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:04): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Human Services regarding housing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: A recent freedom of information request revealed that there were 1,880 empty public housing properties. The same FOI showed that these homes have been empty for a collective total of 421,773 days. Twenty homes have been empty for more than 1,000 days, 191 had been empty for at least 500 days and 1,267, which is two-thirds of the total, had been empty for at least 100 days. My question to the minister is: how does the minister explain to people living on the street that she has presided over homes that have been empty for more than a total of 420,000 days and nights?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:05): I thank the honourable member for his question. In part I have already provided some responses in relation to the state of the portfolio that we inherited, which Labor—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order, leader!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Which Labor had no idea about—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The opposition has asked a question. At least give the minister the opportunity to answer it without interjections.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Which the Labor Party had no idea what condition they were in. Some of them are in questionable habitableness. As I have already stated there was some \$30 million that needed to be spent, which clearly the Labor Party doesn't think we should have spent money on bringing houses up to standard. They would rather that—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Clearly, the Labor Party doesn't think we should be—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Opposition Whip is out of order. Minister, continue, please.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, order! I won't tolerate this.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. Maher: And she laughs about homelessness.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I'm just—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The minister will continue.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: It is remarkable, isn't it, that we've got a party in this place that asks questions and doesn't want the answers, clearly.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I don't think they like the answer. In relation to those properties we spent some \$30 million actually bringing a number of those up to speed that were just completely in need of a great deal of work. We've spent \$168 million in the previous financial year to upgrade a range of properties. We've got a new policy which means that we're accelerating those properties which are very hard for us to let in the system, a policy which, apparently, Labor opposes, and we continue to work through the ageing stock we are managing.

GFG ALLIANCE

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:08): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer a question regarding Whyalla.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: Members would be aware that the wonderfully resilient citizens of Whyalla have been soldiering on whilst the city's largest employer, GFG, has had a financial cloud hovering above it. Can the Treasurer update the council on the current situation regarding GFG and Whyalla?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:08): I acknowledge the honourable member's longstanding interest in Whyalla and the hardworking citizens of Whyalla. I have to say I am still occasionally approached in the Myer food court by people who continue to remind me of the honourable member's exploits in the early 1980s for the wonderful South Whyalla Football Club—but that's for another time.

It's pleasing for the workers and households in Whyalla that—I think it was only two or three days ago now that GFG Alliance announced, internationally, I should say, to the financial markets around the world, but of particular interest to us in Australia, a major announcement in relation to their debt restructuring.

I won't comment on the proposed actions in relation to the United Kingdom, Europe and America, but in particular the announcements in relation to the operations in Australia. Mr Jeffrey Stein, the chief restructuring officer, said:

I am pleased to report a significant advance in GFG Alliance's global restructuring. The debt restructuring we have agreed for LIBERTY Primary Metals Australia gives the business clarity and stability and secures a clear recovery plan for creditors. The funding we are injecting to LIBERTY Steel UK puts it in a strong position for business transformation and debt restructuring. The next stage in our global refinancing will be in Europe where a significant number of new lenders are expressing interest in refinancing our steel assets.

In relation to their Australian operations, they have stated a significant step forward in relation to their path to recovery following the collapse of their main lender, Greensill, in March is that GFG and Credit Suisse have agreed a debt restructuring for LIBERTY Primary Metals Australia, which comprises its integrated mining and primary steel business at Whyalla and the coking coal mine at Tahmoor.

In summary, GFG has announced that their record-breaking performances, following its operational efficiency drive, continuous improvement initiatives and favourable market conditions, underpinned by strong investment in infrastructure, has now led them to a stable financial platform for their Australian-based businesses.

The strength of the Australian businesses enables it to make a substantial up-front payment to Greensill Bank and to Credit Suisse, which has been closely involved in GFG's work to refinance and restructure. Under that agreement there is a significant up-front payment, as I said, and the balance will be paid in instalments to Credit Suisse and Greensill Bank through the amended maturity date of June 2022—so over the next 18 months or so.

The final bit of interest for Australians, and South Australians in particular, is the relative financial strength of the Australian operations, obviously off the back of the continued strength of steel and coking coal prices in the international markets. The simple figure in the accounts, and in this particular release, indicates that the profit of the Australian businesses, as measured by EBITDA, grew from \$106 million in 2020 to \$729 million in 2021. So their profitability, as measured by EBITDA, grew by \$600 million—from \$100 million in one year to \$700 million in another year.

Put simply, the strength of their operating efficiencies, in particular, clearly driven by iron ore prices soaring internationally, has meant they have had the capacity to enter into this debt restructure with Greensill and Credit Suisse over a period of time leading through to 2023. If these statements are followed through, it will lead to the ongoing strength of operations of GFG at Whyalla.

I am sure all members in this chamber will be pleased to have seen that particular statement, as a result of weeks and months of negotiations. We are hopeful it will see that transition into implementation of further investment in further operating efficiencies, as well as the substantial long-term retention of jobs and job prospects in Whyalla for the hardworking families of Whyalla.

AGED-CARE CCTV

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:13): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question about CCTV in aged-care facilities.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Yesterday, in this chamber, the government was asked a series of questions about the tragic circumstances surrounding the death of 83-year-old Jeffrey Beaton, who was found alive on Sunday night eight days after disappearing from an Eyre Peninsula aged-care facility only to die the following day from his injuries.

Firstly, like everyone else in this place I'm sure, I extend our sincerest condolences to Mr Beaton's family on the tragic death of their husband, father and grandfather. While SA Health continues to refuse to explain how Mr Beaton went missing while in its care, the minister yesterday revealed that Mr Beaton absconded from the same facility in Cleve twice in the two days leading up to his final tragic attempt, luckily being found a short time later in the town.

Mr Beaton's disappearances follow a similar incident at the trouble-plagued Kindred Living aged-care facility in Whyalla in March this year, when a 79-year-old dementia resident escaped from the facility and was found after a large-scale search 3½ days later in an unoccupied house a few streets from the nursing home. My question to the minister is:

1. How was Mr Beaton able to leave the aged-care facility three times in two days without being noticed by staff and/or raising any alarm bells?
2. Was Mr Beaton being accommodated in a secure part of the facility, given his medical condition?
3. Why wasn't security around Mr Beaton upgraded following his two prior successful attempts to leave the facility?
4. How many other incidents have occurred where patients living in a stated-owned aged-care facility have escaped or gone AWOL for more than 12 or 24 hours over the past five years?
5. Can the minister update us on how the CCTV trial is currently going?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:16): I thank the honourable member for his question. A number of the issues he raises are certainly issues that the government and the community look forward to being addressed. I referred yesterday to the fact that there will be reviews, and I just want to highlight to the house that the treating GP from Mid Eyre Medical notified the Coroner on 12 October of the death of Mr Beaton at the request of the facility's executive officer, the director of nursing. SAPOL had already notified the Coroner at the time of the resident's death.

The Eyre and Far North Local Health Network initially advised the Aged Care Quality and Safety Commission of the incident via a serious incident response scheme report on Tuesday

5 October and provided further updates after the resident was found, and on Tuesday 12 October after he passed away. I have also been advised that as well as the two departures from the facility on 1 and 2 October there was also one previous occasion in August where Mr Beaton left the facility and was found quickly afterwards. As I said, the government is looking forward to both the internal reviews and any reviews that might be undertaken by the Coroner and the commission.

In terms of technology, the honourable member is correct that CCTV could have been of assistance. Obviously, in this case, the issue would be not so much what happened inside the facility but rather the security of the perimeters. The technology may not be CCTV. It may well be other sorts of sensors such as ribbon alerts, I think they call them. I certainly agree that technology in many ways can help us enhance the security and safety of aged-care facilities, and the government is very keen to pursue that.

In terms of an area of technology that the government is using in a completely different context—I am referring to the home quarantine app—one wonders whether that technology may well be useful for people who tend to wander, not only in terms of being able to locate them after they have left the premises but, if you like, using perimeter alerts. My understanding is that these devices can be set such that if a person leaves a designated area somebody is identified—for that matter whether it is part of the care staff or members of their family.

The honourable member asked me questions in relation to details of the number of people over a significant period of time and across a range of facilities. I am sure that he wasn't expecting me to have that data with me, but I am certainly happy to take that aspect of his question on notice.

The PRESIDENT: Before calling on statements on matters of interest, I indicate that today we have had the lowest number of primary and supplementary questions in a number of months. I think it is in the interests of all members of this chamber that this level of questions is not continued.

Matters of Interest

MELBOURNE GROUP 99

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:20): I stand to speak about an Australian story called Melbourne Group 99 (MG99), which was aired on ABC TV on 23 August 2021. This story has many similarities to mine and those hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese boat people. On 16 June 1981, a small wooden fishing boat built for 30 people left Vietnam's Mekong Delta with 99 Vietnamese refugees—men, women, children and infants.

By the fifth day, the boat was breaking and taking in water and the 99 people accepted that the end was near and were praying for a merciful end. As fate would have it, the Royal Australian Navy tracker plane 851 spotted them and called on a nearby HMAS *Melbourne* to rescue them at dusk in stormy seas.

This year marks the 40th anniversary of that fateful rescue. A reunion with the crew of the HMAS *Melbourne* was held at the HARS Aviation Museum in New South Wales, where the very tracker 851 that spotted them was being housed to celebrate this special anniversary. It was an opportunity for MG99 Vietnamese Australians and their families to personally say thank you to the officers who saved them from a certain death.

Thor Vo said, 'I have waited for 40 years. Finally, I get to say thank you. Back then, I couldn't speak a word of English.' Stephen Khanh Nguyen, who was a bakery owner for 30 years and the main organiser of the reunion, said it is a connection that was forged in a moment of life and death. He said with heartfelt gratitude, 'We owe you our lives.'

Like many refugees, the MG99 and their extended families have contributed much to the Australian society and economy. They became small business owners, healthcare workers and other professionals. They are now living the Australian dream. The event also changed the lives of many of the crew on board. Former sailor John Tregoning said, 'I think that because of that night when my day comes I'll be able to leave a footprint, something that's going to be here forever. It's made me a better person.'

John Ingram, an officer who oversaw the refugees' welfare and formed a lifetime friendship with Stephen Khanh Nguyen, said the night of the rescue 'was the pinnacle of my career'. We

understand John Ingram has been fighting cancer since 2009, which has now spread elsewhere in his body, and he knew it was likely the last time he would be able to get together with anyone. I wish him the very best of health.

For sailor Rob Patterson, a Navy photographer who captured the moment in photos, the event has had a huge impact on him: 'It's a moment that wasn't just a high point of my military career, it was also a high point of my entire life.'

I would like to thank the officers, seamen and aircrew of the HMAS *Melbourne* and HMAS *Torrens*, who chose to rescue the refugees without seeking approval from the Navy headquarters 40 years ago. They were heroes to the 99 refugees and they are also my heroes. I want to acknowledge the late Commodore Mike Hudson, captain of the HMAS *Melbourne* at the time of the rescue, for his leadership and compassion. I leave honourable members with his words in an article. He said:

Sending men, women and children to a watery grave is absolutely abhorrent. Drowning is a terrible way to die, the sea is a very lonely place. You may be in the Navy for 25 years, but you've got to live with your conscience all your life. The MG99 rescue was the highlight of my career.

VETERINARY INDUSTRY SUICIDE PREVENTION

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (15:25): I rise today to speak about a matter very close to my heart: suicide prevention in the veterinary industry. In particular, I would like to touch on the work of the Australian Veterinary Association (the AVA) and not-for-profit organisation Not One More Vet in this space. As many in this place know, I was a veterinarian prior to my election as a member of the Legislative Council in April 2020. I love my previous occupation and I am proud of the work veterinarians do for animals and their owners, not just in South Australia but right across our nation.

I recognise how much of a privilege it is to be standing here representing South Australians, but no matter for how long I am privileged to be a member of parliament I will always consider myself a vet. I worked at the Riverland Veterinary Clinic for 15 years and my experience has made me acutely aware of the pressures that vets feel in the industry due to staffing numbers, long work hours and patient demands.

As a regional vet it is not unusual to work long hours or to be on call for extended periods. The alternative was to risk the wellbeing of animals and to cause distress to their owners, which for vets is not an option. Sadly, the pressures of the industry have resulted in Australian vets being four times more likely to take their own life than the general population, according to the Australian Veterinary Association. That is double the suicide rate of doctors, pharmacists, dentists and nurses. Many predict that the pressures on vets will continue to grow, with reports of a surge in pet sales throughout the COVID-19 pandemic.

We live in a world that is far more understanding of the importance of mental health. Beyond Blue, Lifeline and Headspace are just some organisations that have opened a positive dialogue about mental health, while providing services to individuals. In government we have seen a shift in funding to providing specific services in the mental health space. I am sure that everyone in this place welcomes the change in attitude to mental health in our nation, while recognising that we must explore avenues to continue to assist those who require our support as a government and as a community.

I am highlighting the AVA and Not One More Vet organisation today because of their work to support the mental health of those in the veterinary industry. They are not the only organisations to do so, and I would also like to acknowledge the large number of informal veterinary groups that contribute to the support structure of the profession. Much like Beyond Blue, Lifeline and Headspace, these organisations are opening a positive dialogue about mental health and providing important services.

Not One More Vet is the world's largest peer-to-peer support group for veterinarians, providing resources tailored to the unique challenges faced by vets. Their services include education, financial assistance and funding research, and they run lectures and workshops as part of their education program, focusing on veterinary wellness and wellbeing. Topics include 'Struggles new graduates face' and 'crisis intervention'. As well as supporting vets, the organisation is engaged in

research, aiming to better understand the underlying issues around mental health in the veterinary profession, to guide programs that have a more significant impact in the future.

Not One More Vet is undertaking a great deal of work to ensure that our future vet workforce has the appropriate support. The Australian Veterinary Association represents, champions and empowers the veterinary profession to thrive by providing a voice, education, community and support. It is a membership-based organisation and provides a number of programs and services, including a free telephone counselling service, mental health first-aid training, graduate mentors programs and employee assistant programs. These programs are critical for the those in the veterinary industry.

The rates at which Australian vets take their lives is tragically high, and there is always more work we can do to provide the appropriate support. But I do believe that things are improving, as our community becomes more engaged with the importance of mental health and the importance of being kind. I recently attended a University of Adelaide networking night for veterinary students at the Roseworthy Campus. I was one of the guest speakers for the evening, and it was a pleasure to speak with so many students on the cusp of an exciting career in the vet industry.

I was heartened by the event, with the importance of mental health, building a support network and the industry's challenges openly discussed throughout the evening. Vets play a critical role in our community. They save lives, they support and look after the wellbeing of animals, but vets need support too, and we need to work towards a time when not one more vet feels their only option is to take their own life.

PUBLIC HEALTH SYSTEM

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:30): If I were a betting person, I would be betting that the parlous state of our public health system and how to fix it will be one of the major issues in the lead-up to the state election in March next year. Successive state governments—the past 3½ years of the Liberals and the preceding 16 years of Labor—have brought the public health system to its knees.

A select committee I chair into public health services in SA has heard harrowing evidence after harrowing evidence from a range of witnesses, from parents of sick children to some of the state's most respected and highly talented specialists and dedicated frontline nurses who leave no doubt in my mind that people are dying unnecessarily in our health system. In opposition the Liberals said they had a clear and concise plan to fix our public health system. Sadly, after promising so much and having 16 years of purgatory to develop a blueprint for doing so, they have been appallingly bad, following the lead of the former Labor government.

You need look no further than the behaviour of SA Health senior executives for further evidence of why our health system continues to decay. It starts with the way senior executives treat frontline medicos. In what has been described as an unprecedented show of solidarity, about 400 public health doctors held a stop-work meeting this morning to be updated on their enterprise bargaining negotiations with the state government. These are the very same frontline doctors who have worked around the clock for the past 18 months to protect the community from the ravages of the COVID-19 pandemic, some of whom are known to regularly work double shifts to ensure enough qualified doctors are on duty.

The meeting was organised by the South Australian Salaried Medical Officers Association (SASMOA), who informed its members the government had rejected its proposal for a three-year deal with a pay increase of 2.4 per cent a year. The proposal also included initiatives to address excessive workloads, fatigue and bullying and to improve conditions for trainee doctors.

SASMOA did not know how many doctors would turn out this morning. It was aware of a threatening communiqué SA Health's CEO, Chris McGowan, had sent to its troops yesterday warning the doctors and other staff that they were not authorised to attend the scheduled stop-work meeting, threatening those who take part that they would not be paid for that time. SASMOA need not have worried. Dr McGowan's poking of the bear sparked a roll-up of public hospital doctors the likes of which has rarely been seen before. As SASMOA's chief industrial officer, Ms Bernadette Mulholland, said, and I quote:

This morning we had a one hour stop work meeting where we had an overwhelming show of support by our doctors, up to 400 doctors attended the meeting today...which is unprecedented in the time that I've been at SASMOA, but what was really clear is the disappointment and disenchantment that they have with the hierarchy of SA Health and the disrespectful attitude they have towards frontline health clinicians.

It takes a lot to get under the skin of these dedicated, committed and hardworking doctors and nurses working in our public health system. Their preference is and always has been to remain at the frontline treating sick people in the hope of returning them to wellbeing. This is particularly so during COVID-19.

These highly skilled professionals deserve a medal—not to have their union plead for a fair and reasonable EB agreement. The government has a responsibility to explain why it will not agree to SAMOA's EB proposal. It needs to explain why it is only willing to commit to a short, some might say insulting, agreement expiring in December next year, with only a 1.5 per cent pay increase. It has been said the current deal being offered by the state government is an insult to dedicated, frontline public health doctors. It is very, very difficult to disagree with that wrap-up.

Just as critically, there is growing concern that public hospital doctors will abandon the public health system in preference for the better remunerated private sector if the government continues to treat them so poorly, and who could blame them. But what then for our already teetering public hospital system?

COVID-19 RENTAL AFFORDABILITY

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:34): I rise to speak today about the despair and hopelessness of small business owners in the Adelaide CBD who are experiencing a massive downturn in trade as restrictions keep customers away, while their rents remain at pre-COVID levels. Many of these businesses have been forced to close because of the imbalance in earnings and outgoings and it has reached the point where something needs to be done before we lose more of our city traders.

I received an email recently from one of these struggling traders and it really hit home. Massimo Sassi, who runs a small corner shoe repair shop on Grenfell Street, wrote that he has endured the toughest time in almost 50 years of trading as he struggles against all the odds to keep his business open.

One of those genuine hardworking characters of our city, Massimo is desperate for some support after receiving a notice of eviction from his landlord, who is still charging pre-COVID rents. This came while he and the tenants of other small businesses have been denied customers because of lockdowns and a major change in the way we work. Customers who once worked in the city simply do not work there now, and it is going to take some time before trade returns.

We have all been asked to share the load in these difficult times that are nowhere near over. People's working hours have been cut, so have their wages, and many city traders have struggled to make even a greatly reduced living, or they are simply going to close altogether. Yet landlords continue to charge the same rents they were charging before the pandemic dramatically reduced city trade.

Massimo says that while he has negotiated recessions and downturns before, the COVID restrictions have created an impact like he has never seen since the store opened in 1974. He says that he and other mum and dad businesses, as he describes them, will be lost forever if they do not get some support through these tough times. We cannot let that happen. Small businesses are vital to the spirit and culture of the city. If we lose them, we will lose the colour, flavour and character that cannot be replicated by major chains alone.

Many current leases were signed before the pandemic hit, and paying pre-COVID rents is just not possible. Those stuck in long leases will simply not survive their terms of lease. We only need to take a walk down Grenfell Street, North Terrace and King William Street to see that offices are closing at an alarming rate. There is a new normal in the CBD and rents need to fall in line. Various reports suggest that trading is falling by between 25 and 50 per cent for most small businesses, and rents need to fall in line with this new normal.

This needs to happen to keep tenants above the poverty line so they continue trading. The alternative is watching the CBD become a ghost town. Landlords are issuing eviction notices as I speak. We need to listen to people like Massimo who are on the ground and can see what is happening. He has spent 47 years in that small business. He works with his wife and his son. His son was going to take over the business when Massimo retires, but his son is now reassessing his future. He fears that these eviction notices and the lack of financial relief will drive traders into bankruptcy, cause severe mental health issues and could even lead to suicides.

We have a responsibility to the traders who have kept the Adelaide CBD a vibrant place to work and shop and to the city itself to make sure we do not lose these traders forever. If you have ever dropped into Massimo's wonderful little corner store to get shoes repaired, keys cut or just for a shop and a chat, you will understand why retaining this personal service is so vital.

Landlords, of course, will argue that they have their costs as well. In some cases, that is true, although at the moment most of them are not sharing the cost of this pandemic. That is being met full on by the traders, who are continuing to pay pre-COVID rents, at least until they cannot pay any longer and shut up shop.

I call upon this parliament to take a bipartisan approach to the dire situation and provide some relief for our city traders. I ask that we subsidise their rents until the time comes when their trade returns to something like it was a couple of years ago, or at least until they can renegotiate new leases with their landlords, who have to take some of the load.

Real people who work hard, providing quality personal service, depend on it, and so does the Adelaide city centre, which would be a poorer place without them. This government must step up to the plate, and I call upon the Treasurer to provide rent relief and introduce measures that will ensure that landlords reduce rents to those small businesses that can show that they have had a downturn in income during this pandemic.

AFL GRAND FINAL

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:39): I rise today to highlight and pay tribute to the players and coaching staff who participated in the recent AFL grand final played between Melbourne and the Western Bulldogs football clubs, who are either South Australian or developed their talents in South Australia.

Melbourne won the premiership playing an amazing second half, winning the grand final by 74 points with a score of 21.14 (140) to 10.6 (66) to close the remarkable 57-year gap since their previous premiership.

Leading the Demons to that premiership was their senior coach, Simon Goodwin. Simon is a legend of the Adelaide Football Club. He played 275 games over 14 years from 1997 to 2010. He was captain from 2008 to 2010. He won the Malcolm Blight Medal as the club's best and fairest on three occasions—in 2000, 2005 and 2006—and was selected in the All-Australian team on five occasions in 2000, 2001, 2005, 2006 and 2009. Of course, he played in Adelaide's two magnificent premierships, in 1997 and 1998.

Immediately following his playing career, Simon progressed to coaching and was an assistant coach at the Essendon Football Club for four years from 2011 to 2014. It was then that the move to the Melbourne Football Club eventuated with Simon's appointment as assistant coach to Paul Roos and his anointing as the heir apparent as senior coach.

After two years as assistant, from 2015 to 2016, he was appointed senior coach from 2017 and has overseen the progression and development of Melbourne to the now premiership titleholder. A fantastic grounding in South Australia to now holding the highest honour in Australian football can only be described as an outstanding achievement and a reflection of Simon's talents and professionalism. Simon was inducted into the AFL Hall of Fame in 2017.

Supporting Simon are other coaches with South Australian heritage in various forms. Troy Chaplin, who is the backline coach and has been an assistant coach since the 2017 season, played 215 AFL games commencing with Port Adelaide from 2004 until 2012 where he played 140 games that included the 2004 premiership.

Alan Richardson is the general manager of AFL football performance at the Melbourne Football Club. He had a stellar playing and coaching career, not the least being an assistant coach at Port Adelaide supporting current coach Ken Hinkley. Finally, there is the indomitable Mark Williams—a member of Port Adelaide's Hall of Fame and part of a family tradition that astounds the football community. A legend of the AFL, he was recruited to Melbourne at the end of 2020 as head of development, primarily working with younger players to ensure they reach the highest level and realise potential.

What can be said about Mark Williams after 40 years as a player and coach that includes 380 games in both the AFL and SANFL across multiple clubs, 12 years as senior coach of Port Adelaide that includes the 2004 premiership, and assistant coaching roles at Greater Western Sydney, Richmond and now Melbourne. He is a passionate mentor and communicator, who I am sure played a significant role in Melbourne's success in 2021.

In terms of key players in the grand final, there were a number who either came from South Australia or played in South Australia. Melbourne's Harrison Petty grew up playing for Wudinna United, Rostrevor College and ultimately Norwood. The exciting Kysaiah Pickett played for Port District, Prince Alfred College and then Woodville West Torrens before being drafted to Melbourne in 2019. Alex Neal-Bullen played for Plympton and then Glenelg before being recruited by Melbourne in the 2014 AFL draft.

Tom Sparrow played for Bridgewater-Callington and South Adelaide and transferred to Melbourne in the 2018 AFL draft. Jake Lever has played a total of 117 AFL games, learning his craft with the Adelaide Football Club over 56 games before seeking a transfer to Melbourne at the end of the 2017 season where he has become a critical defender.

The Western Bulldogs had three players on grand final day who worked their way through to the AFL via South Australia—most notably Caleb Daniel who played for Edwardstown and South Adelaide and debuted for the Bulldogs in 2015. Caleb is the smallest player in the AFL and had a remarkable game in the grand final. Bailey Williams played for Brighton Districts and Old Scholars, and Glenelg, and joined the Western Bulldogs in 2015 while Alex Keath was traded to the Bulldogs from Adelaide at the end of 2019.

There were eight of 44 players on grand final day from South Australia or who had played in South Australia. Those players and coaching staff bear the standard of football in South Australia. It clearly marks the SANFL as the best state league in the nation.

In closing, it would be remiss of me not to acclaim Ollie Wines from Port Adelaide in securing the Brownlow Medal and Travis Boak, also from Port Adelaide, for winning the AFL's Jim Stynes Community Leadership Award for his decade-long support of individuals and families at the Childhood Cancer Association.

ELECTRIC VEHICLES

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:44): I rise to speak about the possibility of electric vehicle production returning vehicle manufacturing to South Australia. Senator Rex Patrick's strong advocacy was instrumental in ACE Electric Vehicles Group securing a \$5 million grant in the 2020-21 federal budget for (1) a South Australian advanced manufacturing facility to facilitate manufacturing and assembly of electric vehicles and (2) a bidirectional vehicle-to-grid trial to examine the concept and operation of systems which support solar home charging, grid services and virtual storage infrastructure.

I understand that stage 1 of the ACE EV Group project planning is underway with this \$5 million grant. The bidirectional vehicle to grid will not only support energy trading opportunities that lower home energy costs and vehicle running costs but the virtual power plants and the multiuse of the EV batteries can contribute to grid resilience, home energy security during blackouts and mobile energy management as a direct power source for tools and other off-grid applications.

Parliament needs to be careful that these opportunities are not killed off in reviewing legislation that allows disconnection of small users from the grid in the name of grid management. Rather than following a path dictated by major market operators and generators, the grid needs to be designed and developed to allow for the viable financial development of these local options.

South Australia is in the box position, because of the high level of rooftop solar and renewables, to do the forward supportive thinking for grid management when it comes to encouraging EVs as virtual power plants and indeed the use of these economics to encourage transition to EVs. Just as easily, a lazy grid management strategy could be rolled out that disincentivises the concept of local virtual power plants by not rewarding their use.

I would argue that the development of a grid management system that encourages virtual power plants is more important for EV take-up than sterile discussions about NSW and Victoria models, the disincentive of road user charges and the positive effects of direct payments to the financially privileged to take up EVs, paid for by those who cannot afford the new technology at this stage. The ACE EV Group particularly point to the importance of mobility electrification and mobile energy, noting that it will be transformative in our society, spawning new industries, and drawing an analogy with mobile phones.

The next stages planned by ACE EV Group is the location of their head office and locating and establishing a manufacturing hub. The ACE EV Group indicate the benefits from their forward plans to be in the order of 1,400 jobs by 2025, with a further 12,000 indirect jobs, and the production of 55,000 units and 64,000 battery storage modules, with 70 per cent for export and 30 per cent for domestic fleet markets, generating \$1.37 billion revenue. Overseas partners of ACE EV have already built two plants, so the Australian plant would be the third. The manufacturing process uses moulds, plastic, carbon fibre and gluing.

The ACE electric vehicles are a light utility vehicle with limited competition from the major vehicle makers converting from traditional petrol vehicles. Other players out of China and India tend to produce low quality product, lacking the sophisticated engineering and technology of ACE. I am not in a position to check and evaluate the veracity of the ACE EV Group project claims, but the company has obtained funding from the federal government.

I am concerned about the extent to which the South Australian government has determined its position and assisted the company over the last several months. I have been in contact with the company since 20 August this year, asked questions of several ministers and tried to find out what the government is doing. I am concerned that there has been uncoordinated and inconsistent follow-up that will result in a potential project of real significance being lost to South Australia.

STATE ELECTION

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:49): There is an election next year. I am sure that has not escaped anyone's attention here, and it certainly has not escaped anyone's attention out there beyond these walls.

It is becoming increasingly clear that Grant Stevens and Nicola Spurrer have done a good job leading us through the crisis, but we are now coming to the stage where real leadership is required, and we have a Premier who just has the wrong priorities. In truth, we have seen these wrong priorities on display even during the lead-up to the crisis. We had a failure to address ramping, we had the cutting of hundreds of health staff and nurses, and we also had the proposed privatisation of SA Pathology.

Indeed, as recently as this budget we saw the Premier, Steven Marshall, prioritising a \$662 million basketball stadium that nobody asked for and that nobody particularly wants. It is not because South Australia hates stadiums, it is just because everyone, apart from the Premier it seems, realises that right now there are more pressing concerns: ramping, doctors on strike, a housing and homelessness crisis, GP clinics closing in regional areas, not to mention the loss of \$90 billion and thousands of defence jobs that were scrapped.

The question is here. It has arrived in the minds of many, both in this place and outside of here: what has Steven Marshall been doing? Let us have a look at that. He has been taking the regional out of regional health, he has been taking the human out of human services, he has been taking the public out of public transport, he has even now managed to take the Liberal out of the Liberal Party.

South Australians know we do not need a leader who says, 'I'm not aware of that. I don't have those details,' when confronted with real, honest to God problems like ramping, palliative care,

or the fact that you have just lost your job. Does anyone think taking a hands-off approach to hands-on problems is actually working? I do not believe, the Labor Party does not believe, and increasingly members of the Liberal Party do not believe, that Steven Marshall is strong enough to fight an internal factional war against members of his own party and battle the health crisis.

The Labor Party stands ready. We stand united. However, in truth, you need more than just being united as a team. You need values and you need policies. We in Labor understand that. Instead of just passing SA off as a great place to live, we need a government that prioritises keeping it that way.

In less than six months, South Australians can choose a fresh and united team that is willing and able to deliver stable government, that is united on bringing our trains and trams back into public hands, that is united on promoting jobs that make it here and make it well—not cutting, privatising or attacking industries like we have seen in health, local government and defence.

We are united on promoting solutions like hydrogen for the betterment not only of the environment but also to make us a powerhouse for future jobs. We are united on solving the ramping crisis, with a commitment of \$600 million already promised to assist that, including \$100 million for regional health. We are united behind a leader we actually like, whose company we enjoy, who we feel understands the problems facing South Australia.

In the lead-up to the March election I am genuinely excited about the vision that Labor has already commenced laying out for the future of our state. I look forward to the election and I know that those of us on this side in the Labor Party do as well. I think South Australians are gagging for it. We are ready for the next election. We are ready to deliver a fair go for South Australians. Bring it on.

Bills

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (STEALTHING) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:55): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:55): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the Criminal Law Consolidation (Stealthing) Amendment Bill 2021. If you had asked me back in January what stealthing was, I would have had no idea. I had to Google the term when I came across it. For those of you who are still unsure, you could easily be forgiven for not knowing what the term relates to, at least not by name.

Stealthing is the contemporary term for the non-consensual removal of a condom during sex when consent has only been given for sex with a condom. This bill contains a relatively simple amendment to division 11 section 46 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to expand the list of factors which can negate consent to include non-consensual condom removal. Section 46 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act states:

- (1) In this section—
'sexual activity' includes sexual intercourse.
- (2) For the purposes of this Division, a person consents to sexual activity if the person freely and voluntarily agrees to the sexual activity.
- (3) Without limiting subsection (2), a person is taken not to freely and voluntarily agree to sexual activity if—
 - (a) the person agrees because of—
 - (i) the application of force or an express or implied threat of the application of force or a fear of the application of force to the person or to some other person; or

- (ii) an express or implied threat to degrade, humiliate, disgrace or harass the person or some other person; or
- (b) the person is unlawfully detained at the time of the activity; or
- (c) the activity occurs while the person is asleep or unconscious; or
- (d) the activity occurs while the person is intoxicated (whether by alcohol or any other substance or combination of substances) to the point of being incapable of freely and voluntarily agreeing to the activity; or
- (e) the activity occurs while the person is affected by a physical, mental or intellectual condition or impairment such that the person is incapable of freely and voluntarily agreeing; or
- (f) the person is unable to understand the nature of the activity; or
- (g) the person agrees to engage in the activity with a person under a mistaken belief as to the identity of the person; or
- (h) the person is mistaken about the nature of the activity.

There is then an example in relation to one of those activities. It is my proposal that we include an additional factor to the list of things that can negate consent, to state:

the person agrees to engage in the activity because of a misrepresentation by the other person about the use of a condom.

Without consent to a sexual activity the act can constitute rape or sexual manipulation, with a penalty range from 10 years to life imprisonment: 10 years applying to the act of sexual manipulation and a maximum of life imprisonment to the offence of rape. Of those two offences it is predominantly the act of rape where consent becomes an issue and where stealthing is also prevalent.

We have been consulting on this bill for a good part of the year and have spoken with a broad range of stakeholders, from public health experts to victims. As I said at the outset, if I had not come across a documentary on stealthing sometime earlier in the year and thought, 'I don't know what this is, let's google what stealthing is, first of all,' and then subsequently watched that documentary, I would not have known how prevalent the practice is.

Since then, we have continued to have stakeholder engagement. I was pleased to see only last week the ACT became the first Australian jurisdiction to criminalise stealthing. It joins a growing number of jurisdictions around the world to legislate against this disturbing yet very common practice. Earlier this year, a New Zealand man was convicted for the rape of a sex worker after removing a condom not only once but twice, despite the victim making it abundantly clear the sex was not consensual without a condom. He was sentenced to three years and nine months in prison. I think more recently we have heard of California having moved down the path of criminalising the practice of stealthing, and they are amongst a group of growing jurisdictions that are moving this way.

The bill makes it clear in no uncertain terms that consent for one form of sexual activity, that being sex with a condom, is not automatic consent for all forms of sexual activity, namely, sex without a condom. It is my hope this bill changes the lens through which men in particular view this behaviour, because data collected by the Melbourne Sexual Health Centre in 2018 shows just how common the vile act of stealthing really is.

Of the more than 2,200 women and men aged 18 and over who presented to the clinic and agreed to participate in the Monash study, 32 per cent of women and 19 per cent of men reported being stealthed at least once in the past. That is about one in every three women and one in every five men.

While in that particular study at least, sex workers represented a big cohort of female victims, this is not a contemporary phenomenon unique to sex work. The evidence shows stealthing is prevalent in modern dating. Of course, stealthing does not just happen to women either; 67 per cent of male respondents to the Monash study reported experiencing stealthing after meeting their sexual partners online on dating forums, including Grindr and Tinder. Quite frankly, though, it is irrelevant whether you are on a date, whether you are working, whatever the case may be, I think we can all agree stealthing is a repugnant and appalling thing to do to any person.

During the course of consulting on the bill, I was deeply repulsed to learn that Adelaide appears to have at least one very notorious serial stealthier. I have spoken to two women in the last 24 hours who reported being stealthed by the same man. They have given me detailed accounts of what happened to them and to people they know by the same perpetrator. He targets unsuspecting new sex workers. It has apparently become his modus operandi for years. Even though this is widely known, the brothel doors that he frequents have continued to remain open to him, and workers are still offered to him. He preys on those workers because of the lack of some other legislation that we have in this jurisdiction, and I will get to that soon.

One of those victims has detailed the following. She has previously provided this to parliament, but yesterday when I spoke to her again she provided me with a fresh copy of this material. It reads:

Lives around Westlakes. Often gets SWs (sex workers) to visit his home. He saw me personally in 2016 when I was new. He came to see me in a CBD hotel—it would have been in 2016/17. He is an older man but physically fit and strong—he showed me his biceps and asked me to arm wrestle him. It was done in a nonchalant way but in hindsight it was basically a way of displaying dominance and making you realise he could overpower you.

Once we were having sex he moved me into a position where he was standing behind me, and I could feel him fiddling with his penis. He is obviously adept at taking the condom off without people noticing. In fact, in that position you can't see what he is doing. I just had an inkling that his behaviour felt a bit off, and after a few minutes reached back and felt that he didn't have a condom on. He acted surprised, but I could tell that he had done it on purpose. I told him I wasn't on any birth control, and that he probably didn't want to be a father and pay child support at his age, and that seemed to rattle him enough.

It was long enough ago that I can't remember any other details. When I later started discussing this, as I got to know other sex workers, it became evident that Mark is well known to book private and brothel workers, and during the booking stealths the condom off. Fortunately, I caught him out before he ejaculated, but many workers have not been so lucky. I only personally know about 15 Adelaide sex workers, and he has stealthed—taken the condom off without the worker's consent or knowledge—at least 10 or 12 of them. I cannot imagine how many others I don't know that he has done this to.

When speaking to this person, I said to her, 'What did you think?', and she said to me, 'It was rape, 100 per cent.' She went to the police, only to be told there was nothing she could do.

At least two of the woman I have spoken to said that this particular client has been stealthing for years, he has a reputation for preying on young workers in particular, and he banks on the fact that none of them will complain or that nothing will happen as a result. Of course, the lack of a regulated sex industry in this jurisdiction has made it all the more difficult for those sex workers to make a complaint and for that complaint to be followed through, without facing the full force of the law themselves.

Even if stealthing were explicitly dealt with in our laws, the reluctance to come forward continues to exist because of their line of work. Until then, they rely on word of mouth from other workers, they rely on sites like Ugly Mugs—a violence prevention program that supports sex workers and groups like SIN—to know which perpetrators to keep away from. Still, those I have spoken to and those I have consulted with say that this is a very welcome move, because it is one step closer to providing them with a safe working environment.

I do not need to explain why I am outlining sex workers at the outset of this debate, because we know that in all likelihood they would be amongst the highest proportion of people who are impacted by it without any recourse. Going to the police is not an option for those workers, like it would be for one of us who encounters this sort of situation and then makes a complaint to police. They have other limitations that prevent them from doing the same. Like we heard from this victim, she felt strongly enough about this to go to the police, only to be told, 'There is nothing we can do to help you.'

So with stealthing explicitly listed as a factor to negate consent as part of this bill, there will be something they can do confidently if the bill passes, but of course there are other factors that this chamber has to consider in terms of a regulated sex industry in order for them to feel 100 per cent safe about pursuing any perpetrator of this sort of crime.

So, Mark from West Lakes, you are on notice. This is one piece of legislation that will give victims the confidence to come forward, because we know a majority have suffered in silence in the

past. Only 1 per cent of victims reported to the Monash University study that they have made a police complaint. Even victims themselves who do not work in the sex work industry specifically are left confused or helpless, and it is time we set the record straight.

Many people I have spoken to have been just as horrified as I have and inevitably ask, 'Why do men stealth?' In my view, the sense of entitlement and the prioritisation of their own sexual gratification, above the health and wellbeing of their sexual partner, can be the only reason. In their own warped mind, maybe they think it is some sort of sick game or an act of degradation. Perhaps these men lie to themselves, tell themselves that what they are doing does not make them a criminal or a rapist, but in reality it is a selfish, harmful and disgusting act and it is time we spell it out for them.

The very existence of this law, I think, will set a significant threshold, a clear line in the sand, and if you cross that line, you are committing a very serious crime. If you cross the line, you will face the potential charge of rape and the maximum imprisonment of life. Let us make it abundantly clear to all those men who attempt to justify in their head that this is not a big deal, because as we know rape does not have to be a forceful or violent act for it to constitute rape.

Stealth is a vulgar practice with potentially serious consequences for the victim, both physical and psychological. From a public health perspective the consequences can include the possibility of contracting a sexually transmitted infection, such as HIV, or an unwanted pregnancy. From a mental health perspective the consequences can include anything from anxiety to depression to PTSD.

The Monash study I have referred to highlighted that many victims are left confused as to whether they are actually the victim of a sexual assault, and that is no different from any of the other consent factors that apply. I think we would all recall the same sorts of arguments applying in relation to someone who might have been under the influence of drugs, in relation to someone who might have been under the influence of alcohol, in relation to someone who might have been passed out, in relation to someone who might just be asleep, in relation to anyone who does not have capacity. That is at the heart of the issue of consent.

Our laws are very clear as to where consent is negated and it is important that we broaden that definition of consent to ensure that there is no blur when it comes to the practice of stealth. We have to send a strong and clear message to the community that if you commit this, you could go to prison, potentially for life. I genuinely hope that this will send a strong message to the community, that it will influence consent education in our schools, that it will make men stop and think the next time they decide stealth is not a big deal, because it is a violation of a person's dignity and their autonomy. It is a risk to a person's health and to their safety.

Anyone practising law, and I think anyone in the wider community, will tell you that rape is already an extraordinarily complex area of the law and the issue of consent usually features front and centre in those complexities, so we need to be doing our level best to remove barriers and make what is an extraordinarily complex area of law easier for our courts to interpret. The addition of stealth to our consent provisions does just that.

I do not need to remind any of you how extraordinarily difficult and indeed how extraordinarily brave it is for a victim to pursue a rape allegation in the first instance. Historically, like all sexual offending crimes, victims are put on trial. That has not changed enough in recent years. We know this even through the reluctance of people to come forward and see a complaint through to prosecution, but there is always a victim left at the end, whether they go through that process or not.

These laws are in many ways intended to encourage people to come forward and make those complaints, because when they do not come forward and make those complaints we allow people like Mark from the western suburbs to continue to frequent brothels or visit sex workers or go online to dating websites and find young people, older people—whatever the case may be—to engage in sexual intercourse with and feel the sense of entitlement that he does to stealth them at the same time.

In my mind, this is not different in terms of the education campaign that applies to sexting. I think we can all think back to a very recent time when revenge porn was the thing of the day, when people would engage in the practice of sending photos via social media or via their phones, disseminating that material to others without any legal repercussions.

It took making that a criminal offence, it took an education campaign for our community, or members of our community, to finally appreciate that that practice is not acceptable, that it does not meet current day community expectations and that if you take part in that practice then you will be subject to the full force of the law. This is no different. All we are doing is expanding those provisions that are already clear in relation to when consent will be negated. With those words, I commend this bill to the chamber.

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

Motions

CITY OF WHYALLA BY-LAWS

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

That by-law No. 7 of the City of Whyalla concerning cats, made under the Local Government Act 1999 on 16 August 2021 and laid on the table of this council on 7 September 2021, be disallowed.

For the benefit of members, there are three related matters that I intend to speak to once, and I will do that now. There is also an item listed at No. 50 on the *Notice Paper* which relates to the City of Campbelltown cat by-laws. I do not intend to speak on each of these individually so I will wrap it up in the one go, much to the delight of the Hon. Terry Stephens. At the outset, I will admit also that I am not much of a cat person. In fact, I am allergic to them. Yes, they give me terrible hives and make me extraordinarily uncomfortable and I do not actually really like them. I am very much a dog person.

An honourable member: Fair call.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Yes, it is a fair call. But you would not know that from the number of motions I put up about cats in this place. I do so because it has nothing to do with whether you like cats or you do not like cats, or you think cats should be contained or you think cats should be treated like dogs. It is because the current process that we have in relation to dealing with cats and their confinement is not working.

The growing number of by-laws that the Legislative Review Committee receives and that we have to consider in terms of a disallowance is evidence of that. I am not passing any judgement on any of the measures contained in any of these by-laws. That is not the point of these disallowances. The point of the motion is to highlight the very real need for a statewide approach to this issue rather than the ad hoc and what has become a very inconsistent approach that we currently have.

The point of the motion is to highlight that if we do nothing, as we have done for a number of years, then we will continue to be forced to spend our time before the Legislative Review Committee hearing from councils about the merits of their by-laws compared to other councils and their by-laws. It is simply not efficient, and I have learned that it is also very divisive because councils are adopting different models. There is no consistency between those models. Everyone thinks they have the best model, and inevitably there is something in their model that is the subject of contention.

The RSPCA's main concern at present is the state's individual council by-law approach to cat management, which it deems as inefficient and ineffective. They say:

- i. Over 36 council by-laws are in existence, but most are quite different and result in a highly inconsistent cat management strategy in SA.
- ii. For any by-law to be effective, the Dog and Cat Management Act must be revised to allow for the seizure and detention of identified cats wandering at large. Until this happens any by-laws are stop gap measures at best that work around this deficiency and will not lead to effective control of the state's cat overpopulation.
- iii. Effective cat management is a complex issue and most councils in developing their by-laws do not have the resources nor expertise to fully research and develop appropriate legislation. This is clearly evidenced with the serious animal welfare concerns in the Campbelltown Council by-law and their replication by Gawler council.
- iv. Ratepayers are surely unnecessarily funding legal costs across multiple councils in developing these sub-standard bylaws.

- v. The Dog and Cat Management Act will be reviewed properly in 2022 with cat management as a priority. It is now time to end the ongoing proliferation of inconsistent cat by-laws and wait for a professionally developed state wide legislative framework to be implemented.

I really do not think that we need to say much more than that. I think the RSPCA has covered it quite well.

One of the by-laws that I deal with is the Campbelltown council by-law and it too acknowledges, in its own evidence, that there is currently a legislative vacuum to assist in achieving and executing the LGA and RSPCA's plans for effective control of domestic cats and that council, like many, feels a responsibility to fill the void to better support its community and their pets. Of course, in so doing the council is only adding to the inconsistent manner in which cats are dealt with by local governments and only a statewide approach will address this issue.

I think everyone is familiar with this issue. I think everyone has been lobbied by the RSPCA, probably by the LGA, probably by people in their communities. There are issues around adjoining council areas. If I live on one side of the road I will be covered by one set of laws, if I live on the other side I will be covered by another set. I am sure the Hon. Nicola Centofanti will speak to this from her own experience in terms of issues of tethering and containment, what is deemed dangerous, what is not dangerous. Is tethering any more dangerous than containing a cat in a vehicle? There are all sorts of considerations. They are all very contentious and what we know is that we need to address this once and for all.

There is a review that is on the table. I think what we need to do is pause any more by-laws—pardon the pun—but pause the passage of any more by-laws and wait for that review until we can have a statewide approach. I sincerely hope that members from all sides will agree with that position and that we can deal with this once and for all.

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

DISTRICT COUNCIL OF COOBER PEDY BY-LAWS

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

That by-law No. 7 of the District Council of Coober Pedy concerning cats, made under the Local Government Act 1999 and the Dog and Cat Management Act 1995 on 25 May 2021 and laid on the table of this council on 23 June 2021, be disallowed.

I refer members to the contribution I have just made.

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

CITY OF MARION BY-LAWS

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:23): I move:

That by-law No. 7 of the City of Marion concerning cats, made under the Local Government Act 1999 and the Dog and Cat Management Act 1995 on 10 August 2021 and laid on the table of this council on 7 September 2021, be disallowed.

I refer members to the comments I have just made in relation to the previous by-law.

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

ENTERTAINMENT INDUSTRY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:23): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the profound impact COVID-19 has had and will continue to have on the entertainment industry;
2. Recognises the work and unique positions of Five Four Entertainment, Plus One Co., and Lion Arts Factory as a collective of some of South Australia's most notable music and event businesses;
3. Notes that prior to COVID-19 these businesses collectively delivered to South Australia 24 full-time equivalent staff, \$6 million in tourism impact, and a total yearly economic impact of \$35 million;

4. Recognises that if Five Four Entertainment and the Lion Arts Factory are allowed to fail it will come at not just a significant economic cost, but at a great cultural cost as well, particularly for younger South Australians;
5. Calls on the Marshall Liberal government to grant such vital businesses in South Australia's entertainment industry funding so that they can continue to operate; and
6. Calls on the Marshall Liberal government to provide certainty and clarity regarding a lease extension for Lion Arts Factory.

I rise today to speak in strong support of Five Four Entertainment, Plus One Co., and Lion Arts Factory, a collective of unique and creative South Australian businesses that bring so much rich variety to our music and events scene.

We all know that the pandemic has had a serious and profound effect on the arts industry around the world, in Australia and particularly in this state. We have seen devastating effects in this state. Despite us being the Festival State, things sure are not looking particularly festive for the entertainment industry. We are at serious risk of losing some of our vital arts infrastructure, businesses and talent.

Five Four Entertainment is predominantly a festival and concert promoter that is responsible for delivering two of the state's major music festivals—that is, the Spin Off Festival and St Jerome's Laneway Festival. The Lion Arts Factory is an award-winning 600-capacity music venue located on North Terrace, Adelaide, just a few blocks from here. Plus One Co., is a club night promoter responsible for some of the country's most well-known touring club nights, operating across Australia, New Zealand and Japan.

Prior to COVID, these businesses collectively delivered to South Australia 24 full-time equivalent staff, \$35 million in yearly economic impact and a tourism impact of some \$6 million per annum. Since COVID hit, and particularly from March 2020, these businesses have been severely affected, with trading levels plummeting to between 0 and 10 per cent of their normal operations over the last 18 or so months.

During this really difficult time, these businesses have tried everything. They have pivoted so much they should be prima ballerinas. Five Four, in fact, in this time, however, did host the country's first COVID-safe music festival, Summer Sounds Festival. Certainly, I attended, back in January-February 2021, and I hope other members of this parliament did to understand the great work that these organisations do. That was presented alongside Groove Events and Secret Sounds. Despite being publicly hailed as a success outside the organisation and selling some 30,000 tickets, this still did not prove to be financially viable as a business model.

Further, the Lion Arts Factory have tried every format of event and capacity they can think of under the health rules to keep their business running—that is, from reduced club nights and gigs, attempting to run the venue at a 45 per cent capacity, to quiz nights and even an indoor plant market. But without some serious support, all this effort will still not be enough. No matter how many such events and formats were trialled, these businesses simply cannot be sustainable with the current level of state-based health restrictions—and we understand why they are there—and the capacities and the level of government funding available.

At this moment in time, two of these businesses, Five Four Entertainment and Lion Arts Factory, are six months or less away from bankruptcy and closing. Plus One Co., has managed to survive by running events in other states that have more favourable health restrictions, such as WA, Tasmania and Queensland.

To make matters harder, however, the Lion Arts Factory's lease, which is a government lease, is set to expire in December this year. They had a three-year lease, and little did we know that almost two years of that would be consumed by COVID. They made a major investment when they took on that three-year lease, but nobody could have foreseen what was to happen in terms of the impact on this industry. So far, inexplicably, they have not had any answers from our Marshall Liberal government regarding their requested lease extension to give them certainty, despite having discussion after discussion with staff at the Department of the Premier and Cabinet over the past 18 months.

The lease for that building was first secured in late 2018, and there was a verbal understanding with Arts SA at that time that if over the three-year period of that lease the venture was a success, additional leases were likely. Significant renovations of the building were then undertaken in good faith, and they proceeded to host over 150 live music events in 2019. I fondly remember the Archie Roach gig that was put on in that venue, amongst many others.

The Factory's first and only year of full trade was that 2019 year, with some 150 or so live music events, clearly a major contributor to the scene in South Australia. Yet following this success they had to close for the majority of 2020 due to the COVID-19 restrictions, and the small amount of trade that they have been able to undertake since has not been in a manner that is viable or sustainable for their business. Even since early this year (2021), when restrictions have somewhat lifted, they have only been able to trade at best between 25 per cent and 50 per cent of capacity.

Despite this, they are required to pay full rent, full tote odds, by the Marshall Liberal government, even though they are incurring all their usual fixed costs without being able to operate at a capacity to meet those costs. I have seen—in fact I have received, after reaching out on behalf of Five Four Entertainment—the lacklustre correspondence received from the Premier in his capacity as the Minister for Arts and, of course, the correspondence from Minister Pisoni. That response has been deeply disheartening, failing to address their concerns and telling these businesses to engage with the Music Development Office to try to get support.

The funding available from the Music Development Office is minuscule compared to the funding needed to get this set of iconic music businesses back on their feet. Indeed, Five Four Entertainment followed up with the Music Development Office and were informed that, in fact, no additional funding is being made available at this time. What are we supposed to do? Let this significant music and events business go under after all the joy and benefits, the positive economic impacts, they have brought to our state?

I think this council, and our community, knows better than the Marshall government. That is why some 11,475 people have currently signed a petition—which is on [change.org](https://www.change.org)—that calls for support for these businesses to continue into the future and not be lost to the South Australian community. As the landlord of these businesses, simply giving them some relief on their rent would be a small token that would go a long way.

The audience for these events is a particular youth audience. They are engaged and passionate about live music in our state, and their needs are not met by other companies; they are not met by the WOMADelaides and the other festivals. To cut off these particular businesses that support younger South Australians and their interests in the music industry will be indeed to cut off entire generations and to show entire generations that this government simply does not support their interests.

These companies have fought tooth and nail to stay afloat during the pandemic. They have sunk in increasingly, trying to pivot, trying to stay afloat, without even the courtesy from the Marshall government of letting them know whether or not their lease will be extended. There is enormous personal investment in these businesses.

What I want to draw council's attention to is the fact that in other states support for the music and entertainment industry has been far different. In New South Wales, music industry specific funding of some \$75 million has been made available, and there are currently regular weekly payments of significant amounts to businesses and staff during their extended lockdown. In Victoria, there is music industry specific funding of some \$20 million plus a package that was announced recently to pay regular weekly payments of significant amounts to businesses and staff during their extended lockdown.

In WA, which of course has not had the same restrictions, there has been music industry specific funding of some \$15 million, plus restrictions on music venues and festivals has been minor compared to what we have had here. The sector there is currently trading at 100 per cent capacity and without restrictions on dancing. In Queensland there is music industry specific funding of some \$10 million, plus restrictions relating to capacity, dancing and festivals are far more favourable than those we see in South Australia.

In South Australia we have had music industry specific funding of \$3 million, which is an absolute pittance in terms of what is needed and what is reflected around the rest of the country. I cannot see how we can proudly call ourselves the Festival State when we are investing—foolishly, I think—in festivals that seemingly no-one much wishes to attend, and letting those that have been proven successes—the Laneways Festivals are one of the most outstanding youth-oriented music festivals in our nation—fail, while we throw good money after bad with things like the Bloom experiment.

I urge the council to support this motion to show that we stand with those members of the community, those younger South Australians in particular, or those younger minded South Australians, in that these sort of music industry businesses and events are the ones we wish to see continue to flourish in South Australia, as they did before the pandemic. These talents, this expertise, this part of the industry is too important not to throw that investment in now before they are lost to us forever.

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

WORLD KANGAROO DAY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:35): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes that 24 October is World Kangaroo Day, celebrating kangaroos and raising awareness about the largest commercial slaughter of land-based wildlife in the world;
2. Acknowledges that loss of habitat, bushfires, drought, predators, legal and illegal hunting, car accidents, fences, and animal cruelty are driving South Australian populations of kangaroos to near extinction; and
3. Recognises that kangaroos cannot be humanely farmed, and that the commercial kangaroo industry relies on hunting wild kangaroos which has significant health and animal welfare concerns.

This motion notes that 24 October, in just a few short weeks, is World Kangaroo Day, and that it celebrates kangaroos and raises awareness about the largest commercial slaughter of land-based wildlife in the world.

This motion acknowledges the loss of habitat, bushfires, drought, predators, legal and illegal hunting, car accidents, fences and animal cruelty that is driving South Australian populations of kangaroos to near extinction. It recognises that kangaroos cannot be humanely farmed and that commercial kangaroo industries rely on hunting wild kangaroos, and that this has not just significant health concerns but animal welfare concerns.

As World Kangaroo Day, 24 October should be a day when we are celebrating our iconic Australian species of kangaroos, but it is not such a happy day for our kangaroos in South Australia at the moment. Through World Kangaroo Day we aim to celebrate kangaroos and raise awareness about the issues raised in this motion. I do not know that many people really know that the kangaroo meat they eat is hunted—hunted, not farmed—in a way that cannot be done humanely. They are hunted in the wild for their meat and skins, with shooters going out, usually at night, in rural communities, and joeys of female kangaroos are either bludgeoned to death or left to die from starvation, exposure and predation. The dependent young are considered 'waste' by the kangaroo industry.

Dead kangaroos are loaded into the back of trucks with zero refrigeration and with quite inadequate hygiene conditions. They are eventually transported back and processed for their meat and skins. The justification for this is industry claims that it is sustainable. That justification is flimsy at best. Kangaroos are often portrayed as pests, but the numbers simply do not support this view. I would point out, and I will expand on this later, that current methods for counting kangaroos in South Australia are, in fact, farcical.

Let me be clear: kangaroos are disappearing. Between 2018 and 2019, red kangaroo numbers declined by between 71 per cent and 82 per cent in parts of South Australia. Most of South Australia's kangaroo populations can be considered at risk of extinction. It is not an issue unique to South Australia. In New South Wales, between 2016 and 2019, grey kangaroos in one

region alone declined by 98 per cent. In another part of New South Wales, red kangaroo numbers declined by 95 per cent, and in some parts of Queensland, kangaroos have disappeared altogether.

Beyond that, it is bizarre to many that kangaroos are considered a pest and are often labelled as such when they are being blamed for damage caused by livestock. Kangaroos are soft-footed, which means they do not damage the environment, but also a kangaroo's tail and feet actually regenerate native grasses by helping to push seeds into the soil. Further, studies have shown that sheep and cattle produce substantially and consistently greater changes to native vegetation than grazing kangaroos, and kangaroos only rarely visit crops or compete with grazing sheep and cattle except for when their food is already scarce.

It is also unclear how kangaroos could breed enough to become a pest species. Kangaroos have one baby a year and a joey stays in the pouch for some 11 months. Kangaroos do not breed during droughts and 25 per cent to 35 per cent of joeys do not live to adolescence. A further 70 per cent to 75 per cent do not make it to adulthood. On top of this, kangaroos face many other threats: loss of habitat, bushfires, drought, predators and, as I said, legal and illegal hunting.

It is a myth that kangaroos are overabundant in our state. The way the department currently counts their populations simply does not stack up. Further, we know that most of South Australia's kangaroo populations are low or very low density. Red kangaroos are low or very low density in 10 out of 11 harvest zones, and western grey kangaroos are low to very low density in nine out of 14 harvest zones. More than half of South Australia's red kangaroo populations are at risk of extinction, and six out of the 14 western grey kangaroo populations are at risk of extinction.

So why is World Kangaroo Day necessary? It is time to raise awareness. Why are we killing these iconic creatures? The answers can be found in the South Australian Commercial Kangaroo Management Plan 2020-2024. The plan itself states, 'The primary goal of this plan is to ensure an ecologically sustainable harvest of kangaroos and to provide an alternative management option for reducing the damage caused by overabundant kangaroos.'

However, no study or report was produced to confirm the kangaroo damage alleged in the South Australian Commercial Kangaroo Management Plan 2020-2024. Believe me, my office has put significant effort into trying to find this evidence up until the department eventually confirmed that they did not have any specific evidence or documentation demonstrating any damage attributable to kangaroos. There is not enough data in South Australia to link kangaroo abundance directly to vegetation condition. There is simply no evidence that kangaroos need to be culled. The commercial culling of kangaroos is simply to supply a commercial industry.

The chief executive of the Department for Environment and Water, Mr John Schutz, observed that the outcomes of the commercial harvesting system are primarily driven by market demand factors domestically and internationally. There is no evidence to support the government's current position that the commercial killing of kangaroos is sustainable in South Australia.

Leading scientists conclude that kangaroo populations of less than 10 kangaroos per square kilometre should not be culled or harvested, because the population is likely to fall below the critical level. Red kangaroos and western grey kangaroos should not be killed in South Australia under any circumstances. All South Australia's red kangaroo and western grey kangaroo populations are presently less than 10 kangaroos per square kilometre, yet from conservation legislation the South Australian government runs an ecologically unsustainable commercial kangaroo industry.

The South Australian Department for Environment and Water decides how many kangaroos can be killed in each commercial subregion. That number to be killed is called a quota. The quota system adopted in South Australia uses higher percentages than what is considered sustainable by scientists. The quota system ignores changes in the environment such as drought. When kangaroo numbers decline during drought, the kill quotas become double what is scientifically sustainable. South Australia also kills twice as many female kangaroos than what is considered sustainable by scientists.

There is also the issue of how the kangaroos are killed. Many people, I would assume, like to think that these animals, if they are to be killed, are killed humanely, but unfortunately this is simply not the case. The National Code of Practice for the Humane Shooting of Kangaroos and Wallabies for Commercial Purposes requires shooters to kill adult kangaroos with a head shot to the brain.

However, shooters remove kangaroo heads and leave them in the bush. It is impossible for authorities to know whether kangaroos are killed by a head shot or neck shot, which is extremely painful and requires a second shot to ensure death.

An independent assessment of compliance with the code, carried out by Animal Liberation NSW between 2005 and 2008, identified an average of 40 per cent of kangaroos per chiller in 24 chillers throughout New South Wales and Queensland were neck shot. Neck-shot kangaroos may suffer that painful death, which is a clear transgression of the humane practices and code guidelines.

An ABC reporter spent a night with a kangaroo shooter, who came home with 16 dead kangaroos. The shooter shot 18 kangaroos but two escaped, and the shooter was unable to find the injured kangaroos. No-one knows how many kangaroos are injured and disappear into the bush to die those slow, painful deaths, and injured kangaroos are never recorded or acknowledged by the commercial industry.

This is not a healthy industry. Kangaroos are wild animals, shot in remote locations during the night, making contamination of kangaroo meat unavoidable. Kangaroo carcasses and mincemeat from South Australian meat processing plants were tested in 2002 and 2004: *E. coli* was found in 70 per cent. In minced kangaroo meat salmonella was detected in 18 per cent of those samples. Kangaroo meat contains high levels of L-carnitine, which causes the build-up of plaque in arteries, responsible for heart attacks, strokes and vascular disease.

Pets also can become sick from bacteria and pathogens found in kangaroo meat. Raw kangaroo pet mince is preserved with toxic sulphites. These sulphites cause thiamine deficiency in pets, which of course can be fatal. In recent media reports interstate we have seen those issues brought to the fore. I think most would agree that this does not paint a pretty picture, certainly not for the kangaroos and certainly not for people.

It is hard to believe that we would create an industry out of killing these iconic animals. I note that there is some confusion and concern about this practice amongst the international community, to the extent that kangaroo products are banned in such places as California. As we approach World Kangaroo Day, on 24 October, I urge all to reflect on this industry and to commit to caring for our kangaroos and not killing them.

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

Parliamentary Committees

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: KANGAROO ISLAND FACT-FINDING VISIT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (16:47): I move:

That the eighth report of the committee, on its Kangaroo Island fact-finding visit 15-16 June 2021, be noted.

Over two days in June 2021, the Natural Resources Committee conducted a fact-finding visit of Kangaroo Island. This is the committee's report of that visit. This was the committee's first field trip since the COVID-19 pandemic and the first opportunity for the committee to visit the region following the devastating 2019 and 2020 bushfires.

On this visit with me was the Presiding Member of the committee, the member for King, and fellow committee members, the member for Hammond and the Hon. Russell Wortley MLC. The member for Mawson and the Mayor of Kangaroo Island also joined the committee for part of the visit. Over those two days of the trip the committee visited a range of sites and spoke with a number of local residents, business owners and regional staff about their experiences of the 2019-20 bushfires and the recovery to date.

On one day the committee met with two local farmers, Mr Sam Mumford and Mr Dave Halloran, who played crucial roles in fighting the 2019-20 bushfires on Kangaroo Island. They offered the committee valuable insight into the fires at a local level. One of the matters raised at this meeting was the importance of keeping roadsides and fence lines clear of vegetation to prevent the spread of fire. Committee members encouraged the local residents to report their concerns by making a submission to the committee's review of the Native Vegetation Act 1991, which is presently underway.

The committee also met with Ms Shauna Black, Executive Director of Kangaroo Island Plantation Timbers Limited, who showed members the effects of the fires on the company's pine and blue gum plantations. Committee members were relieved to hear that the fires had not destroyed the timber, but had simply burnt the outside bark, leaving good quality wood inside.

On day 2, the National Parks and Wildlife Service led committee members on a tour of Flinders Chase National Park to see the damage caused by the bushfires and the recovery to date. The committee was joined by a number of National Parks and Wildlife Service staff as well as representatives from the Kangaroo Island Landscape Board and the Department of Primary Industries and Regions.

The committee was excited to see the incredible natural regeneration and revegetation throughout Flinders Chase National Park and hear how the region was rebuilding and recovering from the bushfires that burnt an estimated 96 per cent of the national park. A range of matters were discussed during the tour, including plans for the new Western Visitor Hub to replace the visitor centre destroyed in the bushfires, progress made in eradicating the feral cat and feral pig populations on the island, and the planned restoration of the popular walking trails and camping sites throughout the park.

The committee was impressed to hear that the regional staff were not only recovering from the devastation of the bushfires but were using the unique opportunities presented by the fires to their advantage. Those involved in the pest control programs were taking advantage of the reduced populations to try to completely eradicate feral species from the island.

The National Parks and Wildlife Service plans to bring back the Flinders Chase Visitor Centre, wilderness trails and camping sites better than ever before, incorporating feedback and suggestions from past visitors. The committee would like to acknowledge all the residents and regional staff who joined the committee on its two-day fact-finding visit. They were welcoming, enthusiastic and generous with their time.

Kangaroo Island has experienced an unprecedented 18 months. While still recovering from the devastating 2019-20 bushfires, the island was then forced to grapple with a global pandemic, further isolating an already isolated community at a time when support was needed the most, but the passion, hard work and dedication of the Kangaroo Island community will ensure that the island will recover from the 2019-20 bushfires to remain a repository of some of the state's finest natural resources and one of the nation's most beautiful and iconic tourist destinations.

I commend the Presiding Member of the committee, the member for King, and the other members of the committee—the member for Port Adelaide, the Hon. John Darley MLC, the member for MacKillop, the member for Hammond and the Hon. Russell Wortley MLC—for their contributions. All members have worked cooperatively on this report. Finally, I thank the parliamentary staff for their assistance. With that, I commend this report to the house.

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

JOINT COMMITTEE ON STATUTES AMENDMENT (ANIMAL WELFARE REFORMS) BILL

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

That the report of the committee be noted.

(Continued from 22 September 2021.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (16:52): I rise again to speak in support of the report to this chamber on the Hon. Tammy Franks' Statutes Amendment (Animal Welfare Reforms) Bill. In doing so, I would like to acknowledge the dedication and hard work of the Hon. Ms Franks on this issue over a number of years. I also wish to pay tribute to her advocacy for an improved legislative framework around animal welfare.

As you are well aware, Mr President, I was a veterinarian by profession prior to entering this place. Our clinic and our team often faced challenges relating to stray animals that were brought into the surgery. The inability to identify an animal is an ongoing problem for many veterinary clinics; however, I would like to acknowledge the efforts of the Dog and Cat Management Board in their role

in practically delivering the Dog and Cat Management Act that has seen a greater proportion of dogs and cats microchipped, desexed and registered.

This in itself makes the role of veterinary clinics, shelters and rescues in identifying animals and reconnecting them with their owners less arduous. However, despite these significant changes, there are still many cats and dogs that remain unidentified or are surrendered to these organisations every year.

The question is: how do we go about reducing the number of dogs and cats euthanased each year, ensuring they have a good quality of life and balancing this with sustainable outcomes? Importantly, this bill looks at a code of practice and licensing requirements for animal rescues, shelters and rehousing organisations. In doing so, it provides practical guidance for people who have a duty of care to these animals and ensures there is a standard of care within these organisations.

During the course of the committee's deliberations, we received 18 written submissions and heard evidence from 25 different witnesses. The committee worked diligently and collaboratively through these witnesses and submissions to finalise this report, which makes 21 recommendations that aim to improve the bill. As our Chairperson pointed out, the aim of the bill is to amend the Animal Welfare Act 1985 and the Dog and Cat Management Act 1995.

Primarily, it (a) seeks to reduce the number of dogs and cats needlessly euthanased by rescues and shelters; (b) creates a code of practice and licensing requirements for animal rescues, shelters and rehousing organisations; (c) inserts civil provisions to enable proactive actions to better protect the welfare of animals; and (d) creates provisions relating to transparency around the reporting of data on greyhounds in South Australia.

It is important to note that, as stakeholders pointed out, stray or lost cats and dogs fall into different categories: undomesticated or feral, unidentified but potentially owned, and identified. Further complications can arise when these three categories of cats and dogs may behave similarly in an unfamiliar environment, making it difficult for cats and dogs to be categorised by rescues or shelter workers and their suitability assessed to be rehomed.

With the aim of the bill in mind—that is, to reduce the number of animals unnecessarily killed each year—the committee reviewed the application of part 3A, section 15C(2) to unidentified dogs or cats. The committee found that part 3A applies neither to feral cats or dogs nor does it apply to community owned dogs in remote Aboriginal communities, and that further clarity should be added in the regulations. However, no amendment was required.

Submitters were strongly supportive of the bill, but raised concerns about some aspects of the bill in its current form, including a lack of clarity on some of the terms contained within the bill and that some of the terms were inconsistent between the bill, the Animal Welfare Act 1985 and the Dog and Cat Management Act 1995. This led to the committee recommending that clause 5 of the bill be amended to clarify the definition of 'owner' and provide some consistency and alignment between the Animal Welfare Act and the Dog and Cat Management Act.

There was some lengthy discussion and concern about the length of holding periods for both dogs and cats within animal rescues, shelters—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Members should respect the member on her feet.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: —and rehousing organisations. Subsequently, the committee resolved to provide further clarity and nuance to the definition of holding periods for cats and dogs and to clarify within the code of practice that animals should not be permanently sheltered with a prescribed organisation except in exceptional circumstances.

Stakeholders raised a concern around the lack of provision to mandate the requirement to develop a code of practice. Stakeholders pointed out that it was a critical provision in the bill that should be mandated, and highlighted their interest in being involved in the development of a code of practice. The committee consequently resolved to include the requirement that the minister develop a code of practice consistent with stakeholders' requests.

Concerns were raised about the amount of the licensing fee and the ability for the regulators to carry out inspections, but most submitters were supportive of licensing arrangements for animal rescues, shelters and rehoming organisations. Regarding provisions for interim and intervention orders to protect animals, stakeholders, and particularly the regulators, were very supportive of civil provisions to proactively enable the better protection of the welfare of animals.

On methods of euthanasia, the committee was keen to ensure that the provision did not constrain veterinarians from carrying out the most appropriate practices when euthanasing animals and acknowledged that vets were best placed to determine the most appropriate way to euthanase an animal. The committee also recommended amending clause 16, section 15L(3)(a), because it felt the term 'experiencing irremediable physical or mental suffering' was too restricted to ensure that euthanasia remains an option available to vets faced with animals that they consider cannot be rehomed.

The committee also acknowledged the challenges that rural and remote communities often face due to the tyranny of distance and lack of resources. Consequently, the committee resolved to review clause 18 of the bill to provide some flexibility in allowing inspectors in regional and remote areas to humanely kill dogs and cats whilst in the process of detaining such animals but keeping the intent that only vets carry out euthanasia once an animal has been detained.

The committee also resolved to review clause 19 of the bill to ensure that, consistent with the original intent of the bill, officers authorised in accordance with the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 can undertake feral cat eradication programs in parks.

Finally, around provisions on the responsibility of providing publicly available data on greyhounds, Greyhound Racing SA told the committee that the publication of data on greyhounds in their annual reports negated the need for legislation to enforce the publication of data. The committee, although acknowledging the efforts of Greyhound Racing SA in this regard in recent years, found that the transparency and consistency of data provision would benefit from mandating its annual reporting to the minister.

I would like to specifically thank all stakeholders and interested parties for making time to prepare a submission and/or to provide a witness statement. I would also like to take time to thank all members of the committee: our astute Chairperson, the Hon. Tammy Franks MLC; the member for Port Adelaide, Dr Susan Close MP; the member for Newland, Dr Richard Harvey MP; and the committee secretary, Mr Philip Frensham, and research officer, Ms Merry Brown. I commend this report to the house.

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

Bills

CIVIL LIABILITY (BYO CONTAINERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 September 2021.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (17:00): I rise to speak on this bill today and indicate the opposition's support. This bill continues a proud legacy of our former colleague in this place the Hon. Mark Parnell. Whilst he has left this place, his presence is still warmly felt by many of us with a number of the issues he championed and with Robert Simms progressing this bill.

Mark—and I am not sure if he is still the 'Hon. Mark Parnell'; probably not is my guess, but Mr Parnell—introduced a similar bill about BYO containers, to avoid waste, in 2018. The parliament was prorogued before the bill was voted on. Thankfully, the Hon. Robert Simms has now introduced this similar bill to amend the Civil Liability Act to provide limited immunity for food vendors when customers use their own containers.

The immunity only applies to personal injuries caused by the use of the container and does not limit the liability of consumers to seek remedies for injuries arising from the food itself, which I

think is a very important distinction to make clear. The bill also sets out further limits on the immunity from liability, that is:

- knowledge or reckless indifference on the part of the vendor that the food would be unsafe if consumed from a particular container;
- negligence in the use of the container;
- unlawful use of a container; and
- the provision of food that was subject to recall at the time of the sale.

Importantly, the bill does not create an obligation to fill a BYO container and vendors may exercise their judgement as to whether they do or not. No similar legislation currently exists in Australia so this would continue a proud tradition in South Australia of Australian firsts, although charities like Food Bank have some immunity from the Civil Liability Act arising from consumption of food they give away.

The sale of food in South Australia is governed by the Food Act 2001 with the associated Food Regulations 2017 that legally adopt the provisions of the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code. This ensures a consistent approach to labelling laws in food sold around Australia. The current legislation allows for food to be sold in a BYO container although the practice is not widespread due, I suspect, to a combination of both liability concerns and practicality issues.

Some small independent retailers such as butchers and confectionery outlets currently accept BYO containers, and various private web pages list the locations of BYO-friendly stores. I am informed bigger retailers like Pasadena and Frewville Foodland stores have a self-managed reusable container system where containers purchased from the stores can be reused.

Other retailers, like Coles and Woolworths, have raised potential barriers in their view to BYO containers. These have included food safety concerns and the difficulty in investigating adverse outcomes, if they arise. This bill will help address some of these concerns from some of those bigger retailers. If a retailer chooses not to participate, even with this legislation in place, then consumers will have a greater choice to use retailers that would allow that and they can exercise their choice accordingly.

We have seen important legislation on single-use plastics and this bill builds on that work. Importantly, this bill is about choice. Both retailers and consumers can choose whether they participate in a scheme that is aimed to be more prevalent for BYO container use under this bill.

I also note that various retailers who may or may not avail themselves of the BYO container arrangements are moving to use more environmentally friendly containers than they have in the past. I applaud businesses and consumers who are bringing their values with them in making sure that we reduce the cost and liability on the environment, and I think every piece of waste that we avoid is something that is to be commended and will help generations to come. We will be supporting this bill, as I said at the outset.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:04): I rise today to briefly add my support for this very sensible bill. As my colleague the Hon. Robert Simms has noted, this bill is an extremely simple amendment to the Civil Liability Act that aligns with the general population's desire to cut back on single-use plastics and, indeed, the Marshall government's desire to phase out single-use plastics, which the Greens have happily supported, regardless of our political colours.

By now I believe we are all aware of the dangers of plastic not only to humans but to all other forms of life and our environment as well. Studies have shown that toxic chemicals leach out of the plastic into our food and water and then into us. Exposure to these chemicals has been linked to cancer, birth defects, impaired immunity, endocrine disruption and many other health issues.

Plastic poses a threat to wildlife who mistake it as food and eat it. Birds that have slowly starved to death have been found with stomachs full of plastic that they cannot digest which leaves little to no room for actual food they need to survive. It litters the sides of our roads, our parks, our beaches, our oceans. It is everywhere, literally everywhere. Microplastics have been found in the

placenta of parents after giving birth, and we consume approximately a credit card's worth of plastic each week. We have plastic inside us right now.

There is a clear rationale for reducing plastic use. The why is quite simple; the how is where things of course become a little more nuanced. Currently, many businesses are reluctant to allow BYO containers due to the potential liability should the consumer become ill. This bill places the responsibility on the consumer to ensure the container is clean and suitable for the purpose for which it will be used, with the general exception where the person selling the food did so knowing the food was not fit for human consumption.

This is a simple change that could allow consumers and businesses to reduce their plastic use significantly and help us move towards a more sustainable future where we can still enjoy the food or the drink we love but without the harmful plastics. With that, I commend the bill to the house, and I hope this is an instance where commonsense prevails.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (17:07): I am pleased to be able to speak on behalf of the government and indicate we will be supporting the Civil Liability (BYO Containers) Amendment Bill 2021. The bill amends the Civil Liability Act to provide food sellers with immunity from civil liability from the use of reusable containers brought in by the customer. South Australia is leading the way in the movement towards reducing single-use plastic, and the aims of this bill align with the Marshall Liberal government's initiative to phase out single-use plastic.

On 1 March 2021, South Australia became the first state in Australia to ban plastic drinking straws, stirrers and cutlery from sale, supply and distribution. From March 2022, the ban will be extended to polystyrene cups, bowls, plates and clamshell containers. This bill is a sensible next step in promoting reusable and recyclable options, as consideration continues in relation to banning more items as market demand increases and other sustainable alternatives become available.

The bill will encourage sellers to allow customers to bring in their own containers and alleviate concerns about their liability for consequences that are beyond their control—for example, where the customer does not properly sterilise the container or store the food in a safe manner once it leaves the store. The bill includes proper safeguards to ensure that sellers are not immune from liability for unlawful or negligent conduct.

The government will be moving three minor amendments to the bill to assist it to operate as intended, and I thank the honourable member for working with the government on these amendments.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:08): I want to thank all members for their contributions and for their support of this bill. In particular, I want to acknowledge the fact that whilst this is a very simple reform it does traverse a few different portfolio areas, and I have greatly appreciated the support of the Attorney and her office; the Minister for Health, Stephen Wade MLC; and the Minister for Environment, David Speirs. I also want to acknowledge Dr Susan Close in the other place, the shadow environment spokesperson, with whom I have worked and, of course, the Hon. Frank Pangallo, in this chamber as well.

As has been stated, this is a legacy bill in many ways. My predecessor Mark Parnell first proposed a very similar reform back in 2018, and there was no opportunity to advance it before the election. When I took over from Mark I picked up this issue and looked at it again.

I am really pleased to see it has such strong support in the parliament. It is something that will be welcomed not only by consumers but also by businesses that want to do the right thing in terms of encouraging customers to bring their own containers and reduce waste. They will now have protection in doing so and a clear framework in terms of legal protections that will work for them. With that, I commend the bill.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Treasurer-1]—

Page 2, lines 19 to 22 [clause 3, inserted section 74B(3)(a)]—Delete paragraph (a)

This amendment deletes exception (a) as it overlaps with the provisions in the Food Act 2001. It is unnecessary and likely to cause issues upon its application by the court.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I rise in support of the amendment. Again, I want to thank the government for working constructively with the Greens on this. I had the opportunity to discuss these amendments with the Attorney-General, the Hon. Vickie Chapman, and she spoke to me about the intention of the amendments.

The changes being proposed by the government are minor and are in the spirit of the reforms; indeed, I think they better achieve the objectives. The Greens will be supporting the amendment the government is putting forward. I do not propose to speak to each of them; I indicate our support for the suite the government is moving.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Treasurer-1]—

Page 2, line 23 [clause 3, inserted section 74B(3)(b)]—After 'container' insert:

by the person selling the food

This amendment makes it clear that the immunity will not apply if the use of the container by the person selling the food was negligent.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Treasurer-1]—

Page 3, lines 3 and 4 [clause 3, inserted section 74B(4)]—Delete ', recall order, unsafe and unsuitable all' and substitute 'and recall order'

This amendment is technical so that the definitions of 'food' and 'recall order' carry the same meaning as those in the Food Act 2001.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:14): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Parliamentary Committees

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CURRENT SYSTEM OF PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. C. Bonaros:

That the report of the select committee be noted.

(Continued from 22 September 2021.)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (17:15): I rise to speak briefly to this important motion that is based on an important piece of work that a committee of the Legislative Council undertook in

relation to the effectiveness of committees. The Hon. Ms Bonaros has already outlined the major features of the recommendations of the report, and I do not propose to traverse all of them. I believe these amendments, when enacted, will be the most significant amendments to parliamentary committees in the parliament for 20 or 25 years. I think the last significant amendments were in the period of the late—30 years, I suppose—eighties, early nineties, and soon after that. These are the most significant amendments to our parliamentary committees since that particular time.

There was sensible discussion amongst all parties and Labor, Liberal and crossbench parties were represented on the committee. There was give and take from all. Everyone went into that discussion with their own particular views but, ultimately, in the interests of arriving at consensus, the committee recommendations are what has evolved as a result of that discussion. I congratulate the Hon. Ms Bonaros and the other members who participated in that particular committee discussion.

In relation to the Legislative Council the lessons we have learnt from the, I think, generally successful operations of the Budget and Finance Committee have now demonstrated their worthiness, and in particular the experiment that we introduced in the Budget and Finance Committee of non-participating members being involved in the operation of that committee has proved to be very worthwhile. The recommendations now are that that be a standard option or procedure for all of our committees.

The recommendations are for three standing committees of the Legislative Council, and I am going to roll for the Budget and Finance Committee and two portfolio committees. Each parliament, the actual portfolios that would be referred to each, committee A and committee B, would need to be determined because, clearly, as a new government comes in there are new portfolios and new ministries and each parliament will need to be flexible.

Frankly, it might occur during a parliamentary term. If you have a changeover, as there was under the former government, of a new premier who came in partway through, he or she may well have new ministers and new departments and you will need to be in a position to be able to make decisions that particular portfolios would go into either committee A or B. But the system is nimble enough and agile enough to be able to adapt to that.

I think the very interesting and new innovation that is recommended here is that two non-government members would have presiding member positions on these committees, and that will require amendment to the various acts which reimburse presiding members in relation to the extra responsibilities they have.

Of the three committees, one would be chaired by a government member, one by an opposition or non-government member and one by a crossbencher, recognising that it is highly unlikely in the foreseeable future that we will not have crossbenchers represented in some number in this particular chamber, as we have had since 1979.

There are significant changes. I think the changes in relation to the joint standing committees—the Hon. Ms Bonaros had a particular passion, as indeed other members did in relation to the scrutiny of bills and the appropriate role of that particular committee. Dividing up, in essence, the legal responsibilities into two broad areas to allow for a sensible division of responsibilities makes a lot of sense.

As I said, I am not going to go through all of the recommendations. I support them and endorse them. I did want to thank the appropriate people but also to update the house, as Leader of the Government and in the discussions I had within the committee, to highlight the fact that I have not left this on the shelf to wither and die.

I have commenced discussion with parliamentary counsel—to be honest, it is only at the very early stage with parliamentary counsel—to say we need to commence the task now of drafting the appropriate changes. If significant changes are going to be required in terms of legislation, there will need to be some issues of detail, I suspect, and further consultation with opposition and crossbench members in relation to what they think we actually meant by this or how it will actually operate in terms of the detail.

We necessarily endorse the broad principles in the report. The very many details in terms of drafting legislative changes will throw up lots of interesting questions that we will need to work our way through. But I hope to be in a position, whichever government is elected after the March election, that there is a legislative package that is ready for that government. Should it be a re-election of this government, a commitment that I have given and the discussions I have had with the Premier indicate that we will be committed to introducing that package of changes.

We would hope that we would get a sort of similar commitment. I indicate that we will go through a consultation from an alternative government that those changes will need to be implemented. They will not happen on day one. The legislation can be introduced and it will have to be debated, but there may need to be a transitional provision where the existing committees operate for a short period of time until the new committees are brought into effect.

That is really all I wanted to say, to congratulate all members who participated in the committee. I indicate that it is certainly my intention to do what I can to see something based on this package ready to go for those of you who will be here post March next year. I cannot promise I will be tuning in regularly to a live stream of the debate, but should this particular issue be discussed I will at least ask one of my colleagues to give me an update in terms of how it is progressing and whether or not it has been bastardised by a parliament in the future. With that, I indicate my support for the motion.

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

Bills

FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES (BUSHFIRES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 September 2021.)

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (17:24): I rise to indicate that the opposition supports the Fire and Emergency Services (Bushfires) Amendment Bill, brought to this place by the Hon. John Darley. This bill seeks to amend the Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005 and makes amendments to the Emergency Management Act 2004. This bill has been introduced by the Hon. John Darley to further protect communities vulnerable to the devastation of out-of-control bushfires. The bill seeks to do this by adding bushfire monitoring technology and a statewide plan for prescribed burns on public and private land.

There is a sense of urgency to this bill, given that the first bushfire of the season has already occurred on the second day of spring of this year. It is the view of the opposition that we must see every tool at our disposal to prevent bushfires, particularly to avoid the devastation of bushfires that we have seen, like Cudlee Creek and Kangaroo Island. Those dreadful fires led to the comprehensive review of the former federal police commissioner, Mike Keelty OAM.

While prescribed burning has been shown to reduce the intensity and destruction of wildlife and property in the event of a bushfire, even when prescribed burns are managed well they are inherently high risk and require significant resources and have a cost to local government. Prescribed burning on private land is further complicated by a confusing application process and a need to develop a complex operational burn plan.

The Keelty review identified many shortcomings in our state's bushfire preparedness, including confusion about landowners' access to information, which would allow them to adequately protect their land or fully understand burning operations on public land. The opposition supports the Hon. John Darley in his genuine effort to introduce more transparency into the State Bushfire Management Plan, and to give the public and the parliament more information on an annual basis to ensure that everything possible is being done to prevent bushfires.

As previously noted by the Hon. John Darley, a 2016 Burning on Private Land Project noted that without professional support landowners are unlikely to conduct strategic burns and instead are likely to opt for mechanical land clearances, compromising environmental assets, or to undertake no

hazard reduction activities at all. This is especially concerning, considering that almost 40 per cent of land requiring operational burns in the Mount Lofty Ranges are on private land.

This bill essentially enhances the requirements of the State Bushfire Management Plan and subsequently expands the annual reporting requirements of the State Bushfire Coordination Committee. The State Bushfire Management Plan is required, but is not limited, to:

- set out the principles to be applied to achieving appropriate levels of hazard reduction for bushfire management;
- outline strategies to achieve the statewide coordination and integration of bushfire management activities;
- set standards or requirements that must be applied or observed in the preparation and implementation of the bushfire management area plan; and
- include or address the other matters prescribed by the regulations or specified by the minister after consultation with the chief officer of the South Australian CFS.

The role of the State Bushfire Coordination Committee is to provide a coordination and assurance function for bushfire management in the state. The committee is based upon collaboration and has no power to direct the wide range of government and non-government stakeholders included in its membership.

The South Australian CFS is required to provide executive support to the State Bushfire Coordination Committee and the South Australian CFS Chief Executive Officer, who is the ex officio chair, but the State Bushfire Coordination Committee is not a committee of the South Australian CFS, it is a state government committee appointed by the Governor. Further to that, section of 71E of the Fire and Emergency Act states:

- (1) The State Bushfire Coordination Committee must, on or before 31 August in each year, provide to the minister a report on activities of the State Bushfire Coordination Committee and each bushfire management committee during the preceding financial year (and need not provide a report under the Public Sector Act 2009).
- (2) The Minister must, within 12 sitting days after receiving a report under this section, have copies of the report laid before both Houses of Parliament.

So the Hon. John Darley's bill and the amendments filed by the Hon. John Darley do two things which will enhance transparency and community understanding going into each bushfire season. Firstly, the bill creates a provision for a statewide plan for coordinating prescribed burns within the State Bushfire Management Plan. It is important to note that the bill is not prescriptive but merely provides that such a plan should exist so that the public have at least a rough idea of what is planned. It must be reported to the parliament within the annual report of the State Bushfire Coordination Committee.

Prescribed burns are largely the responsibility of the Department for Environment and Water, and of course they already publish burns on a regular basis. This bill merely formalises this process in the State Bushfire Management Plan. As I said, it is not prescriptive. Should the pattern of burns or the methods and how they are described change, they can be updated in the committee's annual report.

Secondly, the bill creates a provision to allow the State Bushfire Coordination Committee to report to parliament on the use of any fire monitoring and detection cameras and other technologies, and the use of any police monitoring technologies as part of Operation Nomad within the annual report of the State Bushfire Coordination Committee.

Again, my understanding is that this is not prescriptive. It simply anticipates, quite reasonably, that firefighting authorities will adopt this new technology over time and allows the annual reporting process to inform the public and the parliament of these developments. Of course, if the government intends to amend this bill in any way, we will listen to any sensible ideas that are put forward and consider those between the houses.

I hope we all want the same thing here: to prevent bushfires and ensure that firefighters and the broader community have all the information they need to make informed decisions and keep each other safe. I thank the Hon. John Darley for the work he has done to bring this bill together and

for working with members to coordinate this bill. Any increases to the safety and management of necessary operational burns should be welcomed by the parliament and this bill seeks to do just that. The opposition will support this bill and the amendments currently filed by the Hon. John Darley.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:32): Bushfires have long been a regular occurrence in our country, there is no doubt about that. They are so common that many native plant species have adapted to require scarification from hot temperatures in order for their seeds to germinate. This is far from a new phenomenon that we are grappling with. What has changed of course is the severity—the increasing severity and scale of these fires—and the ever-shrinking window we have to prepare for them due to climate change.

This bill seeks to enhance some of the measures we take to help us prepare and protect ourselves from these inevitable fires. Prescribed burning, while certainly not the only measure, is an extremely important and valuable tool to be used in reducing the severity of bushfires and one that has been used in various forms for so many thousands of years by Indigenous communities. However, much like any tool, it must be used effectively in order to have the best outcome. There have been concerns raised not only about the underutilisation of prescribed burning by private landowners due to a lack of knowledge of how to safely conduct them but also with burns being carried out in areas that are not critical to protecting our communities.

For prescribed burning to work as effectively as it can, it must be undertaken on both public and private land and in areas where it will have the most benefit. As the Hon. John Darley mentioned in his second reading explanation, using this method effectively requires a large commitment of human resources, physical assets and relevant expertise, which can be costly and therefore not accessible to many people or councils.

The Greens have long supported prescribed burning when it is used appropriately. The topic of prescribed burns is often a tricky one to navigate but it is not something we can afford to toss into the too hard basket, nor is it something we can rely completely upon due to the small amount of time when conditions are ideal to carry out burns safely. The Greens believe there is much to learn from the traditional custodians of this land and we should be listening to those communities about their various cultural fire practices.

Further, we must ensure that communities are educated and that they are trained and provided with the resources they need to adequately prepare for a bushfire, especially those who live in the higher risk areas; that new and existing buildings and spaces in high-risk areas are fireproofed as much as possible and that existing buildings and spaces are too; and that both our country and our metropolitan fire services receive the funding they need to be appropriately equipped and trained while still having the capacity to continuously recruit more workers.

There is no silver bullet with regard to bushfire safety and we must ensure that we are continuously reassessing our toolbox so that we are basing our approach on the best available science, whilst balancing competing social, economic and environmental factors. This bill also seeks to introduce bushfire monitoring and detection cameras. These cameras are intended to help provide for the early detection of fires, which can be crucial and aid in identifying arsonists. This could be a game changer in protecting people, environment and country, as well as property.

Although I support this, I would like to put on the record that we have some concerns that have been raised in enshrining this system in our law without trialling it first and placing this responsibility on the already strained State Bushfire Coordination Committee. This committee has an extremely important and difficult task to undertake and we should be doing all we can to ensure that they are able to carry out their duties efficiently, and not overloading them.

We have seen time and time again the absolute devastation that bushfires can cause, and I am sure the terrifying and heartbreaking images from the 2019-20 bushfire season are still fresh in our minds, as is the memory of that choking smoke. Unfortunately, this of course is only the beginning. As the sixth IPCC report highlighted, extreme fire days are becoming more common. The fire seasons are becoming longer, and the intensity, frequency and duration of fire weather events are projected to increase throughout our nation.

This bill is a step in the right direction, but these measures must be accompanied by serious, immediate and long-term climate action at every level of government—state, federal and local. Some governments are acting appropriately and taking this risk seriously, but others are dragging their feet, risking all of our futures for power or for money. If we truly want to protect people, environment and property from bushfires, then we need to address climate change. Otherwise, that hellscape that was the 2019-20 bushfire season is likely to become an increasing reality.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (17:37): I rise on behalf of the government to speak on the Fire and Emergency Services (Bushfires) Amendment Bill 2021 and indicate that the government will not be supporting the bill. The bill has two distinct aims. Firstly, it aims to require annual reporting to parliament and planning of prescribed burns. Secondly—and I understand this has changed substantially from the initial bill—the bill requires annual reporting to parliament on the developments in emerging technologies insofar as they relate to bushfires.

In respect of the first element of the bill, reporting on the planning and execution of prescribed burns already occurs publicly and is a collaborative effort between the Department for Environment and Water, the CFS, ForestrySA and SA Water. DEW publishes an interactive map, which details the proposed locations of prescribed burns, which updates as they are executed.

Currently, in addition to the inaugural State Bushfire Management Plan, which the Marshall government delivered as part of its \$97.5 million response to the Keelty review, the State Bushfire Coordination Committee oversees nine bushfire management areas, which produce bushfire management area plans. The State Bushfire Management Plan is a five-year plan. Bushfire management area plans are generally developed to guide a period ranging from four to 10 years. Mr Darley's bill would require the State Bushfire Management Plan to be updated on an annual basis to include the statewide prescribed burns plan.

The State Bushfire Management Plan sets out the statewide principles and strategy in respect of hazard reduction, whilst the area plans identify risk locations within their respective areas. These locations are published online, with an accompanying treatment register. Under this bill, the requirement for an annual statewide prescribed burns plan would require the five-year State Bushfire Management Plan to be updated on an annual basis, which would have significant resourcing implications.

In respect to annual reporting to parliament, as part of our response to the Keelty review the Marshall government amended the Fire and Emergency Act 2005 to require the State Bushfire Coordination Committee to provide an annual report to the minister for tabling in parliament. This report includes reports from each bushfire management area. The Department for Environment and Water annual report also reports on the conduct of prescribed burns. The government does not see the value in establishing an annual review of a plan when the information is already publicly available.

In respect to the second element of the bill, the government is of the view that the intention of the bill was to deal with deliberately lit bushfires; however, as amended, the bill seems to require broader reporting on the development of technologies. South Australia Police have raised particular concerns should a requirement for annual reporting on technologies used to prevent bushfires be enacted.

As members can appreciate, SAPOL undertakes a range of activities to prevent deliberately lit bushfires through Operation Nomad. This includes the use of surveillance technology. The publication of these activities and technologies used may compromise the effectiveness of Operation Nomad. I am also aware of concerns held by the CFS in respect to both elements of the bill which would provide the State Bushfire Coordination Committee with the power to essentially direct operational agencies. This is a step the government is not willing to support.

Given the already comprehensive publicly available information on the planning and execution of prescribed burns, the concerns raised by SAPOL, and the concerns raised by the CFS, the government will not be supporting this bill.

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

MINING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF PRIVATE MINES) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 September 2021.)

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (17:42): I rise to speak on the Mining (Environmental Impact of Private Mines) Amendment Bill 2021 and indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition. This is an important matter and the opposition is pleased that the Hon. Mr Simms has brought this to the attention of the chamber and the parliament.

This is an historical phenomenon where we have private mines that operate under different requirements than commercial mines. That difference is predominantly in the definition of 'environment', and the details of those differences were outlined by the Hon. Mr Simms in his second reading explanation.

The opposition agrees that changes are needed. This bill, however, makes significant changes. They may well be good ones. It may well be that Labor could support them in the future, but the problem is, as there are the limitations of a private member's bill, there has not been sufficient opportunity to both consult and then investigate what the potential ramifications of this bill are.

It will affect over 200 private mines. We have heard that there are 186 active mines and that a further 86 are inactive. The questions need to be answered of what the impact will be on these mines, both on the active and the inactive ones. What will be the impacts in the immediate term and in the longer term? What impacts will there be in terms of environmental impacts, community impacts, financial impacts and jobs? It potentially affects many millions of dollars of industry.

We need more resources for a proper consideration of this very important matter and a proper consultation than a private member's bill can provide—and this is absolutely not any criticism whatsoever of the member, simply an acknowledgement of the limitations both in opposition and on the crossbench in terms of being able to fully investigate and analyse and consult in terms of something that might have significant ramifications.

We want to understand the impacts so that we can ensure that any changes made have the best possible outcomes for all affected parties. The opposition's preference would be that we actually have a select committee look into this, but, of course, we are at the very end of a parliamentary session. It is therefore not feasible for a suitable select committee to be established to investigate and report within the time frame. However, I do want to put on the record that that would be a possible future action in regard to this matter.

In summary, while we cannot support this bill at this time, we are very keen to have a detailed and robust investigation in the future with a view to making changes that will address the issues that are raised with this current difference between the definitions but that will have the evidence and research behind it to ensure that we do get the best possible outcome.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:45): I rise to briefly speak in support of the amendment to the Mining Act 1971 put forth by my colleague the Hon. Robert Simms. This bill seeks to impose similar regulations on private mines as exist for public ones and to address the legal protections enjoyed by private mines.

As it currently stands, private mines are given far too loose a leash under the Mining Act. The 222 private mines in our state, 186 of which are currently active, are held to a different standard of environmental impact than the rest of the mines in our state are. This means that private mines are exempt from any legislated responsibility to account for existing or permissible land use, geological heritage value or the aesthetic and cultural value of an area.

It is absolutely shameful that antiquated private mines in the 21st century not only continue to exist but continue to be held to different legal standards—lesser legal standards—than public ones. It should not be seen as permissible for a public mine to expand right up to the edge of someone's neighbourhood, so why should it be different for private mines?

When the White Rock Quarry expansion was being proposed, members of the community voiced their rightful concern and outrage. Their quality of life was being directly impacted by the quarry being in such close proximity to their homes. There were health concerns, as the quarry produces respirable crystalline silica, or RCS, which is known to cause silicosis. Bear in mind that according to the Cancer Council, there are no safe levels of RCS inhalation. Furthermore, the impact of this quarry on the surrounding environment has been lamented by those in the community, especially as it was discovered that 7.5 hectares of the land used by Hanson is actually part of a conservation park.

Faced with the evidence of a proposed expansion's damage to residents' health and to the surrounding environment, this upper house agreed to reject expansion plans for the White Rock Quarry 'until residents, the government and the Environment Protection Authority can be assured there will be no impact on the nearby natural environment and community amenity'—to quote this council. But this is not enough. Opposing Hanson's expansion plans for the White Rock Quarry does not do enough to address the crux of the issue: the fact that these mines are setting the precedent to expand right up against housing, a precedent that is allowed through the current legislature.

When Hanson resubmits their mining operation plans, the Greens want to ensure they are being held to the same environmental standards as any other mining company would be. For far too long the argument that private mines predate the residential areas that surround them has been made to justify the incursions of private mines upon South Australians and to prevent any change to their legal advantages, as if their age should remove these mines' accountability. To the people of South Australia, the right to a clean, safe environment and community should be paramount.

The bill my colleague has put forth does not seek to put an end to private mines. Rather, it seeks to put them on equal footing with other South Australian mines and to keep them accountable. This is opposed to the current antiquated system which has opted to arbitrarily afford these mines with lesser levels of regulation. We ought to be amending the section of the Mining Act that enshrines the ability of private mines to impede upon the surrounding community, right up to our back doors. This bill provides community interests and the environment with protection, and it simply makes sense to have public and private mines be both held accountable and held accountable to the same standards as other mines.

I note that the opposition has lamented the lack of time to set up a select committee that perhaps might better enable their support. Well, I note that yesterday in the other place the Labor Party and the crossbenchers set up a select committee. Indeed, yesterday in the other place we saw powers given to the Presiding Member to use the powers only currently available to government to extend our sitting days.

If rumours are to be believed we are not in the last two weeks of sitting before the state election at all. We have just seen a select committee set up for what I would call somewhat political reasons. Why are we not able to see a select committee set up now for the Labor Party to investigate this very important issue, an issue they have just informed us they have every interest in supporting should they have more information?

Indeed, we have just seen the clock that was ticking down wound back to allow for more time for this and other important issues to be debated properly by this parliament—particularly should we be coming back in February—so that these residents, these private mines and these very important issues do not have to wait until April next year before the Labor Party takes them seriously.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:50): On behalf of SA-Best, I rise to speak in support of the bill, and thank the Hon. Robert Simms for bringing this matter to the attention of the parliament and, in doing so, echo everything that our colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks just outlined.

The catalyst for this bill is the proposed expansion of the White Rock Quarry—there appear to be many tongue-twisters today—located less than 10 kilometres from the Adelaide CBD. The private mine has been in operation since 1946 and, as such, enjoys special privileges and exemptions under the Mining Act, along with 221 other private mines in SA.

The bill does not go so far as to abolish this protected species, but rather seeks to improve the process by ensuring adequate consultation and transparency in relation to the cultural heritage of the site as well as the impacts of any proposal on the health and safety of people nearby. I

understand the December 2020 White Rock Quarry Mine Operations Plan was silent or deficient on these issues and more. It remains to be seen what the final outcome will be but, needless to say, the community has spoken very loudly in opposition.

Earlier this year, SA-Best met with the president of the Residents Against White Rock Quarry, Jim Bastiras, who, along with many other South Australians, has passionately advocated opposition to the multiphased expansion. He came to the meeting armed with all the evidence we needed to conclude that the five-stage proposal could have absolutely devastating ramifications on so many levels. That was followed up by a public meeting which had overwhelming support. There is no question that the local community is supportive of this measure.

We were astounded that consultation did not appear to have taken place with traditional owners of the land, particularly given the real possibility that culturally significant sites exist within the development area. This includes the cave known to rock climbers as the Bachelor Pad and Aboriginal rock art. They may well enjoy the protections of the Aboriginal Heritage Act and the Heritage Places Act which, at the very least, should be explored.

The potential for serious health ramifications for people within the mine's vicinity, with all we know about dust diseases today and silicosis, is of deep concern for local residents and the broader community. The bill seeks to ensure health and safety is specifically addressed in a mine's private operation plans going forward.

SA-Best has legitimate concerns about this example. Let's not forget it is within 10 kilometres of where we are right now, the CBD, where thousands of people work every day. We are concerned not only for the residents of the 17 properties currently within 500 metres of the mine, or the residents of the 50 properties that would ultimately be within that radius, we are concerned for people who live and work a kilometre away, two kilometres away or five kilometres away.

That is not even on a windy day, when children attending school nearby could be exposed to the very fine silica dust particles that we know cause the lung disease silicosis. Silicosis permanently scars the lungs, and is a horrible, horrible irreversible disease. I ask the powers that be if they would send their own children to a school situated right near a mine. Would they live there? Would they work there, with all that we know about dust diseases and silicosis?

We are truly gobsmacked there is even the possibility that a mine could be given the green light to significantly expand so close to an inhabited area and so close to residential homes. Alongside this is the absolute desecration of our irreplaceable landscape. Aesthetically, from what I have seen, the ultimate proposal would leave a gaping hole in the visual amenity of Mount Skye, a permanent reminder of mining gone mad. Local wildlife would be driven out, if even afforded the opportunity. There is just so much wrong with what is being proposed.

It is encouraging to hear that the department has either listened to, potentially, or shares some of the outrage of the community in relation to this particular plan, but following a public meeting on 10 June, as I said facilitated by the residents of the quarry, the mine operations plan was returned to the mine's owner for further input as a result. I understand they have six months to resubmit and satisfy the very long list of unanswered questions.

We will follow that particular case with great interest in the hope that common sense prevails, but I think it is very sensible that we deal with this bill today and that we deal with this bill in a favourable manner to ensure that this cannot continue to happen across South Australia and across our residential areas, our landscape and so close to our CBD.

This is not one of those issues that is out of sight, out of mind, it is literally around the corner. With those words, and again endorsing the words of the Hon. Tammy Franks in relation to the opposition's statement a few moments ago as to why we cannot support this, I hope there is a change of heart and indicate our wholehearted support for the bill.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (17:56): On behalf of the government, we have the same position as the Labor opposition in that we are opposing the bill. The bill seeks to amend the definition of 'environment' as it relates to private mines and requires operators to address impacts of operations on the health and safety of persons in their vicinity.

There are differences between private mines and mining leases under the Mining Act; however, the requirement to address potential environmental impacts is still mandatory for all quarries and mines in South Australia. In the government's view the bill misunderstands the Mining Act and prejudges the assessment process, which has proven to be effective. The bill to amend the Mining Act 1971 shows a lack of knowledge of the established legislation that already requires:

- potential environmental impacts to be addressed for all quarries and mines in South Australia, whether regulated as a private mine or an extractive mining lease;
- impacts on people and communities, in addition to health and safety, be addressed; and
- science and evidence-based assessment of potential impacts in determining separation distances.

This private member's bill has obviously been brought up in response to the proposal to expand the White Rock Quarry. Many quarries in Adelaide, including this one, predate the residential areas that now surround them. The Department for Energy and Mining is legally required to assess applications proposing to expand quarrying operations. Regulators require individual assessment of environmental impacts based on site-specific details, using science and evidence-based decision-making.

Many issues that have been raised by the community for private mines include concerns about dust, especially respirable crystalline silica, noise, vibration, light pollution, water contamination, decrease in property values, biodiversity, public safety, loss of the Hills Face Zone and loss of places which may have cultural significance.

The established government assessment process considers all of these concerns. Where an application does not adequately address regulatory requirements, DEM issues a request for further information that requires analysis of potential impact areas. Requests for information are published on DEM's website and are publicly available to provide transparency that the government assessment process captures community concerns.

Quarry operators must clarify the scope of their proposed operations and provide risk analysis and evidence relevant to that scope. Quarry operators must submit a revised mine operations plan for reassessment before any extension of current operations will be considered. All new and revised mine operations plans are subject to technical review by DEM, EPA, DEW, SA Health and SafeWork SA.

The established regulatory framework ensures fit-for-purpose management of impacts to protect the environment and the health and safety of the community. For those reasons, we have adopted the same position as the Labor opposition in that we will be opposing this bill.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:59): I fear my winning streak may be coming to an end. I thank members for their contribution and, in particular, I want to thank the SA-Best party for their support of this bill.

I am disappointed to hear that the Liberal Party and the Labor Party are not supportive of this bill being advanced. I take on face value what the Labor Party has said through the Hon. Clare Scriven in terms of their support for the principle, but if that is the case, then I urge them to vote for this bill to progress at the second reading so that we can continue to keep this issue alive. Given we are going to have more sitting days potentially between now and the next election, there are going to be lots of opportunities to delve further into this and for the Labor Party to avail themselves of the information that they require.

I point out that this is not a controversial change. I doubt that that there would be huge community concern around what I am proposing. In fact, the community are on board with the changes. After all, what I am suggesting is simply an alignment with the existing requirements of consultation that apply to other mines. What I am proposing is that they be applied to private mines as well. That would ensure that the broader definition that exists for all mining operations in South Australia, including cultural heritage, is applied to both private mines and other mines.

As has been stated, the catalyst for this has really been the debate about White Rock Quarry, where residents have been rightly outraged at the fact that there is a private corporation devouring

their landscape and pushing for development right in their back gardens, pushing up against their private residence. It has a terrible impact on our environment and a terrible impact on community health. I just want to put members on notice that, if this is not carried on the voices, I will be calling a division so that the community can see which members of this place stand with them and which members stand alongside the mining corporations that are seeking to tear up their neighbourhoods.

The council divided on the second reading:

Ayes..... 5
 Noes 16
 Majority 11

AYES

Bonaros, C.
 Pangallo, F.

Darley, J.A.
 Simms, R.A. (teller)

Franks, T.A.

NOES

Bourke, E.S.
 Hanson, J.E.
 Lee, J.S.
 Maher, K.J.
 Scriven, C.M.
 Wortley, R.P.

Centofanti, N.J.
 Hood, D.G.E.
 Lensink, J.M.A.
 Ngo, T.T.
 Stephens, T.J.

Girolamo, H.M.
 Hunter, I.K.
 Lucas, R.I. (teller)
 Pnevmatikos, I.
 Wade, S.G.

Second reading thus negated.

Motions

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ITALIAN ASSOCIATION

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (18:05): I seek leave to move my motion in an amended form.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the 70th anniversary of the South Australian Italian Association (SAIA);
2. Recognises the contributions made by the SAIA to the advancement of multiculturalism in South Australia through the preservation and promotion of Italian culture, heritage, services and experiences within the Italian community and the wider community of South Australia;
3. Acknowledges the enthusiastic work by the SAIA in fostering strong business and cultural ties between South Australia and Italy;
4. Congratulates Dr Daniela Cosmini and Professor Diana Glenn on the publication of their book *La Seconda Casa* (The Second Home) marking and documenting the important history of the SAIA;
5. Recognises South Australia's continuing strong business, trading, diplomatic and economic ties with Italy; and
6. Identifies that Italian is the largest non-English language spoken in South Australian homes, and calls on Flinders University to immediately reverse its decision to cut the teaching of Italian.

The motion acknowledges the 70th anniversary of the South Australian Italian Association and the publication of the book on its history, *La Seconda Casa* (The Second Home), by Dr Daniela Cosmini and Professor Diana Glenn. Diana is the national head of the School of Arts at the Australian Catholic University and was formerly the Dean of the School of Humanities and Creative Arts at Flinders University. Daniela has a PhD from Flinders University, where she is currently senior lecturer in Italian in the College for Humanities, but for how long?

There have been some alarming developments in the College for Humanities, which I will address later. First, I had the pleasure of attending the launch of this impressive piece of South Australian migrant history earlier this year in the company of my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks and one of their upper house candidates Yesha Joshi, at the spiritual home of all South Australian Italians in Carrington Street.

The Italian Association had its origins in 1949, when it was known as the Catholic Italian welfare centre. It has grown to be successful non-profit and non-partisan organisation that has been supported by an army of selfless volunteers who are united in one cause: the preservation of Italian culture and language. This place is not representative of arrivals to this country from a particular region of Italy, but of all those from every paese, or part of the country, who made sacrificial decisions in undertaking uncertain journeys to create a new life for themselves and generations of descendants. It became the central meeting place for them where they could forge their ideals, share their dreams and help one another adjust in a foreign land with a totally foreign tongue. From here, the first shoots of multiculturalism sprouted.

Italians are extremely resilient people able to adapt very quickly to new surrounds and then contribute to their adopted community with their unique knowledge and skills. The Italian diaspora has spread to every corner of the globe, with large expatriate communities and their descendants evident.

Not surprisingly, Australia has one of the oldest and largest concentrations of Italians and those of Italian descent, making them the fifth most prominent of the non-English-speaking communities after the Chinese, Indians, Filipinos and Vietnamese. One million Australians can lay claim to being of Italian ancestry, which is about 4 per cent of the population.

Of course, Australia was not always so welcoming of migrants from Europe. As the book points out, the racist White Australia immigration policy was not only about shutting borders to people of colour. It also excluded the so-called 'less desirables' from southern European countries like Italy, Greece and Malta. By that, we assume that 'peasant, uneducated and non-Anglo-Saxon stock' was not high on the list of Australia's immigration priorities at that time.

Thankfully, that has now changed. That all started to change after World War II when Australia needed to rebuild and boost its population through manufacturing, horticulture and construction, such as the nation-building infrastructure project the Snowy Mountains hydro scheme. With some financial assistance from the commonwealth, these 'undesirables' came to these shores in a large wave. Pockets grew in Adelaide's inner west, to the east and north. They came with skills in horticulture, construction and of course culinary cuisine.

As a child growing up in the western suburbs during the fifties and sixties, you would have been hard-pressed finding an Italian restaurant, pizzeria or even a cafe serving espresso or gelato in the city of Adelaide. The one I do remember vividly is Pagana's in Hindley Street, next to West's Theatre. Gradually, of course, the culture and cuisine brought from the Mediterranean spread to what we now enjoy today, along with so many other ethnic cultures. It was one of the cornerstones of multiculturalism.

By the time the seventies arrived, the South Australian Italian Association had become a favourite meeting place and a popular venue for festive events, dinner dances and celebrations as well as promoting social, cultural and sporting activities and integration within the Australian social fabric. Many met their lifelong partners there. Sunday night was especially popular among young people as a disco venue. After undergoing extensive rebuilding thanks to the generosity of many of the migrants it helped, the Italian Centre, as it was known, was formally opened by the then Premier, Don Dunstan, and the Italian Ambassador, Dtt. Paolo Canali.

Friday lunches at the centre were a must. The main room would be packed to the rafters not only for the fine food that was served there but guest speakers of the calibre of Don Dunstan, Gough Whitlam, Sir Donald Bradman, Malcolm Fraser and John Howard. A pantheon of sporting stars has been there, from soccer greats to Formula One legends. The South Australian Italian Association continues its strong social engagement with the entire community and assists many great causes, including its participation in the annual nine-day Italian Festival.

Flicking through the pages of Daniela Cosmini's and Diana Glenn's fabulous and well-researched history of this place brought memories flooding back for me and the many Italian business and community leaders I met there and who also became good friends of mine. Some of them have since passed but it is good to see their contributions are now formally recognised in print. *La Seconda Casa* is a noteworthy piece of historical work that summarises an important part of our state's history and social and economic development.

I would have liked to have finished this tribute on an upbeat note. However, recent disappointing announcements at Flinders have caused me to make amendments to my original motion. I must express my consternation at Flinders University's decision to close its Italian teaching department, capably headed by Dr Cosmini. I understand no other language courses are yet affected. Dr Christian Verdicchio, the President of the Committee for Italians Abroad, or Com.It.Es South Australia, wrote to me only last week expressing his own deep concern at the move. He magnifies his call for the decision to be reversed with five key points:

1. The Italian community represents one in 10 South Australians;
2. Italian is the fourth most studied language in the world;
3. Italy is one of Australia's major trading partners, and it is valued at \$11.1 billion, with \$383 million in South Australia;
4. There has been a wave of investment into South Australia by Italian companies involved in the space sector at Lot Fourteen, like Leonardo, SITAEL and aizoOn; and
5. The strong diplomatic relations with Italy maintaining a consular office in South Australian.

Dr Verdicchio says these facts alone show how important it is to continue to promote and teach Italian in our schools and universities and to continue to strengthen our business and cultural ties with a G7 country and one of the world's biggest economies.

The South Australian government and the Italian government, through its consul, Dr Adriano Stendardo, are about to sign a memorandum of understanding to continue teaching Italian in our schools. If this language course disappears from tertiary studies, how can university students possibly develop and enhance their teaching skills for when they eventually go into schools?

Flinders University has already benefited from significant research grants donated by Italian government institutions and companies, like the giant shipbuilder Fincantieri, which provided more than \$310,000 for maritime research projects and overseas study scholarships. It is still unclear why Flinders reached this decision, but I can only assume it is linked with the federal government's ill-conceived plan for tertiary institutions to scale down or move away from humanities studies.

I will be writing to the vice-chancellor and the university's board asking them to reconsider. In the meantime, an online petition organised by Com.It.Es has received overwhelming support, with many thousands of signatures from the wider Italian community and the business sector. I urge members to support this motion.

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

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of the Mayor of the City of Playford, Mr Glenn Docherty.

Motions

PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. C Bonaros:

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.

(Continued from 26 May 2021.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (18:18): I rise to speak to this motion. I understand there will be a slight amendment from the Hon. Connie Bonaros, and I note that with that amendment I can indicate that Labor will be supporting the honourable member's motion. I note that amendments from the government landed on our tables today, I think, which we will not be supporting. We will be supporting the motion as it will be put with the amendment from the Hon. Connie Bonaros.

This is an important motion. We see motions on this topic come up from time to time in various forms, including before the parliament. I think many political parties debate issues to do with conflict in the Middle East, and these chambers do also. I think two or three years ago the member for Light, Tony Piccolo, in the other place had a motion that was not too dissimilar to the one the Hon. Connie Bonaros is putting forward.

The loss of life in this area of the world is tragic. It is truly devastating to hear of further losses in civilian life in Palestine during a recent 11-day bombardment of the heavily populated Gaza Strip. I wish to express my deepest condolences to the 242 Palestinians who lost their lives, including 66 children, and I also wish to condemn the loss of 12 lives, including two children, as a result of Hamas rocket fire in Israel. We all recognise the tragedy of civilian loss of life, particularly those of children, and the damage that is caused by severe limitations on human rights. People all around the world, including those in Palestine, deserve to be able to chart their own course in history.

Any breach of international humanitarian law or human rights should be condemned and I am sure the vast majority of people living in Israel, in the Palestinian territories and in Australia simply want to see peace and prosperity in the region. I echo the call from the Hon. Connie Bonaros for our federal government to provide humanitarian assistance to the Palestinian people, particularly those living in Gaza, and to advocate for equal rights for Palestinian and Israeli people to prevent further loss of civilian life.

The late Bob Hawke, a former Labor leader and prime minister, felt very strongly about conflict in the Middle East. While Bob Hawke once held strong pro Israeli views his position shifted over the years in support for the recognition of a Palestinian state. In 2017, Bob Hawke said:

I am well known as a long-time supporter of the right of Israel to exist as a state behind secure and recognised borders—nothing has changed in that respect. What has changed is the sentiment [in the] Israeli political leadership.

I will always remember my meeting immediately after the end of the Yom Kippur War in October 1973 with its then Prime Minister Golda Meir. I listened with admiration and in total agreement as this wonderful woman, still traumatised with grief, looked into my eyes and said there could be no peace for Israel until there was an honourable settlement of the aspirations of the Palestinian people.

[She] was absolutely right and her words have a particular resonance—and invoke a special responsibility—for Australia. It was our great Foreign Minister, Dr HV Evatt who chaired the UN Special Committee on Palestine and it was the Resolution of that Committee that authorised the partition of Palestine into two states.

Bob Carr, the former NSW Premier and federal Labor foreign minister, expressed similar views. In 2017, Bob Carr said:

We must balance our just recognition of Israel with the equally just recognition of Palestine.

The World Bank and IMF say the Palestinians are ready to govern themselves. And Hawke and Rudd and Gareth Evans recommend it.

In 2017, Bob Carr led a successful campaign for NSW Labor to recognise Palestine. Similar motions have been passed on a number of occasions by the South Australian Labor Party at their state conventions.

The concept of a Palestinian state evokes different responses and sometimes, as in the case with Bob Hawke, ones that change over time but the critical and practical issue of borders between Israel and Palestine remain unresolved. In June 2020, Al Jazeera reported a quite concise history of the issues to do with borders in the Palestinian state, which I will not talk about in great detail but it is certainly a good summary of the May 1948 British mandate that triggered the first Arab-Israeli war, fighting that continued until January 1949 when an armistice agreement was signed between Israel and Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan and Syria.

The 1949 Armistice Line, also known as the Green Line, was at the time the generally recognised boundary between Israel and the West Bank. The Green Line is also referred to as the pre-1967 border before Israeli occupation of the remaining Palestinian territories during the 1967 war where Israel occupied all of the historic Palestinian territories and expelled further Palestinians from their homes.

What we have seen then is the Palestinian territories further decrease as Israeli settlements are built on Palestinian land. There is estimated to be between 600,000 and 750,000 Israeli settlers living in at least 250 settlements, thought to be comprised of about 130 official and 120 unofficial in the occupied West Bank and East Jerusalem.

Israeli settlements are regarded as illegal under international law, violating the fourth Geneva Convention. In addition, since 2002 a wall has been constructed that now stretches for some 700 kilometres and there are in excess of 700 road obstacles across the West Bank, including 140 checkpoints.

The Al Jazeera report further talked about the restrictions on movement: about 70,000 Palestinians with Israeli work permits needing to cross checkpoints each day. It went on further to estimate that there are 1.5 million Palestinian refugees living in 58 official UN camps located throughout Palestine and neighbouring countries. It reported that in total there are more than five million registered Palestinian refugees, mostly living outside these camps. The plight of Palestinian refugees is perhaps the longest unresolved refugee problem in the world, the Al Jazeera report went on to say.

The United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs in the Occupied Palestinian Territory publishes a range of material about the occupied territories. One update from 2017 noted that, of the approximately five million Palestinians in the occupied territories, 43 per cent were considered to be refugees, food insecurity was running at 43 per cent and unemployment was 41 per cent in the Gaza Strip and more than 20 per cent in the West Bank. These are daunting figures, all before COVID. The same UN publication refers to just 3 per cent of piped water in these territories being fit for human consumption.

I think it is helpful, too, in considering this, to consider some of the good work that is happening in South Australia. With that, I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Bills

INQUIRY INTO PALLIATIVE CARE BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

CONSTITUTION (INDEPENDENT SPEAKER) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

Parliamentary Committees

CRIME AND PUBLIC INTEGRITY POLICY COMMITTEE

The House of Assembly appointed Mr Teague to the committee in place of the Hon. D.R. Cregan (resigned).

Bills

MOTOR VEHICLES (ELECTRIC VEHICLE LEVY) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

At 18:31 the council adjourned until Thursday 14 October 2021 at 11:00.