

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 4 May 2022

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens)** took the chair at 14:16 and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:17): I bring up the first report of the committee, 2022.

Report received.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS: I bring up the second report of the committee, 2022.

Report received and read.

Ministerial Statement

MARINE SCALEFISH FISHERY

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:20): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement. On 1 July 2021, the former Liberal government implemented a new management system within the marine scalefish fishery that included the imposition of catch quotas for four priority species: King George whiting, snapper, garfish and calamari. Under then Minister for Primary Industries and member for Finniss, the Hon. David Basham, licence conditions fixing a quota entitlement on all licences were applied in accordance with his determinations.

As part of the former Liberal government's plan, a voluntary licence surrender program was undertaken that saw a significant number of marine scalefish licence holders exit the industry. At the former minister's discretion, additional allocation of units could be made by the minister upon an applicant demonstrating exceptional circumstances during the period upon which the quota entitlements were calculated.

I am advised that the former minister, as a matter of policy, limited the adjustment of the quota for licence holders where exceptional circumstances were demonstrated to a pro-rata share of the catch histories of licence holders who surrendered their licences after 2 November 2020. This meant that the former minister chose a course of action that, to use SACAT's words:

...singled out those fishers unfairly disadvantaged by the general allocation process and effectively sought to enshrine that disadvantage...

SACAT proceeded to state:

Further as the policy itself makes clear, the reason the Minister adopted this approach was not related to the equitable distribution of the fishery, or even its sustainability. The rationale and motivation for the policy was to avoid disturbing the indicative quotas which had already been notionally allocated to fishers who had not made exceptional circumstances claims.

A number of licence holders appealed the decisions of the former minister to the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (SACAT) arguing that the pro-rata adjustment method implemented by the former minister was unfair and unreasonable.

SACAT recently made rulings to set aside the decisions made by the member for Finniss in his role as Minister for Primary Industries and for the matter to be remitted for reconsideration. Since the change of government, this now falls to me in my role of Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development.

I draw the chamber's attention to some of the findings of SACAT in the matter of Pennington on 17 February 2022 that:

...although the precise motivation for the policy is not entirely clear, we infer its adoption is likely to have been influenced by considerations of expediency, risk management and perhaps political motivations.

The SACAT findings continue:

...in our view the adoption of this policy imposed an impermissible fetter on the exercise of the Minister's broad discretion and introduced into the exceptional circumstances process an irrelevant consideration, namely the need to leave existing indicative quota allocations undisturbed.

During the caretaker period, appeals to these decisions were filed in the Supreme Court. However, I can today advise the chamber that, as the new minister, I have given directions to withdraw these appeals and accept SACAT's ruling that the former minister's pro-rata policy 'had no legal foundation' and produced unfair and unjust results for these fishers with exceptional circumstances.

I also advise the chamber that this government has resolved to remedy the error of the member for Finniss by recalculating the additional quota units for licence holders with exceptional circumstances while preserving the quota units that were allocated on 1 July 2021 to all licence holders.

I have sought and received advice from the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI) that taking this course of action to correct the former minister's grievous error will not impact on the sustainability of the impacted species.

Consistent with the SARDI advice, the total allowable commercial catches (known as TACCs) can be increased to accommodate the additional units to be allocated to the affected fishers, thereby not impacting on other licence holders in the current fishing period and the expected next quota period.

The decisions taken by the former Liberal government in adopting a policy without legal authority have caused distress to a number of businesses who only sought a fair outcome. The decisions appeared to be made by the former minister, as SACAT indicated, with political expediency in mind. This should not have been a factor in decisions taken to properly manage our marine resources. The nature of the findings from SACAT raise serious questions about the actions of the former Minister for Primary Industries and the policies of the former Liberal government.

Question Time

OMBUDSMAN INVESTIGATION, MEMBER FOR BRAGG

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): My question is to the Attorney-General. Following the report of the Ombudsman, will the Leader of the Government withdraw the allegation he made in this house on 16 November last year, that the former Attorney-General had a conflict of interest which she did not declare in relation to the port development on Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:29): This matter has had a long history and I might just go through some of that because it's important to understand some of the complexities of this area.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: On 12 October 2021, the House of Assembly resolved to establish a select committee to inquire into and report on the conduct of the former Attorney-General in relation to decisions and statements made to parliament regarding the rejection of the Kangaroo Island Port Application made by Kangaroo Island Plantation Timbers in her capacity as the then Minister for Planning.

A select committee was tasked with examining, amongst other things, whether the then Attorney-General had misled parliament in various statements made to the House of Assembly in

estimates committee in 2021. Deliberate misleading of the House of Assembly by a member is a breach of the privileges of the house and may be treated as contempt.

An eminent Queen's Counsel, Dr Rachael Gray QC, was engaged as counsel assisting the committee. The committee tabled its final report on 18 November 2021—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —recommending that the former Attorney-General be found guilty of contempt—

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Point of order: the question was quite clear and quite straight forward. Why wouldn't the Attorney-General answer the question, with respect, which was specifically asked?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Thanks for your point of order. I am not upholding it. The minister is giving a rather extensive answer. It won't go on forever, but I am sure he is going to get to the point reasonably soon.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It is important to get the information here. The committee tabled its final report on 18 November 2021 recommending that the former Attorney-General be found guilty of contempt for misleading the parliament. The committee did not hear evidence to make adverse findings on maladministration against the Premier or other public officers, however Dr Gray considered that, and I will quote:

The evidence adduced before the select committee revealed a significant failure of good governance. There are considerable issues that arise following the investigation by the Ombudsman concerning the manner in which such a departure from good governance and decision-making was able to occur. These issues were referred to the Ombudsman by the committee for investigation pursuant to section 14(1) of the Ombudsman Act. It is important to note that the Ombudsman must act in accordance with the Ombudsman Act and I am certain that there has never been any suggestion by parliament that the Ombudsman should do otherwise.

The Ombudsman investigated only certain matters, not all matters that were considered by the select committee—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —on the conduct of the Hon. Vickie Chapman.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am trying to listen to the minister. Continue, please.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The Ombudsman has now delivered a report into the investigation and I thank the Ombudsman for his report. I have now had an opportunity to read the report. It's an important piece of work and I would like to acknowledge the contribution the Ombudsman has made into investigating these matters. We will examine the report, including, and in particular, the way that matters might be referred to the Ombudsman by parliamentary committees.

On 18 November 2021, the House of Assembly passed an unprecedented vote of no confidence in the former Attorney-General. I am informed that it is the first time in the history of South Australia—165 years now of government—that a minister of the Crown has lost the confidence of the House of Assembly.

Further, on 30 November 2021, the Attorney-General was found by the House of Assembly to be guilty of contempt for deliberately misleading parliament following the findings of the committee that three factual statements were false and were known to be false by the Attorney-General at the time of each of those statements. An example of one of those factual statements was that the government had not commissioned its own assessment of the best location for that port to export timber from Kangaroo Island or undertake a process to look at where—

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Point of order.

The PRESIDENT: I will listen to your point of order.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Mr President, the question was about the Attorney withdrawing the remarks he made last year. This is irrelevant to the question.

The PRESIDENT: The Attorney is actually giving background because there was no explanation given. I am listening to the background and I am sure the Attorney is going to answer the question. Continue, please.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The House of Assembly further passed a motion that suspended the former Attorney-General from the service of the house for six days. The former Attorney-General stepped down from her role as Deputy Premier, stepped aside from her ministerial positions and had other ministers appointed to fill the areas from which she stepped down. Sir, statements—

The PRESIDENT: Minister, I'm sure you are getting to the point.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Statements that had been made at the time were in accordance with the information presented and the conclusions drawn at the time.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Point of order, Mr President—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, would you just like to repeat that last—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Point of order, Mr President: can the Attorney-General please repeat that last part of his answer.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, you should listen.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Point of order, Mr President: he is defying your ruling. You asked him to repeat.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, I didn't hear the last sentence. I would like you to repeat the last sentence, which was your answer to the question. We gave you plenty of leeway to give you a very—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I did remark that conclusions were drawn and statements were made on information and reports at the time.

OMBUDSMAN INVESTIGATION, MEMBER FOR BRAGG

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): Supplementary: can the Attorney-General please answer my question. Will he withdraw the allegation he made in this house on 16 November last year that the former Attorney-General had a conflict of interest which she did not declare in relation to the port development on Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:35): I refer to my previous statements, my previous answer in relation to statements that were made on the basis of conclusions that were made at the time.

OMBUDSMAN INVESTIGATION, MEMBER FOR BRAGG

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:35): My question is to the Attorney-General. Following the report of the Ombudsman, will the Attorney-General and his ministerial colleagues take lessons on how to deal with actual, potential and perceived conflicts of interest and how to interpret the Ministerial Code of Conduct?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:35): Following the report, we certainly will have a look

at some of the comments made in the report. In particular, we will look at the potential ways that parliament, through its committee structures, might refer things to the Ombudsman in the future. There were certainly some helpful guidelines in there that we will look at.

ELECTION COMMITMENTS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister commit to deliver on every commitment relating to her portfolio responsibilities made by her government in the lead-up to this year's election and during the campaign itself?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:36): It wasn't my government before the election, but thank you for the suggestion that it was. This is a government that will keep its promises. Thank you.

RUBY HUNTER ARCHIE ROACH MONUMENT

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister inform the council about the recent unveiling of the Ruby Hunter and Archie Roach monument in Barmera?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:36): I thank the honourable member for her question and for her ongoing interest in this area. Last Friday, I had the privilege of attending the unveiling of the Ruby Hunter and Archie Roach monument on the Barmera lakefront on the lands of the River Murray and Mallee peoples, who were represented by Aunty Ena Turner, who provided the Welcome to Country.

I had the pleasure of attending the ceremony, alongside members of Aunty Ruby and Uncle Archie's family, including Aunty Ruby's brothers Uncle Wally Richards and Uncle Jeffrey Hunter. During the unveiling, I had the pleasure of being seated with the mayor, Peter Hunt, of the Berri Barmera Council, whose colleagues Councillor Rhonda Centofanti and Councillor Margaret Evans were amongst members of the Hunter Roach Monument Committee.

It was the tireless work of this committee, whose members also included Cheryl Norris, Rosemary Gower and Ros Richards, Aunty Ruby's sister-in-law, and Trevor Scott, that led to the creation of these twin monuments.

The local MP, the member for Chaffey from the other place, also attended, as well, sir, as one of your predecessors, now Senator McLachlan, and Senate candidate Kerryne Liddle. I want to recognise others, including Adam Blake, the CEO of Blundstone Australia, who journeyed from Tasmania for the unveiling. It was Adam who, after hearing an interview with Mrs Norris on ABC radio about the work of the committee, contacted her and was able to secure the board of Blundstone Australia to donate the entire \$15,000 needed for this project. It is a great example of the private sector working with the council and the community to further reconciliation.

As many will know, Aunty Ruby Hunter was a local legend of the Riverland who, along with her lifelong partner, Uncle Archie Roach, became some of Australia's most renowned musicians. Their music, often inspired by the Riverland, brought Aboriginal culture and identity to the world.

Before her passing in 2010, Aunty Ruby earned many accolades: an ARIA nominee, Helpmann Award winner, several Deadly Awards and applause from audiences across the country and indeed across the world. Aunty Ruby was the first Aboriginal woman to sign up with a major recording company. She was inducted, posthumously, into the National Indigenous Music Awards Hall of Fame in 2020.

Uncle Archie's music career spans over 30 years and more than 10 albums, from his debut with *Charcoal Lane* in 1990, including the very famous song *Took the Children Away*, to his latest album, *Tell Me Why*, which was released last year as a companion album to the memoir of the same name. Uncle Archie has won nine ARIAs, eight Deadly Awards, four National Indigenous Music Awards, an APRA Award, a National Dreamtime Award and in 2013 was inducted to both the Deadly Awards Hall of Fame and the National Indigenous Music Hall of Fame, as well as in 2015 the Music Victoria Hall of Fame.

Uncle Archie was honoured in 2015 in the Queen's Birthday Honours List and made a Member of the Order of Australia for his contribution to the nation. Both Aunty Ruby and Uncle Archie were survivors of the stolen generations. Aunty Ruby was born on the banks of the Murray River at Renmark and despite being taken from her family as a child never lost her spiritual connection with the Riverland. Uncle Archie was taken from his family in Victoria. It was when Uncle Archie moved to Adelaide that he met Aunty Ruby, both aged 16, and this remarkable partnership began.

It was a moving and fitting day when the Aunty Ruby and Uncle Archie monuments were unveiled in the Riverland. The monuments contain artworks depicting Aunty Ruby's totem, the pelican (Nori), and Uncle Archie's totem, the eagle (Wuldi). I am proud that the new South Australian government committed before the election to implement a \$1 million program for the design and delivery of further statues to celebrate Aboriginal leaders' history and heritage.

It was a great collaboration with Blundstone and the private sector, but we want to lead as a government in making sure we see more of these things around the country. As was commented on last Friday, these sorts of monuments can provide inspiration to young Aboriginal people. I think the words that were used were, 'After all, you can't be what you can't see.'

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:41): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney, representing the Minister for Health in the other place, a question about the Women's and Children's Hospital.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: South Australia remains the only mainland state in Australia without a paediatric cardiac surgery unit. Currently, we know there are about 100 sick babies and children who are flown to the Royal Children's Hospital in Melbourne for their life-saving heart surgery at a cost of about \$6 million a year. It has been revealed that some babies and young children have died, tragically, due to the Women's and Children's Hospital not being able to perform that cardiac surgery here in SA.

Seasoned clinicians from the hospital have told us heart surgery and acute cardiopulmonary treatment can safely and efficiently be performed at the hospital. We are advised that the initial capital expenditure—the maintenance cost for the service at the Women's and Children's Hospital, compared to interstate, would save taxpayers about \$5 million per year, not to mention removing the massive inconvenience of the sick child and their family having to travel interstate.

The former Liberal government was heavily criticised for refusing to establish such a unit in South Australia, despite having philanthropists committed to funding its establishment. My questions to the minister are:

1. Given its position in opposition, is the new Labor government considering setting up a paediatric cardiac surgery unit here at the Women's and Children's Hospital?
2. If not, why the change of heart?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:43): I thank the honourable member for her questions and her interest in this area. They are indeed important questions, and I will refer them to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

MEMBERS, CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:43): My question is to the Attorney-General. How many conflicts of interest have the Attorney-General and his ministerial colleagues declared since their appointments?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:43): I thank the honourable member for her question. I suspect that her colleagues answered questions similarly when they were in government. I am quite sure whenever it is appropriate to, my colleagues and myself will do that.

MEMBERS, CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:44): Supplementary: can the Attorney-General take that question on notice and supply the answer to the chamber when ready?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:44): I can answer it now, and I will answer it again: whenever it is appropriate to do so, I and my colleagues will do that.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hanson.

SNAPPER FISHERY

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:44): Thank you, Mr President. May the fourth be with you, sir. My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about the recent release of snapper fingerlings in South Australian waters?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:44): I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this area. The snapper is an iconic species for its delicious eating but also because it has an important role in our tourism and recreational fishing economies. While snapper is a big part of the commercial marine scalefish fishery, as one of the main target species, its impact on tourism cannot be understated, as it draws people from around the country to our regions that are famed for their proximity to fishing areas that have provided so much enjoyment to recreational fishers and families over many years.

Sadly, snapper numbers have declined over the past few years due to a range of factors and reached a critical point where the current ban was put in place until January 2023 by the previous government. Snapper fishing is currently banned until 31 January in the West Coast, Spencer Gulf and Gulf St Vincent zones, while still permitted within the South-East to all fishing sectors, with measures in place such as catch and size limits for the recreational, charter and commercial fishing industries.

It is of course understandable that many in the community, particularly within regional areas where people travel to fish snapper, want to better understand the rationale behind decisions that are taken in protecting fish stocks. That is why Labor took to the recent election a comprehensive policy around recreational fishing that included better communication with the rec fishing sector on the science behind the decisions that are made. Ultimately, sustainability will be at the heart of decision-making when it comes to protecting all marine resources under the Malinauskas Labor government. Where we can help protect and preserve our highly valued marine resources and environment, we will.

We are very lucky in this state to have dedicated officers within PIRSA and SARDI who are passionate about using their skills and knowledge to the benefit of our marine life and the communities and industries that rely on it. At SARDI's West Beach facility they have been able to crack the code, as it were, and successfully breed snapper in captivity in a major boost to restocking the depleted snapper stocks. Over the past month and in the next few weeks, close to 100,000 baby snapper, known as fingerlings, have been and will continue to be released on the Spencer Gulf on beaches that are close to seagrass habitats, where they will settle naturally in line with their usual breeding cycle.

While I couldn't attend the exciting release of the fingerlings in person due to commitments in this place, I put on the record my appreciation to the researchers at SARDI, who have worked tirelessly to ensure the snapper breeding program was as successful as it has turned out to be. This important work will lead to better outcomes for the snapper species, the marine scalefish industry, the charter industry and the recreational fishers, who all want to see this icon of our oceans returned to long-term sustainability so that generations to come can enjoy snapper, as many of us have done.

SNAPPER FISHERY

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:47): Supplementary: will the minister or someone in her government apologise for, in their term of government, failing to recognise the depletion of the

snapper stocks, placing them in peril and once again leaving it to the Marshall Liberal government to have to enact snapper fishery closures to ensure the ongoing sustainability of the fishery?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:47): Any decision on the removal or continuation of a ban on fishing will be in line with the scientific evidence of the time.

PARLIAMENTARY STANDARDS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:48): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Attorney as Leader of the Government of this place on the subject of parliamentary standards.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I note that this government has already moved over 11 notices of motion in this place in just two days. I also note that they have not chosen to continue the sessional order that they respond to questions put on notice within 30 days and that it is falling to the opposition to move that motion, and the Greens certainly will be supporting that.

I very much notice the missing motion that has not yet been put before this place of an MPs' code of conduct, and yet we have been here for two days. My question to the Leader of the Government is: will you move to reinstitute an MPs' code of conduct for this council, or will you again leave it to the opposition or crossbench to do your job for you?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:49): I thank the honourable member for her question. I certainly will have a look at that this week. If there is something that had been moved in previous parliaments that has been an oversight and not moved, I will look at it and take action to remedy that.

OMBUDSMAN INVESTIGATION, MEMBER FOR BRAGG

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:49): My questions are to the Attorney-General. When exactly did you read the Ombudsman's report investigation of a referral by the select committee on the conduct of the Hon. Vickie Chapman MP, given that you stated on radio this morning that you hadn't read it in full and offered the following explanation: 'There was a pretty busy day yesterday with parliament sitting,' albeit that the council rose at six minutes past five yesterday afternoon? Secondly, what was the Attorney so preoccupied with that he couldn't read a critical report written by one of his statutory officers?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:50): I thank the honourable member for her question. Certainly, I had a good look, but not at every page of the report, when it came out yesterday. This morning, I read thoroughly, I think it's all 99 pages, including the 68 pages of the body of the report, and the appendices.

OMBUDSMAN INVESTIGATION, MEMBER FOR BRAGG

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:50): Supplementary: can the Attorney advise how soon he thinks it's appropriate for ministers to read critical reports by statutory officers in their portfolios?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:50): As soon as they possibly can.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: Well what were you doing after 5 o'clock, you slacker?

The Hon. R.P. Wortley: Order!

The PRESIDENT: Order! Thanks for your help, the Hon. Mr Wortley. I hope you are not dipping into my pay for unsolicited assistance.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Assistant President!

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Wortley, it's your question.

MAY DAY CELEBRATIONS

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:50): This chamber may be aware that on the weekend tens of thousands of people marched around the country—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Industrial Relations.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: As this chamber would be aware, many tens of thousands of people marched throughout the streets of Australia in celebration of May Day—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: And around the world.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: And around the world—there were millions around the world—but in Australia many tens of thousands. Will the minister inform the council of the importance of May Day to working people in South Australia?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for his question and his long, deep passion in this area as a former union official in particular and I think a former minister for industrial relations. It shows his very strong interest in this area.

The Hon. R.P. Wortley: I would have made it a public holiday.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I don't know that the Attorney-General needs your help, to be honest.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the Hon. Russell Wortley for his help—

The PRESIDENT: Well then, 'Poor you,' that's what I say. Move on.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —and I am sure he will continue to be very helpful over the next four years. International Workers' Day, or May Day, is celebrated right throughout the world on 1 May to commemorate the achievements and the sacrifices of working people and their representatives in the struggle for a more just and equal society. May Day celebrations provide a chance to reflect on how far we have come. Many of the rights working people enjoy today were bitterly fought for and hard won by generations in the past.

In just over a hundred years, workers and the union movement have achieved things like the eight-hour day, the 38-hour working week, the minimum wage, redundancy entitlements, workers compensation, equal pay for women and in Australia have been instrumental in some of the really significant reforms, such as Medicare and superannuation. Together, these rights have made Australia one of the strongest democracies and countries to live and work in in the world.

As parliamentarians, and particularly Labor parliamentarians whose political party was proudly born out of the trade union movement at the Tree of Knowledge in Queensland in 1892, we have a part to play in that story. I would also, in particular, like to acknowledge other members of this chamber who I ran into during May Day celebrations over the weekend, in particular the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. Robert Simms.

But the real heroes of May Day are the workers and the union officials and leaders who risk their livelihoods to campaign in their workplaces and their communities for a better future. All of those involved in different parts of the Labor of movement stand on the shoulders of giants of the past. This government is committed to doing its part to support working people by introducing new reforms, areas like fighting against wage theft and criminalising industrial manslaughter as a standalone offence. These reforms will join, in a very small way, those of the past, the legacy of which is celebrated on May Day.

As part of May Day celebrations over the weekend, I was honoured to attend, along with the Deputy Premier, the Hon. Dr Susan Close, the member for Port Adelaide, the Port Adelaide Workers Memorial. The memorial, with its towering marble statue of Justice, has been in place at the corner of St Vincent Street and Commercial Road in Port Adelaide for over a century now. Each May Day the name of a significant figure in the labour movement who has recently passed away is inscribed on the granite base. The memorial features many great and colourful individuals and activists and community leaders in the Port Adelaide area, and this year Ben Carslake was added to their number.

Ben was the secretary of the Building Workers Industrial Union and oversaw many of the amalgamations which eventually led to the CFMEU we know today. He was a committed and lifelong member of the progressive movement and a passionate campaigner for workers' rights who was responsible for many campaigns behind industry superannuation and the construction industry redundancy scheme which building workers continue to enjoy today.

As the member for Port Adelaide, the Hon. Dr Susan Close, reflected upon, he was also instrumental in the movement to stop Marineland expanding and continuing dolphins in captivity many years ago. He sadly passed away in April 2021 at the age of 74. We pay tribute to Ben and all those who have been part of the labour movement in the past.

MARINE SCALEFISH FISHERY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:55): I refer to the minister's statement regarding the marine scale fishery decision that she read out just some time ago and seek an understanding of whether the minister—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bonaros, are you seeking leave to make—

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I am not seeking leave; I am not making an explanation, Mr President. I am asking questions.

The PRESIDENT: Well, you had better ask the question.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Yes, I am.

1. Has the minister consulted with the relevant sectors of the fishing industry regarding the impacts of her decision on those sectors? If so, what was their advice, specifically in relation to the advice by SARDI regarding the total allowable commercial catches and the resulting redistribution of wealth this outcome will create?

2. How many licence holders will the government's decision impact, and is the impact limited only to those licence holders who applied for exceptional circumstances or will it also extend to those who may have had similar circumstances but chose not to apply for assessment on the basis that their circumstances were not exceptional?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:57): I thank the honourable member for her question. I think it is important to point out that this is a decision—a ruling, if you like—from SACAT. The ruling from SACAT was that the policy that had been implemented by the former Minister for Primary Industries had no legal foundation. I repeat that for members' consideration: it had no legal foundation.

This was a policy, created presumably by the former Minister for Primary Industries, that had no legal foundation, that was considered by SACAT to be unjust and unfair and to effectively enshrine—I am paraphrasing the words of SACAT—disadvantage from fishers who had exceptional circumstances. SACAT found that the former primary industries minister enforced this policy which produced unfair and unjust results for a group of the state's commercial fishers. I quote that it:

...singled out those fishers unfairly disadvantaged by the general allocation process and effectively sought to enshrine that disadvantage...

SACAT also reflected that there is no evidence that the minister's policy has been exposed to parliamentary scrutiny.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Point of order, Mr President: we have already heard the minister's statement. Can she please answer the member's question?

The PRESIDENT: I am sure, minister, you are getting close to providing an answer.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Thank you, Mr President. I will point out that I am not reading from the statement. I am reading from some other notes, quoting SACAT. As I mentioned, there is no evidence that the minister's policy has been exposed to parliamentary scrutiny.

These are findings of the SACAT. It is incumbent upon me to now address the mess that has been created by the former Liberal government, the mess that has been created by the former Minister for Primary Industries and the mess that has resulted in a number of licence holders finding that their businesses will be unviable because of this enshrining of disadvantage. In terms of the specific impacts on individual fishers, I am looking forward to being able to provide that information to those affected in the very near future.

MARINE SCALEFISH FISHERY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:59): Supplementary: quoting again from SACAT, is the minister acknowledging that SACAT itself has said that this has the potential to extend to those fishers who did not make an exceptional circumstance application, and is the government's intention to also remedy this for them?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:00): Thank you for the supplementary question. The nature of that question falls under my final comment, which was that we will be able to advise people as soon as possible.

MARINE SCALEFISH FISHERY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:00): Further supplementary: back to the first question I asked. How many licence holders will this government decision impact?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:00): I reiterate again, the decision we are referring to, which has been found by SACAT to have no legal foundation, was a decision of the former Liberal government. The member is welcome to look at the SACAT rulings.

The Hon. C. Bonaros: I've read it.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am glad to hear that she has already looked at some of them, which is excellent. There were approximately 180 who did not apply for exceptional circumstances—presumably they had no exceptional circumstances to apply for—and then there were a number of others who claimed exceptional circumstances. When they were not upheld, some of them have gone to SACAT and not been upheld. Others to do with what is called the pro-rata policy are the ones we are referring to in this.

MARINE SCALEFISH FISHERY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:01): Further supplementary: is the government also intending to remedy the adverse impacts this decision will have on other licence holders who bought quota on the open market and will be adversely impacted by this decision?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:01): I think the member would need to explain what adverse impacts she is referring to there. I say that in particular because the way we have been able to approach this mess that was left to us by the previous government is to be able to increase the total allowable catch, which means that those who currently hold a quota will not be impacted this year or next year by the changes, which have been necessitated by the pro-rata policy made under the former Liberal government, which has been found to have no legal foundation.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Further supplementary.

The PRESIDENT: Final supplementary.

MARINE SCALEFISH FISHERY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:02): Does the minister acknowledge that once a fishery is allocated any decision like this will result in a redistribution of wealth and a discount on the basis of kilo to units for those licence holders who bought on the open market?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:02): I would refer the member to various comments made by SACAT in regard to the impact on those who have—I think I am paraphrasing now SACAT's words—received greater quota than they were entitled to because of this pro-rata policy that had no legal foundation.

OMBUDSMAN INVESTIGATION, MEMBER FOR BRAGG

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:02): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Attorney-General regarding the Ombudsman's report.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: The Ombudsman, in his introduction to his report regarding the referral to last year's kangaroo court select committee, states:

I found the referral to be imprecise and requiring a greater level of interpretation by me than is ideal. I have accepted that the referral requires me to inquire into matters on which the select committee findings were made, namely, when Ms Chapman was in the position of an actual and perceived conflict of interest.

On radio this morning, the Attorney stated that an eminent QC made recommendations on behalf of the select committee, and further that the sanctions the parliament handed down were not on the basis of conflict of interest, that they were on the basis of misleading parliament. Attorney, who is correct—yourself on radio this morning or the Ombudsman?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:04): I will check, to make sure I am accurately representing this, but as I recall the original sanction the House of Assembly proposed to impose was nine days, and that was on the basis of three days for each of the instances of misleading parliament. That was reduced to six days, I think on the basis of two days for each of three instances of misleading parliament. I will go back and check and, if I need to add anything more to that, I am happy to do so.

OMBUDSMAN INVESTIGATION, MEMBER FOR BRAGG

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:04): Supplementary question: can the Attorney confirm that the letter from the committee chair, Ms Andrea Michaels, member for Enfield, refers only to the conflict of interest and not to misleading parliament?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:04): If I need to, I'll check that, but I don't think that's got absolutely anything to do with anything that we've talked about.

OMBUDSMAN INVESTIGATION, MEMBER FOR BRAGG

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:04): Further supplementary: does the Attorney-General stand by his comments this morning on radio—every single one of them?

The PRESIDENT: That was part of the original question, but it wasn't part of your answer. I call the Hon. Mr Hunter.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Hunter will be heard in silence.

DOG FENCE

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:05): And, sir, I would seek your support and protection from these nasty barbs being sent across the chamber at me.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Sir, the Hon. Ms Lensink is casting aspersions at my dressing style.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Hunter, sit down for a second. The Hon. Mr Hunter will ask his question and be heard in silence, and the answer will be heard in silence. The Hon. Mr Hunter.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: New rules?

The PRESIDENT: No, they're not new rules.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Thank you, Mr President, for your protection.

The PRESIDENT: They're the age-old rules. The Hon. Mr Hunter.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Thank you, Mr President. My question is directed to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister update the council on the current dog fence repairs?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:06): I thank the honourable member for this very important question, and I'm delighted to inform the council on the progress of this vital piece of infrastructure. The dog fence is 5,400 kilometres long and protects the sheep industry from wild dogs and dingoes. The fence stretches across South Australia from the Great Australian Bight near Fowlers Bay, borders New South Wales and then turns north and east across Queensland to the Darling Downs.

The South Australian dog fence was established under the Dog Fence Act of 1946 to stop dingoes migrating into land used for sheep production. More than two-thirds of the South Australian dog fence is more than 100 years old. Over time it has been damaged by kangaroos, emus, feral camels, wild dogs, weather events and sand erosion. The dog fence protects South Australia's \$4.3 billion livestock industry, which is why it is so important that the fence is repaired when necessary.

This current project will improve a 2,150-kilometre barrier that stretches from the Great Australian Bight to the New South Wales border. Each section is designed and built to suit the terrain, type of ground and pressure from wild dogs and other wild animals. Over the past 15 years wild dog numbers have significantly increased and continue to invade the sheep zone in South Australia. To manage these challenges there is a need for constant communication between the state government, Dog Fence Board and Livestock SA about which sections need to be prioritised for repairs.

The fence rebuild is due to be completed by June 2024. An independent economic analysis shows that by replacing sections of the 100-year-old fence the state will benefit in many ways. The analysis done shows that reducing the impact of wild dogs could create a net benefit to the community of between \$56 million and \$112 million over a 20-year period. This is yet another reason why this government is committed to completing this project.

The large rain event in mid-January impacted about 1,000 kilometres of the dog fence, with 25 kilometres of the fence destroyed in 40 separate breaches. Temporary repairs to the fence are complete, with around one-third of the 25 kilometres destroyed having been rebuilt to the new standard. One-third is temporary and will be fixed through the rebuild program, and one-third has been temporarily repaired and will need to be rebuilt by the Dog Fence Board. The funding of the rebuild will be done by contributions from the commonwealth, the state government and from the livestock industry.

Local dog fence boards have contractors who patrol the fence every 14 days to undertake repairs, place poison baits along the fence line and destroy dogs in the vicinity of the fence. The Dog

Fence Board inspects half of the fence every year to identify sections that need updating or replacing and prioritise capital works.

The Malinauskas Labor government will continue to ensure that this project gets the funding and attention it needs to complete this project as quickly as possible and looks forward to bipartisan support in this chamber and the other one for this important project.

DOG FENCE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:09): My supplementary is: how much funding and how many repairs were provided in the previous 16-year reign of this government prior to 2018?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:09): I wasn't in government and therefore responsible to the chamber for that previous 16 years.

DOG FENCE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:09): A further supplementary—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: —from the original answer: how much will the Labor government commit—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: —in this budget?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:09): As I said in my original answer, the Malinauskas Labor government will continue to ensure that this project gets the funding and attention it needs to complete.

Ministerial Statement

COVID-19 SCHOOLS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:10): I seek leave to table a ministerial statement made in the other place by the Minister for Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I apologise for not doing it at the start but it hadn't been delivered in the lower house by the time we did that here.

Question Time

AGE OF CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:10): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Attorney-General on the topic of raising the age of criminal responsibility.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: A national campaign to raise the age of criminal responsibility to at least 14, in line with other jurisdictions around the world, has been backed by a coalition of legal, medical and social justice organisations, including the Law Council of Australia, the Australian Medical Association and Indigenous-led groups. Here in South Australia we still charge children at the age of 10. According to the Law Society of South Australia, and I quote from them:

The majority of children that come face to face with the criminal justice system have a background of disadvantage and trauma.

This is a system that is punishing the most vulnerable. Over 50 per cent of children incarcerated are from Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander background, further adding to the disadvantage that is already faced by these communities. In November 2020, the ACT Labor government committed to raising the criminal age of responsibility to 14. My question to the Attorney-General therefore is: will the Malinauskas Labor government follow the lead of the ACT Labor government and commit to finally raising the age of criminal responsibility in South Australia to 14?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:11): I thank the honourable member for his question. It is an area that I know the Hon. Robert Simms certainly has a passion for and an interest in. I have been at events and had discussions with Robert Simms as part of that. Raising the age of criminal responsibility is an important issue. I will talk in a moment a bit more about how it intersects not just with my Attorney-General portfolio but, really importantly, with my Aboriginal affairs portfolio.

In South Australia under section 5 of the Young Offenders Act 1993, the minimum age of criminal responsibility as identified by the honourable member is 10 years old. Under that age, a child cannot be held to commit an offence, meaning they cannot be held criminally liable for their actions. The minimum age of criminal responsibility is the age at which a child can be held criminally responsible and therefore charged and convicted of criminal offences. As the member said, it is higher in many other places around the world. The United Nations had previously recommended a minimum age of criminal responsibility of 12 years old, which it has now revised to the age of 14.

While the age of criminal responsibility in SA is 10 years, between the age of 10 and 14 the common law rebuttal presumption is that the child does not understand the full consequence of their actions and is incapable of forming the mental element of the offence, but that is a rebuttable presumption. At 14 years and after a child can be held criminally responsible for their actions without that rebuttable presumption, meaning that they are considered capable of committing the crime and of forming the necessary mental element that goes into proving the commission of the crime.

There was a working group set up in 2018 under the auspices of the Council of Attorneys-General to examine this particular issue. The Meeting of Attorneys-General, which replaced the former council, was last held I am advised on 12 November 2021. At that meeting in November last year, state attorneys-general supported the development of a proposal to increase the minimum age of criminal responsibility from 10 to 12, including with regard to any exceptions, timing and discussion of implementation requirements.

The Northern Territory, as I am aware, has previously committed to raising the age to 12 years and will continue to work on their reforms and what diversion and programs and services may be in place. As the honourable member pointed out, the Australian Capital Territory has said that they are committed to raising the age to 14 years and are starting work on their own reforms outside of that council of attorneys-general.

One part, as I have been advised, that is a consideration of this group is the reforms of individual states and discussions about those threshold levels of 12 or 14 years of age. As I have said, the council of attorneys-general has agreed to look at reforms to 12, but one jurisdiction, the ACT, is moving towards 14.

I know that there has been commentary from the United Nations, other bodies and human rights organisations, some of which the Hon. Robert Simms has outlined today, for not raising this age yet. This is something that I have certainly had a number of discussions about with a wide range of people, led by Cheryl Axelby, who will be known to many as the former head of the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement and who is now the head of an organisation called Change the Record, which advocates for raising the age. I certainly had discussions before the last election and I will continue those discussions with Cheryl and others in relation to this issue. It is an important issue.

We know that in both adult prisons and in youth detention there is a massive over-representation of Aboriginal people. A couple of years ago, I was told of a statistic that on occasions the entire population of the youth detention centre in South Australia is made up of Aboriginal people. There have been occasions when that is the case. Now that we are in government,

I will be keen to test some of the things that I have been told. In any event, I don't think there is any doubt whatsoever that Aboriginal children, as a percentage, make up far too big a portion of our youth detention.

Raising the age, with appropriate other programs, could go some way to meeting that. Certainly, we see from some of the big national statements, whether it's the Uluru Statement from the Heart or the Closing the Gap targets, that this is an important issue. It is something that we will be turning our mind to and it is discussions I have been involved in and I will be pleased to keep the honourable member up to date with where we go and what we do on this issue.

AGE OF CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:17): Supplementary: noting the minister's reply, has the minister had the opportunity to talk to the ACT Attorney-General about the approach taken there and if he hasn't done so, is that something that he will be doing?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:17): I thank the honourable member for his supplementary question. I haven't done so yet, but very keen to do so.

OMBUDSMAN INVESTIGATION, MEMBER FOR BRAGG

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:17): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General regarding the editorial in *The Advertiser* today.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: In *The Advertiser* today I am sure members would have seen and read with some surprise or some interest at least that the editorial was quite scathing of the previous government and their role in the inquiry into Ms Chapman late last year.

I would like to add a few quotes from *The Advertiser* editorial this morning, and I quote directly, 'The parliamentary probe into Ms Chapman was indeed stacked against her.' Next quote, 'It was a partisan inquiry.' Next quote, 'It was politically loaded.' Next quote, 'Dan Cregan and his Labor friends from the Premier down tried to humiliate Ms Chapman.' The next quote, 'The whole thing is a worrying episode.' Next quote, 'We saw with the Chapman affair Mr Malinauskas and his team were open to the most brutal political games.' Finally, it concluded, 'They were all badly wrong.'

My question to the Attorney-General is: does he accept the account of the editor of *The Advertiser* in today's editorial and if not, why not?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:18): I thank the honourable member for his question. I haven't read today's editorial. I will do so at some stage. I am not in a position to give great commentary on what was said without having yet read it.

I will check the *Hansard* record but I think the honourable member referred to the actions of the previous government, which would be the Liberal government. I am not sure if he wants me to reflect on the actions of the previous Liberal government. I am not sure that's what he meant.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: If that's what he said. We can all check the *Hansard* to see if the honourable member wanted me to reflect—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —on the previous Liberal government or not, because I am quite happy to reflect on the previous Liberal government, if that's what he wishes. Putting that aside, it may have been just a slip, if that's what the honourable member said.

I will note that the committee that looked at this didn't have a majority of Labor members on that committee. It was a committee that had a minority of Labor members on this committee. In fact, other members of the committee were Liberal members and former Liberal members.

It was a minority of Labor members. The majority of the committee were Liberal members and former Liberal members, so it wasn't something that was a Labor-dominated committee, it was actually dominated by Liberal and former Liberal members.

OMBUDSMAN INVESTIGATION, MEMBER FOR BRAGG

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:20): Supplementary: will the minister commit to reading the article and coming back tomorrow and giving his views on the particular editorial?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:20): At some stage, I will endeavour to have a look at the article and consider what the article says. I will reiterate: it wasn't a Labor committee, it was a committee that was made up, in the majority, by Liberal and former Liberal members.

OMBUDSMAN INVESTIGATION, MEMBER FOR BRAGG

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:20): Supplementary: is the editor of *The Advertiser* wrong?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:20): Not at all and I will defend our independent media, regardless of the aspersions the Hon. Dennis Hood wants to make, regardless if the Hon. Dennis Hood thinks *The Advertiser* gets things wrong. I don't agree with that.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Point of order: the member knows I did not say that and did not imply that. I ask that it be withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, I think you are going a stretch too far.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I have great respect for the media and the profession of journalism.

TERRITORIES STOLEN GENERATIONS REDRESS SCHEME

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:21): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister provide an update on South Australian support for the Territories Stolen Generations Redress Scheme?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:21): I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this area, particularly as he is once again a member of the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee. I pay tribute to the Hon. Tung Ngo and to our colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks and others who were members of this committee in a previous parliament, two parliaments ago, that took the issue of the Stolen Generation's Redress Scheme as a very serious issue and brought reports to this chamber on this issue. I know that is why the member, as well as many other members, has a very strong interest in this area.

As members would be aware, the stolen generations represents a very difficult chapter in our nation's history. The impacts and trauma of these events are still felt by stolen generations today, their descendants and by Aboriginal people and communities more generally. I was proud, and it was following the deliberations previously of the former members of the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee, that South Australia, under the Jay Weatherill Labor government, became the first mainland state in the country to have our own Stolen Generations Reparations Scheme, introduced in 2015, funded with \$11 million funding that provided an individual reparations scheme that provided ex gratia payments to Aboriginal people who were eligible under the scheme.

I know from being the minister at the time that this reparations scheme, the first in mainland Australia, that it wasn't the ex gratia payments that I think most Aboriginal people who talked to me found the most valuable part of it. It was the ability to have their stories heard, the ability to be believed, to talk about their trauma and what actually happened to them and their families and their communities.

I am also pleased, in another way, that we are supporting the commonwealth government's redress schemes for survivors of the stolen generations in our territories. The Territories Stolen Generations Redress Scheme provides financial payment and support services to survivors of stolen

generations and, in doing so, it recognises again the deep and long-lasting hurt and trauma these past events by governments and institutions have caused.

In particular, this territories redress scheme seeks to support survivors who were removed from their families and communities as children in the Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory before self-government. The scheme has been established through the National Indigenous Australians Agency of the commonwealth government and began accepting applications from survivors on 1 March this year.

It is believed that some of those children who were stolen from their families were sent, amongst other places around the country, to South Australia and therefore that South Australian authorities and instrumentalities and institutions may have records related to where these children were stolen to, their lives afterwards and the circumstances in which they were wrongfully taken. I am pleased to advise the council that State Records of South Australia is formally cooperating with the territories redress scheme to help find evidence that is needed by the survivors who have been taken as children and therefore support applications to the redress scheme.

The commonwealth's research team is seeking specific records about places and times to help us establish the documents that a survivor needs to show they were removed from their family and their community. In this way, the process is protecting the privacy of people who hold records, both State Records and similar agencies, across the task.

It is not a small task, and I am advised that State Records will be undertaking searches of a database of approximately 150,000 entries, liaising with the redress agency and other government agencies to identify other records, and coordinating loans of physical documents when needed. This is another way our state can acknowledge the wrongs of the past, can look at the circumstances of today and can move forward. No amount of money, no amount of redress will help make up for some of these injustices of the past, but it is in a way the recognition that is needed.

AGTECH GROWTH FUND

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:26): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development about AgTech.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The AgTech Growth Fund provides grants of up to \$100,000 to incentivise private investment into technology innovations in South Australia's agricultural sector. I understand that the outcome of the latest grant round is yet to be finalised and is sitting with the minister's office for sign-off. Many startup companies that have applied for this grant are being affected by the delay and haven't been able to move forward with their innovative technologies. My questions to the minister are, could the minister please advise:

1. When did her office receive the department briefing on the outcomes and recommendations regarding the most recent AgTech Growth Fund grant round?
2. When will the outcomes of the AgTech Growth Fund grants be finalised and applicants informed of the outcome?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:27): I thank the honourable member for her question. AgTech of course is the rapidly evolving tools and technologies that enable agribusiness to innovate, grow and adopt more efficient production practices. South Australia has an AgTech Strategic Plan supported by the AgTech Advisory Group, and South Australia has also enhanced an agTech adoption conference, AdvanceAg. In 2023, in fact, Adelaide will host evokeAG, the Asia-Pacific's premier agrifood tech conference. I am advised that PIRSA is facilitating the development, commercialisation and adoption of fit-for-purpose and cost-effective AgTech solutions.

In terms of the exact day, I think the question was, that my office received the recommendations and the briefing, I will certainly go back and find out what that date is for the member, and certainly if she has particular interests in any of the applicants for the AgTech fund and wants to bring those to this place to discuss that might also be an excellent opportunity to promote

some of our regional businesses, which of course are so important to our economy. I will look forward gaining the extra information that the honourable member has asked for, and I hope to be able to finalise details in regard to the funding to which she referred at the earliest opportunity.

AGTECH GROWTH FUND

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:28): The minister mentions 'at her earliest opportunity'. Does she have a time frame?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:29): Yes, my time frame is 'the earliest opportunity'.

Ministerial Statement

WEST BEACH TRUST BOARD APPOINTMENTS

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:29): I table a copy of a ministerial statement that was made in the other place by the Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Housing and Urban Development and Minister for Planning in regard to appointments to the West Beach Trust Board.

Matters of Interest

FEDERAL ELECTION

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:29): I rise to speak about the important choices facing the people of South Australia and our nation later this month. On 21 May, South Australians will head back to the polls for the second time this year to pass their verdict on another Liberal government. I am hoping that we will also see the Liberals consigned to the opposition benches in our national parliament.

From their inaction on the climate crisis and equality to their incompetent management of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Abbott/Turnbull/Morrison governments have been a catastrophe for our country. We know that Prime Minister Scott Morrison does not hold a hose, but we also know he does not hold a torch to the other prime ministers who have led our nation. This is a man who has been described by his own Deputy Prime Minister, Barnaby Joyce, and I quote, as 'a hypocrite and a liar'.

But it is not just the Hon. Barnaby Joyce who has passed his verdict on this Prime Minister. The Prime Minister's good friend Senator Concetta Fierravanti-Wells has described him—and I quote from the *Hansard* in our national parliament—as 'a bully with no moral compass'. These are not my words; these are the words of the people who know this Prime Minister best.

We are in the midst of a housing affordability crisis and we are in the midst of a cost-of-living crisis. We are seeing soaring inflation right across our country, and the cost of living is completely skyrocketing out of control—record prices for fuel, food, basic groceries, housing, education. Yesterday, the Reserve Bank increased interest rates for the first time in 11 years. Sadly, in the midst of this cost-of-living crisis we are seeing wages stagnating and more and more South Australians are being plunged into poverty.

We have all seen the effects of the climate crisis firsthand during the Morrison government's years in power. We have seen fires, floods, droughts—once again, no action from the Liberals in Canberra. We have seen the rorts. We have seen the appalling inaction in the face of allegations of sexual assault in our national parliament, something that has brought great shame on our democratic institutions.

We have seen the embarrassing diplomatic blunders, the attacks on our allies that have diminished our reputation around the world, and a deal to build radioactive war machines here in SA that involved ripping up an agreement with the French government and wasting billions of dollars—\$5 billion of taxpayer money thrown into the wind. What a disgrace! We saw the appallingly slow rollout of the national vaccine and the disastrous effects of that—what it meant for health, what it meant for education, what it meant for our economy.

The Greens have been very clear about our desire to see a change of government in Canberra. But just as the voters will determine who will form the next government of our country, they will also determine who will make up the Senate, and the Greens have a very ambitious agenda. We have a plan for a safe future with an immediate freeze on all new coal, oil and gas projects. We want to finally put dental and mental into Medicare. We want to make university free. We want to build a million homes. We want to make childcare free. To do all this we can get big corporations to finally pay their fair share of tax, but we can only achieve these things if we secure the balance of power in the national parliament.

Here in South Australia the Greens have a formidable person standing as our lead candidate for the Senate, Barbara Pocock. Barbara is somebody who has spent her working life fighting to make sure our economy works for people and our environment. She is an economist and an emeritus professor at the University of South Australia. She was a founding director for that university's Centre for Work + Life. She has worked for the Reserve Bank of Australia and she has provided advice to various governments.

At this time of growing inequality, we need people who understand how to make sure that our economy works for people, not just big corporations, not just the big end of town. Barbara Pocock is such a person. She understands how our economy works, she knows how to make it work for people and our environment and we need to see her represent our state in Canberra.

FRUIT FLY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:34): My home region of the Riverland is currently tackling several fruit fly outbreaks. It is critical that we all work together as a community to rid this pest and to ensure that the Riverland continues to enjoy the benefits of being fruit fly free. Like other biosecurity threats, the risk of fruit fly continually evolves. South Australia has a strong record of effectively managing fruit fly, but the complex nature of biosecurity threats means that from time to time outbreaks do occur.

It has long been a priority of our state to contain and eradicate fruit fly outbreaks and it must continue to remain a top priority for the new government. I would like to acknowledge the commitment of the former Marshall Liberal government to fight against fruit fly with the largest fruit fly eradication program ever undertaken in South Australia. The former Liberal government waged a two-year battle against this pest, working hand in glove with the community to protect South Australia's \$1.7 billion horticulture industry, to protect hundreds of businesses and to protect thousands of jobs.

In last year's state budget alone, the Liberal government invested a further \$33.3 million to eradicate Queensland and Mediterranean fruit fly. At the peak of the response, approximately 350 staff were employed, visiting around 200,000 properties and releasing around 700 million sterile flies. I would like to acknowledge the amazing work that PIRSA, key industry stakeholders and growers continue to do in response to these outbreaks. PIRSA has implemented an eradication program that includes inspecting fruit trees, organically baiting, releasing sterile flies and establishing suspension zones around detections.

Suspension zones impose restrictions on fruit movement, which can be an inconvenience and challenge for the community. However, restricting fruit movement is an effective and practical way we can prevent fruit fly from being unintentionally transported across neighbourhoods, regions or to unaffected parts of the state. When you live in an outbreak or suspension zone, it is important not to share or move any homegrown fruit or fruiting vegetables from your property. All Riverlanders are encouraged to visit the PIRSA website at www.fruitfly.sa.gov.au and learn whether their residence is in an outbreak or suspension zone and the restrictions that may apply.

By containing fruit fly in outbreak and suspension zones, PIRSA can utilise specific tools, such as releasing sterile flies to target wild flies in and around these areas. Sterile flies are a proven technology and an important tool in any government's fight against fruit fly as it interrupts the life cycle of the wild flies. Whilst these programs are critical to eradicate the current outbreaks and protect our fruit fly free status, it is also important that there is community cooperation when it comes to fighting this pest. Community cooperation is critical.

I would like to thank everyone living in outbreak and suspension zones for following the rules and doing the right thing, including stripping backyards of homegrown fruit and fruiting vegetables.

Most of the outbreaks have been detected in residential fruit trees. These measures aim to remove the host material where fruit fly breeds. With the community's cooperation, the number of breeding locations for fruit fly will be significantly reduced, enhancing the effectiveness of PIRSA's baiting SIT program.

Fruit fly was first detected in South Australia in 1947. It is one of the world's most destructive pests and it poses a significant risk to our horticultural industry. It is critical to understand and appreciate the competitive advantages and the flow-on financial benefits to our growers' local businesses and the state's economy because of South Australia's fruit fly free status.

Unfortunately, many Riverland growers who are currently in an outbreak or suspension zone face a challenging harvest. To get their produce to market will require expensive treatment that is not typically required in the South Australian horticulture industry. South Australian growers need our support now to overcome these fruit fly outbreaks. Together, as a state and as a community, we can eradicate the fruit fly outbreaks and ensure that the Riverland and our growers continue to enjoy the premium market advantage of being a fruit fly free state for decades to come.

ANZAC DAY COMMEMORATION SERVICES

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:39): Thank you for this opportunity to speak about our veterans, RSL clubs, youth cadets and ANZAC Day. These last two years have caused many disruptions to the way that we would usually pay our respects to the fallen and those still serving. Despite these disruptions, we have continued to come together as a community to remember the stories of the past and the present and the stories yet to be told.

In 2020, we lit up the dawn in our neighbourhoods with mini services in our driveways, our gateways and on our verandahs. Last year, some ceremonies were able to go ahead, albeit in a reduced and COVID-safe capacity. In those uncertain times we still came together as a community to pay our respects because we know remembering our past is essential for forging our way through the future.

This year, I once again had the privilege of attending the Payneham RSL ANZAC Day dawn service and the community gunfire breakfast. While it is always incredible hearing the stories of our returned and fallen soldiers and to remember their service and sacrifice, this ANZAC Day I was struck by the number of young people at the service. A bridge between generations was on display at the dawn service as veterans stood beside young cadets, cub scouts and students from nearby schools.

Among the veterans were the 36 cadets, five staff and over 60 parents from the 47 Army Cadet Unit, headed by their incredible captain, Ashley Ruth. Among the 36 cadets stood Jesse, Alex, Renee and Amelie. I wondered whilst at this service what had inspired these teenagers to get out of bed and leave the warmth of their beds so early in the morning. As it turned out, each of them had a very special reason.

Jesse, who is the unit's Cadet Under Officer, shared the pride he has felt being a leader in his community, commanding 70 other cadets in his unit and joining his family's four generation long military legacy. Alex, who is the unit's Cadet Warrant Officer, spoke about how special it had been to meet our state's retired veterans through the cadet's volunteering program, sharing many cups of tea and many stories with them. Amelie and Renee shared how they had seen a growth in women and girls joining the cadets and the pride they have felt in being part of this important cultural change.

I would like to thank the hard work of Ashley's 47 Army Cadet Unit—Jesse, Alex, Amelie and Renee, as well as the Payneham RSL, which is headed by President Mark Lawson-Kent, who you can be sure will ask you many important questions when you go to visit his RSL—for leaving the warmth of their beds and for keeping the ANZAC Day spirit alive and well for the next generations in South Australia.

I would also like to thank the many who kindly shared their stories with me after the service and during the community breakfast—stories of strength, hardship, courage and resilience. After all, storytelling is one of the most powerful tools that we have. It is how we remember, how we teach and how we learn. I am humbled and proud to see that these ANZAC stories and our stories are continuing to be told through the next generation of families, students, cadets and cub scouts.

I have no doubt that these stories will continue to be told and celebrated for the next 100 years and so on for it is through our younger generations that the ANZAC spirit will live on for centuries to come. It is through the younger generations that mistakes of the past will not be repeated into the future, and it is through the younger generations that we will not forget the incredible sacrifice many have made for our great country. Lest we forget.

CORONIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:43): When Deputy State Coroner Anthony Schapel handed down his damning findings less than two weeks ago into the tragic and senseless deaths of two innocent children at the brutal hands of their troubled mother's partner in 2016, the newly elected government leapt to its feet to announce it would accept and implement all of his recommendations. They include a broad range of all coronial and other Ombudsman and royal commission recommendations relating to child protection and a review of all statutory obligations to ensure department practices align.

The new Minister for Child Protection acknowledged the failure of successive governments, for the most part her own, to heed the warnings. I note yesterday the Premier told the other place a review into the implementation of successive Coroners' recommendations will be expeditious and transparent. Forgive me for being a sceptic, but none of us want to hear more hollow words. Like the rest of the community, I think we are all tired of waiting for action, tired of excuses for inaction, only to be reminded again and again when another child dies in tragic unspeakable circumstances that our child protection system is utterly broken.

Make no mistake, young innocent children are dying unnecessarily at the hands of sick and disturbed people due to this state's shattered child protection system. Make no mistake again, more vulnerable children will die or be seriously injured if this government fails yet again to get it right.

None of us can forget poor little Chloe Valentine, who died after suffering fatal injuries due to the cruel actions of her own mother and mother's partner. Despite being exposed to domestic violence, and living with a registered child sex offender, little Chloe was not removed from her mother's care under the previous Labor government's watch. That was 10 years ago, and here we are with another three deaths on our hands and the Coroner's findings still not implemented by successive Labor and Liberal governments.

Then there was four-month-old Ebony Napier. Despite being hospitalised with a broken femur when she was just five weeks old, little Ebony was allowed to return home and died with over 50 injuries to her tiny body. If someone had stepped in—or if only someone had stepped in—to act instead of ignoring the red flags, the 2016 deaths of five-year-old Korey Mitchell and six-year-old Amber Rigney at the hands of Steven Peet potentially could have been prevented. Fortunately, Peet is unlikely to hurt another child ever again after being sentenced to life imprisonment with a 36-year non-parole period.

At the opposite end of the spectrum, I have spent a good part of the past four years hearing from parents and carers who have been on the receiving end of what can only be described as DCP overreach. The department is clearly in crisis. Doing my part to fix it is my priority over the next four years, and it should be the priority of everyone in here. I, like the rest of the community, are tired of hearing that we can do better, that we must do better and then we do not do anything at all.

As of 31 January this year, 4,668 kids were in care in South Australia. There are 4,014 18-year guardian orders in place. These numbers are on a sharp upward trajectory. The over-representation of Indigenous kids in the child protection system is an absolute disgrace, and we should all accept nothing less than the full implementation of the Aboriginal Torres Strait Islander child placement principles to allow the community to lead their own. The full review of the Child and Young People's Safety Act cannot come soon enough, and the placement principles must form part of the review, as should the reinsertion of the best interests of the child paramountcy principles.

Recent changes to the Coroners Act, which I pushed for in this place, are targeted at this very type of situation to keep the government accountable. It means the minister is now bound to report back to parliament on what action it proposes to take in response to each of the recommendations made by the Coroner. Findings cannot just sit on a desk in the too-hard basket

anymore. It is now this government's duty to report action in this case, rather than more empty words that we have had from successive governments in this state.

Let us just pray in the meantime that we do not see another Chloe, another Ebony, another Korey or another Amber hit the headlines before we finally see some real and effective action. This government is on notice once again that the time has come for action and no more hollow words.

PUBLIC SERVICE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:48): I rise today to speak about the ongoing and unacceptable undermining of our Public Service and the buckets of money that are being poured into private-for-profit consultants by successive governments—governments of both sides. The outsourcing of ever-more essential government functions to private corporations has serious negative impacts on both the South Australian community and on the state of our democracy. People go into the Public Service because they want to contribute to its vital work, but they are finding it devastatingly underfunded. More and more work instead is being contracted out to the for-profit corporations, like the big four consultancy firms that profit happily from this systemic undermining of our Public Service.

What we have been seeing over the last few years is the corporatisation of basic functions of democracy, a shift from governing for the public good to government by for-profit corporations. The 2021-22 state budget stated that the government expected to spend \$1 billion on consultancies and contractors—\$1 billion! The majority of these funds, almost \$500 million, were within the Department for Infrastructure and Transport alone: I note, mainly for public transport and road maintenance contracts. Imagine what we could do with \$1 billion in the Public Service.

This kind of spending is not new. In the previous financial year the state government was spending more than \$6.1 million a week on outside advice, specialised services and contract workers. In 2020, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet spent almost \$1.2 million on consultants. Imagine if we invested in our public workforce so that they had the skills that governments and our community need. If we paid these people properly and attracted experts and people at the top of their fields into our public sector, surely that would be a better way forward.

Some of the jobs outsourced and amounts paid to consultants are absolutely eye watering. PwC consulting was handed \$940,480 to review and redesign the local health networks. Infrastructure firm AECOM Australia was paid \$294,817 to provide advice on how to transition Leigh Creek to a sustainable, open and self-sufficient town. KPMG received \$185,200 for the preparation of design documentation for the Aboriginal Entrepreneur Hub. Consultancy firm Learning First received \$207,000 to work with education directors and school leaders to develop—and I quote—a 'school improvement planning process'.

Some of the common tasks you can see outsourced to consultants are things like putting together business cases or providing costings and options, analysis or strategic advice or reviewing processes or assessing programs. Surely these are common tasks that come up on a regular basis. So why are we funnelling public money into private companies to do this work when we could easily build these services into our public sector, who would be best placed to conduct these services and would not have to do them for a profit?

Contrary to what some governments might believe, privatising essential services does not actually save money, and it certainly does not produce better outcomes. Instead, it makes services less efficient and puts decision-making in the hands of for-profit corporations, yet successive governments have outsourced Australia's essential public services, making them more expensive, lower quality and harder to oversee.

The outsourcing of jobs has seen real wages fall and employment conditions worsen, which has put downward pressure on wages and conditions in the private sector. We can end the over-reliance on privatisation and deliver a stronger and more capable Public Service at a lower cost to the public, and we should be investing in local skills and growing the capacity within our Public Service to provide advice on a regular basis, to conduct reviews and to have the skills that government regularly needs to call on available within the public sector, particularly in areas such as cybersecurity, IT and infrastructure.

The Greens firmly believe that the public sector is best placed to respond to the changing social, environmental and economic circumstances and to enhance our society's capacity to pursue important goals such as justice, equity and sustainable environmental objectives, as well, of course, as our community services obligation.

We can do this better, and I hope in the Malinauskas government's first budget we see them look at this as one of the solutions and ways forward and that we look at giving less to private consultancy firms and reinvest that money back into our public sector.

FALL OF SAIGON COMMEMORATION

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:53): I rise today to speak about the 47th Black April commemoration. The Vietnam War had changed the world forever. Known as Black April, the anniversary of the fall of Saigon marks a dark time for South Vietnamese people, when the capital of the Republic of Vietnam was captured by North Vietnamese forces, marking the end of the Vietnam War. An estimated two million people initially sought refuge in refugee camps in South-East Asia and later resettling in Australia, the United States, France and Canada.

As honourable members know, Australia's military involvement in the Vietnam war was the longest in duration of any war in our country's history. It lasted from August 1962 until May 1975. As the new shadow minister for multicultural South Australia and for communities, I sincerely thank the Vietnamese community in Australia, together with the Vietnamese Veterans Association of South Australia, for the invitation and the privilege to join the community to commemorate the 47th anniversary of the fall of Saigon on Saturday 30 April 2022.

It was a cold, chilly autumn morning when Vietnamese veterans and their families gathered in solidarity to pay tribute and respect at the solemn wreath laying ceremony at the Vietnam War Memorial at the Torrens Parade Ground.

Following the morning's service, I also had the honour to represent the Liberal Party leader in the other place, the Hon. David Speirs, at another important commemoration at the Vietnamese Community Centre. I had the privilege to join our respected Vietnamese community and special guests to unveil the new memorial to honour the patriotic generals of the Republic of Vietnam and pay respect to the brave men and women freedom fighters who made the ultimate sacrifice during the Vietnam War.

The new memorial monument provided a meaningful centrepiece for a moving ceremony where the Vietnamese community was joined by invited dignitaries, together with Vietnamese and Australian veterans, for wreath laying and the offering of incense to honour fallen soldiers and Vietnamese war heroes for their bravery, loyalty and sacrifice.

In 2019, the vision for the construction of this important memorial monument was brought to my attention by the president and committee of the Vietnamese Veterans Association of South Australia. The association, with the unwavering support of the Vietnamese Community in Australia SA Chapter, sought to create a memorial on the home ground of the Vietnamese Community Centre to preserve Vietnamese traditions and to honour the past. It was a great honour to support this important construction project through a multicultural affairs grant under the Marshall Liberal government.

The monument is an inspiring tribute to five courageous generals of the Army of the Republic of Vietnam, along with all members of the South Vietnamese armed forces who defended their country until the very end. Their legacy, sense of responsibility and spirit of duty to their country and their people must be remembered, and it is so heartening that this vision has been implemented by the Vietnamese community of South Australia.

I wish to acknowledge the leadership of Mr Linh Dang Nguyen, President of VCASA, along with Mr Dinh Duy Ninh OAM, President of the Vietnamese Veterans Association of SA, past and present committee members and volunteers of both organisations for their incredible hard work and dedication in securing funding and sponsorship to install this significant monument for the community.

It was certainly an emotional day where members of the Vietnamese community reflected on the pain, brutality and injustice of the Vietnam War and to today still grieve the loss of their loved

ones, their beloved homeland and the horrible sacrifices of those who fell in battle and those who lost their freedom and human rights in retaliation following Black April.

Through speeches delivered by both presidents, the Vietnamese community reflected on the past and expressed their gratitude towards Australia and the Australian people for standing shoulder to shoulder with the South Vietnamese people during the war and for offering a safe haven and a new home in Australia for thousands of refugees.

We recognise that Australia continues to benefit greatly from the significant contributions made by the hardworking and resilient Vietnamese community over the last 47 years. We are incredibly grateful for their remarkable contributions in every aspect of our multicultural society. It was an honour to attend their commemoration.

ADELAIDE HOLOCAUST MUSEUM AND STEINER EDUCATION CENTRE

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:58): I rise to speak today about the Adelaide Holocaust Museum and Steiner Education Centre. Adelaide's newest museum opened in November 2020 and is located in historic Fennessey House at 33 Wakefield Street. I am motivated to talk about the Adelaide Holocaust Museum and Steiner Education Centre because of its relevance in the world today. None of us want to live in a world where freedom and human rights are stripped away and power is abused.

During our recent election campaign, South Australians looked on with horror at what was evolving in Ukraine. The scenes we witnessed at the Kabul airport on 16 August last year were just as heartbreaking. Tragically, we are witnessing parts of the world being torn apart by war and people being deprived of freedom and basic human rights. For us in Australia, the essential human elements of compassion, understanding and empathy are what makes Australian society safe, democratic and peaceful.

This type of human interaction is what the Adelaide Holocaust Museum and Steiner Education Centre aims to inspire. The fundamental objective of the organisation is to tell the Holocaust story in the hope that it encourages us to speak out against racism and promote human rights for all humanity.

The education centre component of this organisation is named after the South Australian Holocaust survivor Andrew Steiner OAM. It has been Andrew's lifelong passion to establish a Holocaust museum and education centre in Adelaide. His dream to make this a reality was facilitated by the generous support of the Catholic Archdiocese, which offered Fennessey House as the location.

The permanent exhibition in the museum traces the history of the Holocaust, relating it to the lived experiences of South Australian survivors. Our local Holocaust survivors and their descendants want to make sure that their stories are remembered so the atrocities suffered by so many are never, ever repeated. The survivors talk to visiting students about the dangers of prejudice, exclusion, division and lack of tolerance of others. This encourages students to connect to other forms of racism they see in the world today and the intolerance they experience in their own communities.

The story of the Holocaust has raised many questions about the complexities of human nature. How did the world let six million people be so brutally murdered? During this very dark time, evil triumphed because the good people in the world did not and could not do enough.

At this institution, we learn how Australia's Indigenous activist William Cooper led a delegation of the Australian Aboriginal League to the German Consulate in Melbourne in 1938 to deliver a petition. This was one of few delegations to speak out against what was happening under the Nazi regime. This petition condemned Hitler's regime and was described by William Cooper as 'the cruel persecution of the Jewish people by the Nazi government of Germany'.

At the time, the German Consulate did not accept the petition. However, in 2012, some 74 years later, Cooper's grandson, Alf Turner, presented the consulate with a replica letter. Israel's Holocaust Memorial has honoured Australian William Cooper and his actions with the creation of an academic chair. Last year, I had the pleasure to visit this museum and was impressed by the success of the education program that was being delivered to schools.

The harsh reality of the rise of right-wing groups around the world, as well as here in Adelaide, highlights the significant role of the Holocaust Museum and Steiner Education Centre. I would like to acknowledge the museum director, Kathy Baykitch, museum staff and volunteers, our South Australian Holocaust survivors and the board members for their invaluable work. None of us wants to live in a world brimming with hate. This institution and its dedicated staff and supporters are helping to make our world better and more compassionate.

Time expired.

Motions

DUNCAN, DR G.I.O.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (16:03): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges that 10 May 2022 marks 50 years since the murder of Dr George Ian Ogilvie Duncan;
2. Notes the long-lasting impacts of Dr Duncan's death on law reform and the LGBTIQ community;
3. Recognises the risks of discrimination and violence still faced by LGBTIQ people today; and
4. Resolves to continue to work toward safety and equality for all LGBTIQ people.

This motion recognises a fairly solemn anniversary: 50 years since the murder of Dr George Duncan on the banks of the River Torrens. Can I be very clear at the outset, this was, in my view, a hate crime. Dr Duncan was killed because he was a gay man. Dr George Ian Ogilvie Duncan was an academic. He held a Bachelor of Arts degree, a Bachelor of Laws, a Master of Arts and a PhD from St Johns College, Cambridge.

He was born in the UK, the son of New Zealand born parents, and attended school in Melbourne. After graduating his tertiary studies in the UK and working for a time at the University of Bristol, he returned to Australia in 1972 to take up a position as a lecturer in law at the University of Adelaide.

Dr Duncan lived just up the road at Lincoln College in North Adelaide. He worked just down the street from us in North Terrace at the Adelaide Law School. Just six weeks into his time here, he was attacked on the banks of the River Torrens at night. On 10 May 1972, Dr Duncan was thrown into the river where he drowned. He was not the only victim on that evening or, indeed, of that year. Two other men were also thrown into the water that night although, thankfully, both survived the attack.

At that time, the Torrens was well known as being a meeting place for gay and bisexual men and you will recall, sir, that in fact, it was illegal to have homosexual activities at the time. On that night, in 1972, a group of men came to the River Torrens for the purpose of harassing and assaulting gay men. Fifty years on, none of those assailants have been brought to justice. Three vice squad police officers were charged with manslaughter more than a decade after the offence, but were acquitted of those charges.

No-one has been found guilty of this murder. No-one has been held accountable for this hate crime but, during that manslaughter trial, evidence emerged that confirmed what our community already knew. There was a culture among vice squad officers of going down to the Torrens, harassing gay men and assaulting them and throwing them into the water. They called it, 'Teaching the poofers to swim'.

This just confirmed what members of the LGBTIQ community had been saying for year after year after year. Now, 50 years on, after the trials and inquiries, the Scotland Yard task forces, no-one has been held to account for this crime. Thankfully, over the years, the murder of Dr Duncan has not been forgotten. Every year, the Student Representative Council of the University of Adelaide holds a memorial for Dr Duncan on the banks of the river where he was drowned. I believe that the next memorial session will be next Tuesday.

The Adelaide Law School has taken a leading role in remembering Dr Duncan, a staff member of the law school, supporting efforts to get justice for this crime. I would particularly like to acknowledge Professor John Williams in recent years for his leadership on this at the Adelaide

University. The Adelaide LGBTIQ community also remembers. The relevance of Dr Duncan's murder is not just that it is a terrible, terrible unsolved crime. But this crime, if it had any positive outcomes at all, was that it led the nation, and our state, to consider law reform on the so-called criminal act of homosexual activities. Under the then Dunstan Labor government we enacted that reform.

In the months after, in this place, the Hon. Murray Hill, a Liberal and Country League member, introduced a private member's bill to partially decriminalise homosexuality. It was a very limited form of legal reform, a small step forward, allowing a defence to the crime of sodomy if it was committed in the privacy of a person's home, and it was referred to as the 'drawing the curtains' defence.

But it was not until 1975 that homosexuality was finally, fully decriminalised by the Dunstan Labor government, and I particularly want to acknowledge the efforts of the then Attorney-General, the Hon. Peter Duncan, and particularly the minister in this place who led it through the Legislative Council, the Hon. Anne Levy. That bill, finally passed on 27 August 1975, made our state the first state in Australia to fully decriminalise homosexuality. It led to the same reforms being undertaken around our country, although it was not until 1997 that the last state, Tasmania, finally made this change.

That it took so long for these basic changes of decriminalisation to occur shows that in itself the discrimination faced by LGBTIQ people has not gone away, not in this state and not elsewhere in the country. It shows that the culture that led to police officers beating up gay men on the banks of the River Torrens was persistent around this country. It shows the culture that allows a prime minister to lead the culture war against transgender kids that we have today. It is still persistent in this country. It shows why the work to secure equality for LGBTIQ community members is far from over. I hope that the 50th anniversary of Dr Duncan's death is a catalyst for the next wave of reforms to further equality in our country.

Before concluding, I would like to reflect on the fact that Dr Duncan himself probably would never have enjoyed becoming a martyr to a cause. He would not have enjoyed the limelight, given his history. We do not know much about him. He left very few personal effects behind and those that were stored in the police lockers mysteriously disappeared over the years. His short time in Adelaide meant very few knew him well.

One thing we do know is that he was an intensely private man and I do not think he would have enjoyed the focus that has come to be on him, and in particular on his death. As historian Tim Reeves has noted, he probably would have hated being celebrated as he is today. He is not so much celebrated but remembered, remembered for a hate crime that should never have happened and remembered also for the changes in legislation that flowed from the community's disgust at what was uncovered.

Before I finish, I would just like to reflect, I suppose, personally on what it meant to me as a young man hearing about this crime, not yet a teenager. I was 12. I did not exactly know what my sexuality was, but I knew that I was different, and I also knew, through discussions in my peer group, at school, at home, in the media, in *The Advertiser* and on television that what I was was wrong. I also knew, from Dr Duncan's death, that if I was ever in trouble at all, not to go to the police, because they will beat you up and kill you for being gay. That is the lesson I learnt before I was even a teenager.

The impact that Dr Duncan had in his short time here in Adelaide was in fact immense, immense in terms of the changes in attitude that evolved in our community, immense in the legislative changes that followed his murder, but even to this day immense in terms of our community standing together for equality and making the demands that we should be considered equal citizens in our state. It means also that our LGBTIQ community will not be divided by a prime minister who seeks to single out trans kids—children—for political campaigns, for his own advantage in this election. We will not be divided. We will not sell those kids short.

Whilst Dr Duncan might not have wanted the legacy that he now has, it is indeed an enormous legacy, and I for one am grateful for the contribution that he has made to our community. I only wish that he did not have to die for it. I commend the motion.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. R.A. Simms.

BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:13): I move:

1. That a committee, to be called the Budget and Finance Committee, be appointed to monitor and scrutinise all matters relating to the state budget and the financial administration of the state, any related policy matter and any other related matter.
2. That the standing orders of the Legislative Council in relation to select committees be applied and accordingly—
 - (a) that the committee consist of seven members, that the quorum of members necessary to be present at all meetings of the committee be fixed at four members; and
 - (b) that this council permits the committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it sees fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to any such evidence being reported to the council.
3. That members of the council who are not members of the committee may, at the discretion of the chairperson, participate in proceedings of the committee but may not vote, move any motions or be counted for the purposes of a quorum.
4. That members of the council who are ministers of the Crown are unable to serve on the committee or participate in committee hearings, except as a witness called before the committee.

This motion, or one similar, was originally moved in about 2007 by the Hon. Rob Lucas, and we on our side of the chamber believe that on behalf of the Legislative Council and the people of South Australia the committee has worked well in holding governments, ministers and departments to account.

I certainly sat on the Budget and Finance Committee as a government member. As has been discussed and negotiated between all parties and individuals in the Legislative Council, as I understand it the membership of the committee will continue to be seven, with two government members, three opposition members and two crossbench members. This is a committee that works extremely hard and plays an important role in this parliament, and I look forward to the ongoing work of the Budget and Finance Committee.

This is a fairly straightforward motion and one that has been moved consistently throughout various parliamentary sessions over the years. I am keen to ensure that this motion is voted on during our next sitting week and members are given notice of my intention to do so.

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

REGIONAL SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:15): I move:

That this council commends the Marshall Liberal government for recognising the importance of regional South Australia and its communities, noting their contribution to our economy worth more than \$29 billion per year, through:

1. Investing \$3 billion across more than 1,000 regional projects;
2. Upgrading hospitals, doubling country cancer services and upgrading about 4,800 kilometres of regional roads; and
3. Implementing the Our Regions Matter blueprint following extensive consultation with regional communities about what is needed to improve opportunities for the 29 percent of South Australia's population living and working outside the metropolitan community.

Regional South Australia contributes about \$29 billion to the state's economy, with just 27 per cent of the state's population. This is because regional people, people in my Riverland community and in other communities around regional South Australia, are not just hard workers but are smart and innovative. I have said time and time again in this chamber that it is the regions that drive this state's economy.

As a member of the Marshall Liberal government, I was proud of the enormous amount of work that we did over four years in government to support the regions. I would like to acknowledge

the outstanding work that both the member for Chaffey and the member for Finniss in the other place achieved in their time as ministers for primary industries and regional development.

The Marshall Liberal government created jobs and delivered better services, with \$3 billion worth of investment across more than 1,000 regional projects. We upgraded hospitals, doubled country cancer services and upgraded around 4,800 kilometres of regional roads, including sealing the iconic Strzelecki Track. We built new schools and upgraded existing schools in our regions, we improved local sporting clubs and we delivered new mobile phone towers to fix blackspots.

We provided strong support for our primary producers and fishers. We stood shoulder to shoulder with bushfire, drought and COVID-19 affected farmers, providing grants of up to \$75,000 per producer for those affected by the 2019-20 bushfires. We delivered a \$21 million drought support program, and we ensured that growers still had access to seasonal workers despite COVID-19.

We gave farmers on the mainland the choice to grow genetically modified crops by lifting the moratorium that Labor imposed in 2004, therefore enabling them to finally be on a level playing field with their interstate counterparts when it came to crop production. We invested significantly in protecting crops and livestock from pests. Not only did we deliver on our promise to hire two additional wild dog trappers but we upgraded and rebuilt 1,600 kilometres of the South Australian dog fence.

We eradicated feral pigs on Kangaroo Island, reduced the damage of wild rabbits and invested more than \$70 million to protect jobs and businesses by addressing and eradicating fruit fly outbreaks. We supported South Australia's commercial and recreational fishers by reforming the marine scalefish fishery (something ignored time and time again by the previous Labor government) to ensure sustainable, long-term fish stocks, and we invested significantly in the snapper restocking program in Spencer Gulf and Gulf St Vincent. We also gave our recreational fishers more places to fish and better infrastructure by opening up South Australia's reservoirs and investing in jetties and boat ramps across the state.

Most importantly, after consulting widely with regional South Australians, we developed a South Australian-first, comprehensive Regional Development Strategy to drive economic growth, create jobs and ensure people in our regions have the services they need closer to home. We did this because prior to the Marshall Liberal government there was no strategic, whole-of-government approach to state government investment in our regions.

Five strategic priorities were identified to guide government investment, decision-making and service delivery to reflect the priorities of the regions. These priorities were:

1. Regional voice: how to engage regional stakeholders, businesses and communities to identify ways to grow;
2. Regional connectivity: ways to identify and enhance digital connectivity through telecommunications and data infrastructure and making sure infrastructure programs were implemented, including transport network solutions and engaging representatives for local input;
3. Regional leadership and skills: centring on engagement and giving regional leaders access to development opportunities and, in addition, having strategies in place to support worker shortages;
4. Regional services: identifying regional service gaps and putting in place services for communities' safety, wellbeing and livability; and
5. Regional investment: focusing on initiatives that result in increased trade, productivity, profitability, sustainability and growth.

The delivery of this regional development strategy aimed to guide, prioritise and coordinate the South Australian government's long-term engagement with and investment in South Australian regions. These are just a few of the projects the Marshall Liberal government delivered for our regions around this state. We delivered them as we know and understand the critical importance of regional communities because we live it.

Our regions are the backbone of our state and the economic powerhouse that drives prosperity for all South Australians. Prior to the Marshall Liberal government coming to office a bit over four years ago, the regional communities of South Australia were let down time and time again by the former Labor government. There was a backlog of regional road maintenance, roads that the former Labor government refused to fund for basic upkeep. Instead of investing in basic upkeep, they chose to reduce speed limits, crippling productivity for our farmers and growers right around the state.

Prior to the Marshall Liberal government, there was a backlog of health maintenance projects—hospital equipment in desperate need of upgrading. Between 2004 and 2018, Labor spent a mere \$14 million in total on regional health infrastructure, equivalent to a mere \$3.5 million per year across the entire regions of our state. Let's not forget that in 2008, Labor tried to downgrade and even close dozens of hospitals in country South Australia. In December 2017, the Premier and Labor closed the Repatriation General Hospital, which provided care for older patients and veterans, many of whom originated from our regions, despite former Premier Mike Rann's pledge it would never, ever be closed by a Labor government.

Despite the now Premier's assertions and promises that they are the new Labor in town, we all know on this side of the chamber that the truth will be revealed in the coming months and years and that truth is: Labor is notoriously bad for our regions and cannot be trusted.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. R.A. Simms.

COST OF LIVING

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:22): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that:
 - (a) inflation in Australia is at its highest level in more than 20 years putting enormous pressure on South Australians, particularly those on low incomes; and
 - (b) the cost of living is soaring with South Australians facing price hikes on food, fuel, housing and other essentials.
2. Notes the release of the Anglicare Australia Rental Affordability Snapshot 2022 which found:
 - (a) only two of 1,125 homes on the market in Greater Adelaide were affordable for single people living on the minimum wage;
 - (b) none of the homes on the market were affordable for single people living on pensions or income support; and
 - (c) none of the homes in regional and rural South Australia were affordable for a single person without dependents living on income support.
3. Calls on the Malinauskas government to take steps to relieve the cost-of-living pressures faced by South Australians in its first budget by:
 - (a) making public transport free;
 - (b) introducing rent caps and rent subsidies;
 - (c) increasing the wages of public sector workers;
 - (d) abolishing materials and services charges and subject fees for public school students; and
 - (e) significantly increasing the investment in public housing.

The motion I am moving today recognises that cost-of-living pressures in South Australia are continuing to soar. Inflation in Australia is at its highest level in more than 20 years and that puts huge pressure on South Australians, particularly those on low incomes. We have the cost of living soaring, with South Australians facing price hikes on food, fuel, housing and other essentials.

This comes at a time when interest rates have been increased for the first time in 11 years and when the Anglicare Australia Rental Affordability Snapshot 2022 study found that there are only two out of 1,125 homes on the market in Greater Adelaide that are affordable for people living on the minimum wage. None of the homes on the market were affordable for single people living on

pensions or income support—not one—and none of the homes in regional and rural South Australia were affordable for single people living without dependents trying to live on income support.

This is the backdrop against which the Malinauskas government will hand down its first budget. We in the Greens are calling for the new government to take action to reduce cost-of-living pressures on South Australian families. I recognise that this is not the sole responsibility of the federal government. We know our Prime Minister does not hold a hose. He has taken no action in relation to spiralling inflation and has taken no action to ensure that we see wage growth in our country or to improve the conditions facing working Australians.

It is very interesting for me to note that whilst the Liberal Party claim that they are the superior economic managers, they have been in government on both occasions over the last 12 years when interest rates have increased. It is also curious to note that they are running advertising at the moment claiming to be able to control interest rates, yet they deny any responsibility for the increase in interest rates that is occurring.

We know that interest rates are set by the Reserve Bank, and that is an independent process, but it is incumbent on governments to provide cost-of-living relief to families. It is in that spirit that the Greens are making these suggestions.

There are some really clear things that the South Australian government could do to help people who are struggling at the moment. They could make public transport free. They could introduce rent caps and rent subsidies to help people who are struggling to pay their rent. They could increase the wages of public sector workers. They could scrap public school fees because at the moment we know that parents are slugged extensive materials and services charges and subject fees. They could also increase the investment in public housing beyond the mere 400 houses that they have pledged to build in their first budget.

You may ask, Mr President, it is all very well for the Greens to put these ideas on the table but how on earth would a new government pay for them? Well, one of the things that we did in the recent election campaign is announce a suite of potential revenue measures for the new government to consider, whether that be Labor or Liberal, and we are certainly going to put those ideas back on the table in this parliament.

What we found was that we could potentially generate \$7 billion of revenue by ensuring that developers pay their fair share of tax and by ensuring that they pay a tax on the benefits that flow from rezoning, as occurs in other jurisdictions like the ACT and as has been proposed in Victoria. We could generate a new revenue by finally increasing mining royalties. They have not had an increase in the last 15 years and it is high time they made more of a contribution. We could also generate more money through a levy being imposed on the big banks, banks that we know are going to be raking in record profits particularly as interest rates continue to rise.

That is not a new idea. It is an idea that the Labor Party put on the table when they were last in government and that they then abandoned following a campaign from vested interests. We hope that the new Malinauskas Labor government does have the moral strength to stand up to the vested interests, does not fall into the same trap as the failed Marshall government—and that is to capitulate to the big end of town—but instead shows the leadership we need to get our state back on track and provides relief to families who are struggling in the middle of this economic crisis.

South Australians need relief now. The ideas that the Greens are putting forward in the lead-up to this state budget are sensible. They would have an immediate effect and they reflect the kinds of priorities we would like to see from this new government. I urge Premier Malinauskas and our new Treasurer Mullighan to take note of this motion that the Greens have put forward, to listen to the debate and to consult with us. We would be very happy to give them some ideas for the kinds of actions they could take to help South Australians who are struggling at the moment.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:28): I rise to speak in firm support of this motion put by my colleague the Hon. Robert Simms. This motion recognises the cost-of-living pressures we currently face in our state and across this nation. It does call on the Malinauskas Labor government to take some steps to relieve those cost-of-living pressures in their first budget, most specifically by making public transport free, introducing rent caps and rent subsidies, increasing the wages of public sector

workers, abolishing materials and services charges and subject fees for public school students, as well as significantly increasing our investment in public housing.

Cost-of-living pressures impact on all households, and we know that when the costs of basic necessities like housing, utilities, food, health and transport increase the most vulnerable people in our society are hit the hardest. Low income households are disproportionately affected, and we are seeing many households struggling through our state as incomes and income support payments consistently fail to keep pace with price rises. We know that so many people were plunged into poverty under successive federal governments' abandonment of them through our supposed welfare system.

We have just come out of a state election campaign and into a federal one, where we have seen politicians being asked about the price of bread, the wage price index and other sundry items. What has been missing from this conversation is not a conversation about keto, is not a rattling off of some numbers: it is actually missing the point to ask these questions when in fact the questions people are asking themselves is how they are even meant to afford that loaf of bread when the payments they receive are below the poverty line. What choice do they have? Is it the choice to skip meals or to skip medications?

Is it acceptable that South Australians in 2022 are having to make these choices because our politicians have refused to make the hard political choices to stand up to vested interests? The cost-of-living crisis is an inequality crisis. Currently, the gap between the rich and the poor in our nation has never been wider—it only continues to grow. Many billionaires doubled their wealth during this pandemic, while around the country over three million people are living in poverty. Our essential services have been sold off and now electricity, housing, health and education are all too expensive, when they should be universal, should be accessible and should be affordable.

We now have record low wage growth, endemic wage theft and out-of-control insecure work. Governments are the key to solving these crises, this inequality crisis, and they have the power to improve our state, but they must make the deliberate choice to do so. One of the government's key duties is to provide essential services, and to ensure that we all have the ability to live a healthy life, chase opportunities and to be happy. How can people access their essential services, such as health and transport, when prices continue to go up? People who cannot afford fuel or cars are looking at continual price rises, yet public transport is also not affordable for many either. How can people apply for jobs or get the treatments they need or access the services they deserve when they cannot even afford to pay their phone or internet bills?

I think it is important that the parliament does seriously consider this motion, particularly as we head towards the Malinauskas government's first budget, just one month from now. Budgets are about choices and, put simply, they tell us what the government of the day chooses as being worthy of funding and what it does not. The impact of those choices on us and on future generations are the result of very deliberate political decisions. The government can make a very real and meaningful change for the people of this state, and I urge them—and I urge this council—to support and implement the measures outlined in this motion.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.E. Hanson.

Bills

STATE ASSETS (PRIVATISATION RESTRICTIONS) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:33): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to prohibit the privatisation of certain state-owned assets without the approval of parliament, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

HERITAGE PLACES (ADELAIDE PARK LANDS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:35): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Heritage Places Act 1993 and to make a related amendment to the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. Read a first time.

CIVIL LIABILITY (BYO CONTAINERS) AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:36): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Civil Liability Act 1936. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:37): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Mr President, the bill that I am moving today, one of the many bills that I am moving today, will not be new to you or many of the continuing members of this chamber. It is a simple amendment to the Civil Liability Act to provide a protection for businesses that allow consumers to bring in their own takeaway containers. This would apply to food businesses. It would allow, in effect, a customer to go into a business, to bring in their own takeaway container and to be able to take food from the business in that container without having to use single-use plastics.

We know that at least eight million tonnes of plastics leak into the ocean each year, and estimates suggest that, if this trend continues, by 2050 there will be more plastics in the ocean than fish. That is a really frightening prospect to contemplate. This state has a proud tradition when it comes to taking action to reduce waste, and in particular to reduce single-use plastics, and I do recognise the efforts of the previous government in that regard.

Members will recall that when I put this proposal to the last parliament it had unanimous support, and it is my hope that this is a bill we can deal with quite quickly in the new parliament. It is in that spirit that I plan to bring this to a vote in the next parliamentary sitting period so that it can be resolved early in the parliamentary term, given there is strong support in the community for this reform.

I refer members to my second reading explanation given in the last parliament, which was more extensive. I am happy to send that around to provide a bit more detail in terms of the intention of the bill. I also acknowledge that, in developing this, this was an idea that was first raised by my predecessor, the Hon. Mark Parnell, when he was in this chamber. When I came into the parliament I engaged significantly with three former ministers: the then Attorney-General, the Minister for Health and the Minister for Environment, and also with the then shadow minister, the Hon. Susan Close, who now of course is Deputy Premier and Minister for the Environment.

I had understood that this bill was going to be dealt with in the last parliament and, indeed, the government at the time had indicated to me that it was going to be prioritised. Sadly, that did not happen and so I am really excited about the prospect of resolving this bill in this parliament. With that, I conclude my remarks.

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

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (GAS INFRASTRUCTURE) AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:40): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:41): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Mr President, you will be relieved to know that this is the last bill I intend to move today—not in my eight-year parliamentary term, there are many more good ideas to come, but this is the last bill that I am putting forward today. This will not be a surprise to continuing members of this chamber; indeed, this is a bill that has been pursued many times by the Greens. My predecessor, Mark Parnell, first moved very similar legislation back in 2018 and I introduced this again into the previous parliament.

One thing that really surprised me when I came into this parliament was to learn that in South Australia we have a regime that allows developers to choose the energy provider for someone purchasing a new property. In other words, whilst we do not have mandated gas connection in South Australia the decision around whether a new property is connected to gas or electricity is made by the developer, not the individual consumer, when someone is purchasing a new build, and that is really problematic.

We have talked a lot today about the growing economic crisis, the cost-of-living crisis in our state, and we know that gas is a lot more costly than other electricity options on the market. It is also far worse for the environment. Gas has a terrible impact in terms of our environment and for us in the Greens gas really is the new coal. What this bill is doing is giving that decision to the consumer and allowing consumers to make clean, green choices.

Just to give you a sense of what is at stake here, according to the Grattan Institute running a new Adelaide house on all electricity rather than gas would save up to \$2,183 over 10 years and up to \$5,556 over 10 years if they made the switch from gas cooking, hot water and space heating. The practice of property developers mandating gas connection and gas use in new homes really locks South Australians into higher energy prices and higher carbon emissions. That is a cycle that the Greens are seeking to break.

When I introduced this bill into the last parliament I was delighted to see it had such widespread support in this chamber and so with that in mind I intend to bring it to a vote sooner rather than later. I plan to do so when parliament next resumes. With that, I conclude my remarks.

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

WORK HEALTH AND SAFETY (INDUSTRIAL MANSLAUGHTER) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:45): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Work, Health and Safety Act 2012. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:45): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise today to reintroduce a Greens bill in the wake of May Day over the weekend to make industrial manslaughter a crime. I think it is fair to say that making industrial manslaughter a crime is unfinished business in this parliament. I reflect on the fact that this is not the first time that I have brought this legislation before this place. Indeed, it is not even the first time that it has been brought before this place in terms of the Greens. There is a long history in this place of this issue being on our agenda. I note that my first bill was modelled on that of Nick Xenophon, when he served in the Legislative Council. In fact, it has been proposed at least five times over the years that I have been here and it has been proposed both as a private member's bill and also amendments to other legislation.

I do note, however, that while my most recent attempt to pass industrial manslaughter laws in this state was adjourned at the end of the last parliamentary session, the Labor Party, which is now in government, committed to introducing and passing industrial manslaughter laws in our state. Since announcing over the weekend that the Greens would be reintroducing this legislation this week, the Labor Party have also announced that they will be putting forward legislation to make industrial manslaughter a crime. The Greens welcome this move and we look forward to seeing that legislation. I hope we can all work together to pass industrial manslaughter legislation in this council and in this parliament as soon as possible. I hope that this is the year that we finally catch up with much of the rest of the country and put this matter to rest.

The legislation that I introduce today has a maximum penalty of imprisonment of up to 20 years and up to a \$13 million fine. Under this bill, a person conducting an undertaking or business, a PCBU, would be found guilty of an offence if the employer breaches their duty of care, the employer knew or was recklessly indifferent that the act or omission constituting the breach would create substantial risk of serious harm to a person and that the breach would cause the death of a person.

I note that this is the only slight change since the last time I reintroduced this bill. Indeed, we have updated the language to PCBU instead of employer in this bill before us.

While we have been told many things over the years when it comes to this parliament's opposition to doing what I believe is the absolute bare minimum to protect workers in our state by introducing industrial manslaughter laws, the key one that we have heard offered is that there is no need for this legislation, especially because the other states did not have that legislation at the time in the early days of this debate. I think we all recognise now that things have changed. I want to be clear in restating the case for updating our laws in South Australia now that, in fact, most of the country has moved to not only recognise industrial manslaughter properly in legislation but to apply serious penalties to it.

Industrial or workplace manslaughter laws are in place in New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, ACT, Northern Territory and Western Australia. South Australia and Tasmania are the last remaining jurisdictions without such laws. We have seen as well the final report of the Review of the Model Work Health and Safety Laws released in December 2018, following on from the agreement in 2008 where we all agreed to harmonise our work health and safety laws across this country across all states and territories. Critically, that report states, and I quote:

I am recommending a new offence of industrial manslaughter be included in the model WHS laws. The growing public debate about including an offence of industrial manslaughter in the model WHS laws was reflected in consultations for this Review. I consider that this new offence is required to address increasing community concerns that there should be a separate industrial manslaughter offence where there is a gross deviation from a reasonable standard of care that leads to a workplace death. It is also required to address the limitations of the criminal law when dealing with breaches of WHS duties. More broadly, the ACT and Queensland have already introduced industrial manslaughter provisions, with other jurisdictions considering it, and so this new offence also aims to enhance and maintain harmonisation of the WHS laws.

That was a quote from 2018, some years back now. Of course, since then, we have seen industrial manslaughter laws put in place nationwide, most recently in Western Australia. I would remind members as well that South Australia is a signatory to the Intergovernmental Agreement for Regulatory and Operational Reform in Occupational Health and Safety, which is the agreement under which we agreed to harmonise our work health and safety laws with other states. The report also states:

Advocates for the inclusion of an industrial manslaughter offence believe such change is long overdue and reflects strong public sentiment. The ACTU supports this view and submits that 'the introduction of a new offence of industrial manslaughter will provide a strong incentive to businesses with poor practices to improve'. The Senate inquiry into industrial deaths recommended that the model WHS laws be amended to provide for an industrial manslaughter offence. It considered serious consequences were warranted for organisations whose negligent actions result in the death of a worker or bystander and the offence would provide a strong and appropriate deterrent across the entire WHS regime.

I would like to pull one final quote from this report for the information of not just the members of this council but, indeed, for the community, where it discusses the case for change:

Consultations for this Review (mirrored in submissions to the Senate inquiry into industrial deaths) revealed a clear and increasing view amongst a great many in the community that there should be an outcome-based offence in the model WHS laws where the death of another person occurs as a result of the gross negligence of either an individual or an organisation. The strong community expectation is that it should be possible to prosecute for the death of a person under a statutory offence of industrial manslaughter in the model WHS laws.

As discussed, the most commonly cited reason for rejecting an industrial manslaughter offence during consultations was that the current criminal law offences in each jurisdiction are sufficient for dealing with workplace fatalities. Opponents of change pointed to the potential for a problematic overlap with a jurisdiction's criminal laws if an industrial manslaughter offence is introduced in the model WHS Act. This argument is less convincing given some states and territories either have or are exploring the introduction of an industrial manslaughter offence to reflect what they perceive as the community will and to deal with the limitations of the criminal law in prosecuting breaches resulting in workplace death. At a practical level, the absence of an industrial manslaughter offence in the model WHS Act also increases the potential for inconsistency as jurisdictions successfully introduce their own offence into their WHS or other legislation.

To sum up, this bill is a long overdue measure. We could have led, we will lag, but this bill seeks to capture the minority—and I do say very much the minority—of employers who cruelly put workers through unnecessary risk. South Australian workers have waited long enough for this protection. This is life-saving legislation and every single workplace death is significant. It is an avoidable tragedy

that will affect the lives of many others, should it be the type of death caused that will need this particular legislation to be implemented.

Everyone deserves to come home safely from work, and we must ensure that employers have a genuine incentive to provide a safe workplace and to prevent them from taking shortcuts that endanger lives. As legislators, I think it is our responsibility to ensure that employers have a genuine incentive to provide that safe workplace.

We do have many carrots in our system, but we also need a few sticks, and the message needs to be clear: deliberately or recklessly kill a worker, go to jail. That is what the penalty should be in our state, as it is in almost every other jurisdiction of this country now. I note, unfortunately, that workplace deaths are going up, not down. We need to do more, and we need to do more now. With that, I commend this bill to the council.

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

ANIMAL WELFARE (JUMPS RACING) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:55): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Animal Welfare Act 1985. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:56): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise today to introduce this bill to at long last ban jumps racing in South Australia. This is not the first time this parliament will have considered such a ban, but I sincerely hope it will be the last. There can be no more tolerance, no more excuses, for this cruel so-called sport. Jumps racing is intrinsically dangerous and cruel to horses, and it cannot be made safe and free of animal cruelty. The only remedy for jumps racing is to ban it.

In fact, Queensland stopped jumps racing in 1903, WA stopped jumps racing in 1941 and the sport was banned in New South Wales in 1997. The last race was held in Tasmania in 2007, and it is now over 30 years since the 1991 Senate inquiry recommended that jumps racing be phased out. Victoria and South Australia are the only remaining Australian states that still retain this archaic practice, although I note that we have not seen any jumps racing scheduled for our state in the current racing season in South Australia. That is, of course, following Racing South Australia's announcement on 1 October 2021 that no jumps racing would be scheduled for this year.

Time and again, jumps racing has proven dangerous for jockeys and deadly for racehorses. This year, in the Victorian 2022 jumps racing season, we have already seen at least two horses die, and just yesterday we saw a rider dislodged and another horse have a serious fall. It is time to put an end to this carnage. This sport is dangerous to both people and animals. Jumps racing jockeys can have a fall rate of up to 12½ times higher than flat race jockeys, meaning that on average jumps jockeys can fall every 19 rides.

Further, when racing in a jumps race horses are confronted with the task of galloping at high speed and being forced to clear obstacles of considerable height while surrounded by a group of other horses attempting the same. To avoid injury or death, that horse must clear each obstacle with an accuracy that is difficult when galloping at speed.

As horses fatigue, it becomes more difficult to properly negotiate the obstacles. And fatigue is likely: jumps races are at least three kilometres long, which is one kilometre longer than flat races, and horses are required to carry heavier weights than for flat races. Moreover, jumping in a pack over obstacles places the horses at risk of collision with each other. That is why we have seen a high percentage of falls occur in the latter stages of a race.

Of the known—and I use that word advisedly—deaths in jumps racing in Australia, the majority of cases required euthanasia due to a catastrophic injury. A study by the University of Melbourne reported the risk of injury and death of a horse competing in a jumps race as 18.9 times greater than a horse competing in a flat race.

The RSPCA reports that from 2009 to 2021 at least 76 horses in Victoria and South Australia have died from injuries sustained due to jumps racing, but the death toll is believed to be much higher because the industry has not been compelled to publicly report all associated injuries and deaths.

The industry itself is ready for the end of jumps racing. Attendance is low. Injuries and deaths are high. While jumps racing accounts for a very small proportion of the horseracing industry, it accounts for almost all of the bad publicity that the industry receives. There are transition arrangements that can be made and could be made to ensure not just the welfare of these horses and not just the increased safety in the workplace of the jockeys but the reputation of this industry overall.

There are so many reasons to put an end to jumps racing in South Australia, but I always remember the words in this chamber of one of our own members, the Hon. Ian Hunter, who I believe outlined the case for banning jumps racing quite strongly in previous years, despite in the end not voting to ban this cruel practice. I would encourage members to look up the whole speech, but I will just give you a—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: It was an excellent speech.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: It was an excellent speech, the Hon. Ian Hunter. It has long stayed in my memory. I quote the Hon. Ian Hunter:

...the overwhelming majority of owners in jumps racing make a loss financially on those races, and in most cases the prize money is not even enough to cover the cost of training. One wonders why they do it. Therefore, the argument that jumps racing is needed in South Australia to support our economy is kind of weak.

Supporters of jumps racing argue that without a jumps racing industry to fall back on, the many horses that do not make the grade for flat racing would be sent to the slaughterhouse. Pro jumps racing groups believe the industry saves these slower horses from premature death. I note, however, that critics of jumps racing dispute this and claim that the horses usually end up at the slaughterhouse regardless, with most jumps racing horses running in five or fewer races in their short career.

Despite calls to ban this sport due to animal welfare concerns, jumps racing supporters firmly believe that horses actually enjoy jumping obstacles because it is something they were born to do, but experts such as the University of Sydney's Dr Paul McGreevy disagree. Dr McGreevy argues that in the wild, horses jump only when they need to do so; that is, if they are being chased and they have to go over a fallen tree, fence or some other obstacle. They are, after all, a prey animal. Dr McGreevy argues that in the wild, horses will generally go around an object if they can and jump only when necessary.

The University of Kentucky's equine expert, Dr Thomas Tobin, maintains that the bone structure of a horse is not designed to jump obstacles for extended periods of time, and that long periods of sustained jumping will significantly increase the risk of a horse breaking bones. Whether it is a natural inclination for horses to jump or not, there is no disputing the statistics that reveal that jumps horses face an increased risk of injury and death compared to horses run on the flat.

The Hon. Ian Hunter went on to then say:

In summary, while I will not be voting in support of this motion at this point in time, I think the jumps racing industry should really try to engage with the facts and not try to brush these concerns under the carpet.

The evidence of the suffering and cruelty caused by jumps racing is overwhelming. This sport has no place in our state. Even Racing SA is moving away from scheduling these cruel races. I know that for a long time now jumps racing has had certainly sponsors move away from it in droves.

The evidence is in. I recognise, as with the other time the banning of jumps racing has been raised, that there will be those who decry the loss of a tradition, but there are many traditions that have been phased out as our society evolves. Jumps racing should and must be one of them. Exposing horses to high risk of suffering, injury or death is not a tradition worth keeping. Tradition can never serve as an excuse for animal suffering.

I commend this bill to this council. I note that Racing SA, currently embroiled in legal and internal battles in their industry, have clearly shown the direction that the majority of the industry wishes to take in this state. I refer members to that 1991 Senate committee, which, over 30 years ago, recommended that jumps racing be phased out. For those who do have concerns about the workers in this industry, I ask that those debates be done with the real facts and certainly not be

overstated estimations, and caution against necessarily believing that this will have a massive impact on jobs when the evidence does not prove that to be the case.

However, I note that there will be those who will lose work as a result of the banning of jumps racing, should that go forward. Certainly, this Malinauskas government is in a position to work with the industry and with those workers because that task, while important, is actually quite small. I would never encourage people to progress with putting people out of work needlessly when there are much better options for them that do not involve ongoing animal cruelty and the ongoing animal cruelty that is jumps racing. With that, I commend the bill to the council.

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

Motions

MARSHALL LIBERAL GOVERNMENT BUDGETARY MANAGEMENT

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (17:06): I move:

That this council commends the Marshall Liberal government for its strong budgetary management confirmed by:

1. Meeting its commitments to eliminate payroll tax on small business, slash the emergency services levy on families and businesses and cut water bills while providing support to families and business during COVID-19 totalling more than \$4 billion;
2. Delivering a 2021-22 budget which returns the operating balance to surplus in 2022-23; and
3. Delivering upgrades to South Australia's credit rating by ratings agencies.

During our time in government, the Liberals met commitments to eliminate payroll tax on small business, slash the emergency services levy on families and businesses and cut water bills while providing support to families and businesses during COVID-19, totalling more than \$4 billion. We also delivered the 2021-22 budget, which would return the operating balance to surplus in 2022-23 and delivered upgrades to South Australia's credit ratings by ratings agencies.

In 2018, prior to the election in South Australia, our taxes were far too high, as Labor disproportionately increased government fees and charges and allowed council rates to rise above inflation. Power prices were amongst the highest in the world, not to mention our electricity supply was highly unreliable, with no solution to ensure that South Australians did not have to suffer through statewide blackouts. It was the same for our water prices, which Labor deliberately and deceitfully kept high to protect their budget revenue at the suffering of South Australian residents who were paying through the roof for this essential service.

South Australians elected the Liberal government in 2018, aware of our proven track record and effective economic credentials and ability to manage the economy. We did this with great success. We did more to transform our state's economic opportunities than Labor did in the 16 years that they were in office before us. When we came into government in 2018, we searched for opportunities to create growth and jobs in South Australia.

The Liberal Party did not want to follow Labor's idea of turning Lot Fourteen into yet another apartment building. We wanted to stimulate our economy and bring us back from the terrible position it was in. We made this dream a reality with the vision of Lot Fourteen coming to life, seeing the total transformation of this significant spot in our city into a startup and growth hub, an entrepreneur and innovation centre, the national Space Agency, the Australian Cyber Collaboration Centre and the Digital Technologies Academy. It is also creating gainful employment and collaboration for over 1,300 people. Lot Fourteen has created and will continue to create endless opportunity for South Australians and will bring ideas for the future right here in Adelaide.

In our term of government, we delivered the lowest unemployment rate in 40 years and the highest economic growth in the nation. In September 2018, former Treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas, announced that the global rating agency Standard & Poor's had upgraded Australia's long-term credit rating to AA+ based on the stable economic outlook and the expectations of sustained operating surpluses. In September 2018, Standard & Poor's reported that the South Australian government was taking material steps to achieve savings targets, containing expenditure growth and debt levels.

Not only did the Liberals reduce household bills for South Australians, we also provided massive supports for South Australian businesses that were impacted by COVID restrictions. We wanted to support these businesses that were unable to operate as normal as we managed our response to the pandemic. This included:

- cash grants of up to \$22,000 for eligible businesses;
- an additional \$8,000 Business Hardship Grant for eligible businesses;
- payroll tax deferral for tourism, hospitality and gyms; and
- liquor licence fee waivers for eligible licence holders.

Under the Liberal government, South Australians benefited hugely from lower household bills, including a saving of \$184 on average per year on the emergency services levy. Overall, average households in Adelaide were reaping the benefits of \$940 extra in their pockets every year thanks to the number of the Liberal government's low-cost policies.

One of the biggest household costs for South Australians was cut dramatically under the Liberal government. An independent review of SA Water's regulated asset base (RAB) saw a huge decrease in what households and businesses were paying each quarter for water supply and usage. Under our government, families saw a reduction of about \$200 on average each year and businesses were set to save about \$1,300 per year, after Labor purposely kept water bills high by overinflating SA Water's RAB to cover their debts and to pass on the costs to South Australians.

Under the Liberal government, we worked tirelessly for the people of South Australia making our state a great place to live—in fact, number one in the country and number three worldwide. The Labor Party must stop making reckless promises that will drive up the cost of living for all South Australians and undo the hard work that has been put into place to get the budget back into the black after year upon year of South Australia being in the red under Labor rule.

Labor's unfunded promises equate to a staggering \$3 billion that will put huge pressures on household costs in South Australia. We will potentially be looking at paying an extra \$4,000 in taxes, fees and charges under Labor. The question that remains is: will Labor ever be able to deliver a surplus budget? History would suggest not.

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

INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR THE ELIMINATION OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (17:12): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges that 25 November is the International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women.
2. Commends the following initiatives of the Marshall Liberal government for domestic violence prevention—
 - (a) funding 100 crisis beds across the state to provide women and children fleeing domestic violence with somewhere safer and more suitable to go than traditional motel accommodation, through the provision of enhanced security and a home-like environment with features like a kitchen and laundry;
 - (b) resources to enable the electronic monitoring of more than 100 people charged or convicted of a domestic and family violence offence who break intervention orders, refusing to leave their victims alone;
 - (c) interest-free loans for non-government domestic violence organisations to fund housing-related projects;
 - (d) funding a trial Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme to ensure women who request information about a partner's criminal history have support from a specialist domestic violence service and the opportunity to find out if their current or former partner has a history of violence;
 - (e) funding of an app linking at-risk individuals directly to SAPOL and women's domestic violence services; and

- (f) legislative reforms including expansion of the definition of abuse and increased penalties for repeated or violent breaches of intervention orders.

I note that International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women is some time off on 25 November. Indeed, today there will be a domestic and family violence vigil at the Place of Courage at Rotary Park at Christies Beach, which a number of us will be attending online later on today. I particularly acknowledge Helen and Heather Oxenham, who have been great advocates for the Place of Courage.

Women's activists have marked 25 November as a day against violence since 1981. This date came from the brutal assassination in 1960 of the three Mirabal sisters, political activists in the Dominican Republic. On 20 December 1993, the United Nations General Assembly, by resolution 48/104, adopted the Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women.

In this context, in 1999, the United Nations General Assembly designated 25 November as the International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women (IDEVAW) and invited governments, international organisations and NGOs to organise on that day activities designed to raise public awareness of these terrible issues. IDEVAW represents the start of the 16 Days of Activism, addressing violence against women and their children. Human Rights Day, on 10 December, is the conclusion of the 16 Days of Activism.

In Australia, IDEVAW has been the day on which White Ribbon Day is celebrated; however, this year White Ribbon Day will be celebrated on 22 November, which recognises the role of men in preventing violence against women. I acknowledge the many members of this place and the other place who have participated to ensure that they are not bystanders and are doing their bit to assist the safety of women and children.

In relation to the particular items of the motion, I would like to make some remarks in relation to that: first, the domestic violence beds, interest-free loans, the life-saving app and the domestic violence disclosure scheme. It is an honour to reflect on the achievements of the Marshall Liberal government in tackling the scourge of domestic violence and delivering for survivors. Our vision was for South Australian women to feel safe and know that they could reach out for support when and where they need, because we know that when women feel safe both they and their children have the best chance of thriving.

As a government the Marshall Liberal government committed record funding to support South Australians experiencing domestic family and sexual violence, as well as a range of new prevention measures. In our four years we committed more than \$21 million in new funding towards a suite of new DV measures to support South Australians. These included but are not limited to—and there is quite a long list and a media release issued by the then Attorney-General, Vickie Chapman, and the assistant minister for domestic and family violence prevention, Caroline Power, on 4 May last year, which detailed a range of measures in a large number of areas.

These are some of our highlights. We provided 40 new crisis accommodation beds for South Australians leaving domestic and family violence across Adelaide and the regions, including nine beds for a perpetrator pilot through Community Transitions, or OARS. Those beds have been up and running in the locations where they are needed, as was advised to us through consultation with frontline service providers.

Men in South Australia can now access support through the men's referral service, and inquire about crisis accommodation through the Community Transitions phone line. All the 31 beds for DV victims have been operational, many for some time, including eight beds in the northern metro region, six beds in the southern metro and 18 beds across SA, including the Limestone Coast, Murray Mallee and Eyre and Western.

During the election campaign we were able to announce that we were expanding the program from the 31 beds to 100 beds—that is funding that was approved through the South Australian Housing Authority, and we know that those beds will provide a much more appropriate response for people experiencing domestic violence than the emergency accommodation program, which is the hotel/motels that is referenced in the motion.

Anybody who has had to raise children, particularly young ones, knows that hotel rooms are not the most appropriate place for young children, and to have the space and amenity makes a big difference, particularly if people are there for some time. I look forward to those beds continuing to be rolled out. That was something that was approved by cabinet, and we will be watching closely to ensure that the new government does not renege on that particular program.

There was also an interest-free loan to develop a new housing support initiative, which I think has been announced. It took some time to land, and COVID certainly did not help that process, but the YWCA has a site at Hutt Street, which they will be seeking to redevelop into crisis accommodation. Funding was provided to a new life-saving domestic violence app. As at 30 September 2021, over 500 women had accessed the app by the specialist DV services, and the duress function was activated 99 times.

There was also the domestic violence disclosure scheme, which was part of our suite of election commitments coming into office, that enabled people in South Australia for the first time to seek information from SAPOL about a current or former partner's violent offending history and that enabled them to make informed decisions about their relationship.

I do acknowledge that this scheme had been flagged by the previous government, but they did not actually get around to doing anything about it, so it was something that we were very pleased to be able to implement. I understand that over 1,000 people have sought information on their current or former partner's criminal history, and that is part of more of the prevention measures that assist people not to go through that trauma.

In terms of electronic monitoring, the Marshall Liberal government had a plan to better protect victim survivors through new resources that would enable the electronic monitoring of more than 100 people who have been charged with or convicted of an offence and who break their intervention orders. This would save lives immediately by notifying authorities when an order is breached and also gives victim survivors the confidence they need to live their life to the fullest without the fear of a perpetrator intruding on their lives.

The use of electronic monitoring for offenders in the community has proven to be an effective supervision tool, with more and more jurisdictions worldwide adopting this method for monitoring offenders. The goal of electronic monitoring is to enhance the safety of victims by reducing intervention order breaches through improved enforcement and will see stronger protection measures for the most vulnerable members of our community.

The Marshall Liberal government also introduced legislative reforms, some of which were nation leading. We implemented laws targeting the perpetrators of domestic violence, giving authorities stronger tools to tackle repeat and serious offenders. In addition to introducing a standalone criminal offence of strangulation, legislative reforms, including expansion of the definition of abuse and increased penalties for repeated or violent breaches of intervention orders, were made possible.

The Statutes Amendment (Domestic Violence) Act 2018 came into effect in 2019 and made a number of amendments to prevent and punish domestic and family violence. In the first 12 months of operation of the new laws the number of charges for intervention order breaches reduced by a substantial 13 per cent. Between 31 January 2019 and 30 January 2020, 44 per cent of defendants whose most serious charge was a second or subsequent breach of an intervention order received a custodial penalty.

That is a very brief outline of some of the measures we took. I am also very proud of the safety hubs that we implemented in regional South Australia: 10 safety hubs in various locations, including Berri, Mount Gambier, Mount Barker, Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Whyalla, Port Lincoln, Murray Bridge—and there are probably a couple of others as well that have slipped my memory.

The most common model we used was to call for volunteers in a community-type centre or in the local library, where volunteers were trained up—it was fairly intensive training, I am told—to be able to assist people at the earlier stages, I should say, to seek assistance. I am sure all of these measures have made a difference.

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

*Address in Reply***ADDRESS IN REPLY**

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (17:23): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the committee appointed to prepare a draft Address in Reply be extended until the next day of sitting.

Motion carried.

*Parliamentary Committees***STATUTORY AUTHORITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE**

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (17:23): By leave, I move:

That pursuant to section 21(3) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 the Hon. J.S. Lee be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. L.A. Curran (resigned).

Motion carried.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The House of Assembly notified its appointment of sessional committees.

JOINT PARLIAMENTARY SERVICE COMMITTEE

The House of Assembly notified its appointment of the committee.

STANDING COMMITTEES

The House of Assembly notified its appointment of standing committees.

At 17:28 the council adjourned until Thursday 5 May 2022 at 14:15.