

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 1 June 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. C. BONAROS (14:17): I bring up the fifth report of the committee.

Report received.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I bring up the sixth report of the committee.

Report received and read.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I bring up the seventh report of the committee.

Report received and read.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I bring up the eighth report of the committee.

Report received and read.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I bring up the interim report of the committee on the House of Assembly petition No. 84 of 2021, entitled SA Ambulance Service Resourcing.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Ministerial Statement

POST-CORONIAL REVIEWER APPOINTMENT

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:24): I table a ministerial statement made in the other chamber by the Hon. Katrine Hildyard, Minister for Child Protection.

Question Time

NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding the north-south corridor project.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: In 2020, *Infrastructure* magazine reported that the final section of the north-south corridor is expected to provide huge savings for commercial freight operators, with commercial freight operators to save approximately \$8.80 per trip along the 10.5-kilometre stretch.

The final section of the north-south corridor will also provide efficient access to and from key freight areas, delivering South Australian products to market faster, products that include those produced by South Australia's agricultural, food, wine and forestry industries. My question to the minister is: does she support the Minister for Transport's decision to delay the north-south corridor project?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:27): I thank the honourable member for her question and indeed for her creativity in trying to find a link directly for me as Minister for Regional Development with decisions around the north-south corridor. I think it is certainly true that it is an important project. The Australian and South Australian governments have allocated I think a total of \$9.9 billion to the project, if I am correct, and the department is currently undertaking a review of the project in line with the Labor government's election commitments.

I am advised that initial findings have identified significant issues with the achievability of the program and cash flows, which has necessitated reprofiling \$1.1 billion beyond the forward estimates period, with \$3.2 billion now to be spent over the next four years. The review is also examining alternative solutions to minimise the visual impact of a large, elevated structure at the Anzac Highway intersection and adjacent to the Brickworks Marketplace.

In terms of any other information that the honourable member may seek, I am happy to refer that to the minister responsible for the north-south corridor in the other place.

NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): Supplementary: as the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, does she support the Minister for Transport's decision to delay the north-south corridor project?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:29): I've already answered that question.

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti: I don't think you have.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Centofanti, second question. The minister can choose as to whether to answer or not.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUSTRALIA

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding Regional Development Australia:

1. Does the minister have confidence that the seven regional development associations are important to supporting economic growth and prosperity in our regions?
2. Does the minister believe funding levels for the RDA associations have been adequate?
3. Will the minister ensure that the RDA associations will not have their funding reduced or cut in the upcoming budget?
4. Will the minister give RDA associations and their communities confidence that they are a priority for her government, with funding levels, at a minimum, to be maintained?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:30): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for her question. Certainly, I think Regional Development Australia associations are incredibly important. I think we have a very sound model here in South Australia, where they receive part funding from federal, state and local government.

One of the really important parts of that model is that it does mean that there is buy-in from all levels of government, both in a literal sense but equally as importantly a commitment to ensuring that RDAs do address the issues that are of most importance to regional South Australia and also that they are equipped to respond to some of those issues.

I have been very fortunate to have many, many positive interactions with RDAs, both when I was in opposition and since. I have spoken to a number of the RDA local organisations since becoming minister. I think it's very, very important that we continue to support them. In my own area, I pay tribute to David Wheaton, who is the CEO of RDA, Kelly-Anne Saffin in the Mid North of course,

and many others, but they are two who I've had particularly frequent interactions with. So I certainly do think it's important.

In terms of whether they have been adequately funded in the past, I suppose the Leader of the Opposition is inviting me to reflect on her party's former government. Whilst sometimes here on this side we will do that, other times I don't think it's particularly helpful to reflect on the way that the former government did tend to ignore regional areas to their detriment. Of course, the strong swings against the former Liberal government in regional areas, in so many regional areas, such that a number of—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Leader of the Government, I'm sure the minister doesn't need your help. Please continue, minister.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —such that the number of regional seats now considered safe are minimal, shall we say, for those opposite. They had incredibly huge swings. Maybe that is as a result of a lack of commitment from the former Liberal government to regional issues, a lack of time spent in regional areas actually listening to the diversity of opinions and views in regional areas. It may be because of that, but I don't think it was necessarily because of their approaches to the regional development associations. I think that's probably something that we can agree on, that the RDAs are very useful and fulfil their roles very effectively.

I think it's also interesting that the existing funding commitments are due to run out on 30 June 2022. The feedback that I've had from a number of people in regional areas is that they were fully expecting that those agreements would have been in place before the election—in place before the caretaker period. So I think it is unfortunate that there's been that kind of expectation that wasn't met by the former Liberal government.

However, in terms of going forward, I must just check the date: that's right, it's 1 June today. Tomorrow is 2 June. June 2 usually follows June 1, for those opposite, and June 2 is the date that the budget is due to be handed down. I look forward to hearing our new Treasurer hand down that budget. I would encourage all those here present to perhaps listen to his speech, as soon as they are able to after it's handed down tomorrow, and to take the time to peruse the budget papers, which I'm very confident will be presented in an excellent way, because the Treasurer in the other place, I think, is doing a fine job as Treasurer in the new Malinauskas Labor government.

Of course, he is happy to interact, to take questions, to listen to other points of view, which of course I'm not suggesting the former Treasurer, Mr Lucas, wasn't doing. That was actually the suggestion of many other people, that he didn't like to listen to other people's views, but I would never suggest that, nor would I reflect on his time in that role. Tomorrow, 2 June—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: That's right; I would not do that. Tomorrow, 2 June, is when the budget will be handed down, and I look forward to seeing that budget and listening to the responses.

AGTECH GROWTH FUND

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): 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. The latest grant round still has not been finalised, despite the minister advising members in this place on both 4 May and 19 May that she would be doing so as soon as she can and that she looked 'forward to being able to make those announcements'. My questions to the minister are:

1. Is she committed to awarding the current round of agtech grants?

2. Is she committed to the future of the AgTech Growth Fund, with funding to be continued beyond the current financial year?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:36): I thank the honourable member for her question. The AgTech Growth Fund is part of the PIRSA agtech program, which is designed to enhance the profitability, productivity and resilience of South Australian primary industries through the adoption of agtech that supports best practice farming. This could be, for example, digital ag software and hardware, smart farm equipment, supply chain technology and others.

With regard to the recent round of the AgTech Growth Fund, I think the honourable Leader of the Opposition has answered her own question. As I have said and as I maintain, I look forward to making those announcements.

AGTECH GROWTH FUND

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): Supplementary: when will you be making those announcements, minister?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:36): I look forward to making those announcements imminently.

NUNGA COURTS

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:37): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the minister inform the chamber about South Australia's Nunga Courts and his recent visits to the Port Adelaide Magistrates Court?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:37): I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this area. The South Australian Nunga Court, which currently operates out of the Port Adelaide, Murray Bridge and Maitland magistrates courts, provides Aboriginal defendants with a culturally appropriate sentencing option in an otherwise often confusing and stigmatising legal setting.

Nunga Courts are a proud South Australian initiative which aims to bridge the gap often faced by Aboriginal people in their interaction with the Western legal system. The Nunga Court operating at the Port Adelaide Magistrates Court is the first culturally appropriate court of its kind for Aboriginal defendants in Australia. It was established in 1999, while the Murray Bridge Nunga Court began in 2001, and together they are the two oldest specialist courts in sentencing Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people anywhere in the country.

This court allows for community elders and Aboriginal justice officers to provide the magistrate with advice on relevant cultural and community issues during the sentencing process. Formally acknowledging and taking this cultural advice into account is often effective in helping Aboriginal defendants overcome cultural barriers to understanding the law and court practice and procedure.

It also seeks to build relationships with Aboriginal communities and organisations to aim to reduce reoffending and provide holistic outcomes for Aboriginal defendants. One of the points of difference between the Nunga Court and mainstream court is that all parties, including the magistrate, are seated at the same level and in close proximity to facilitate direct communication.

I had the opportunity a couple of years ago to spend an afternoon at the Nunga Court in Port Adelaide and was impressed with how it worked and those involved. I was fortunate to visit the Port Adelaide Magistrates Court once more last week, where I spoke with many people who play a very significant role in the operation and continuation of the Nunga Court in South Australia.

Among those was my good friend and respected elder, Aunty Yvonne Agius, who was central to the development of this court, the first of its kind. I particularly want to thank Aunty for all the work in getting this court established and for the continued commitment to helping create a better future for the Aboriginal community in South Australia.

The South Australian court was largely the initiative of Magistrate Chris Vass, who was then a member of the judicial Aboriginal cultural awareness program and the regional manager of the Port Adelaide Magistrates Court and its associated circuits, including the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara lands.

The court came to be as a result of many years of discussions between Mr Vass and various other parties, including Aboriginal community groups, state government agencies, the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement, police prosecutors and Aboriginal elders like Aunty Yvonne Agius, who I have mentioned earlier. When the court first commenced, it did so without funding but later on in December 1999 the Courts Administration Authority funded Aboriginal justice officers who continue to operate in the system, explaining court outcomes and sentence compliance, amongst many other roles.

I want to place on record particular thanks to Aaron Zammit, manager of the Aboriginal programs at the Courts Administration Authority, for facilitating my meeting at Port Adelaide and to all the other Courts Administration Authority representatives such as Magistrate Bennett, Magistrate Pandya, regional manager at Port Adelaide, and the many other elders and respected persons who continue to contribute to conversations around the Nunga Court. I look forward to seeing the continued work of this important part of our court system and to working further with experts to ensure their continued operation in South Australia.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:41): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development and Minister for Forest Industries a question about job recruitment.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Last week, I spotted slick advertisements posted on social media platforms by the Queensland government aimed at states like South Australia, offering inducements of \$1,500 plus travel to entice our tradies to move from the most livable city on the planet to live and work in the place they call paradise.

South Australia, of all the states and territories, has suffered the most from young people leaving to find work interstate. We still have the highest rate of unemployment and one of the highest for underemployment. Businesses across the entire spectrum cannot fill vacancies, from tourism and hospitality through to construction. My question to the minister is:

1. Is she aware of the Queensland campaign?
2. What is the Malinauskas government going to do to counter it and make sure we keep our tradies here?
3. Does the Malinauskas government have its own plan to attract skilled labour and others to the state, aside from the ten-pound Pom stunt that is aimed predominantly at backpackers to work in primary production areas and plug some holes in the tourism sector in our regions?
4. Why has the government chosen ten-pound Poms, targeting only British persons, why not expand it to a ten-euro scheme to also entice Europeans, or ten greenbacks to entice Americans, or 100 yuan for Chinese backpackers?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:43): I thank the member for his ongoing interest in regional areas and regional communities. Perhaps to answer the second specific question first, which is in regard to the ten-pound Pom program, my advice is that there were 200 £10 or €10 airfares that went on sale on 10 May, and more than 2,000 people completed the booking form for the fares.

A subsequent fare sale targeting those who missed out on the £10 and €10 fares was launched on 24 May. That sale sees £499 and €499 fares to Adelaide for working holiday-makers and has the potential to attract 500 to 1,000 more working holiday-makers booking a flight to Adelaide for arrival before the end of October 2022.

In terms of whether that may be expanded, I don't have any information on that, but I am happy to inquire whether there are any plans to expand that. But I think it is worth mentioning that those backpackers who are targeted with this sort of program do play a very important role in filling all sorts of vacancies.

Certainly, it's targeted towards hospitality, but often when backpackers visit a place like Australia they will engage in employment in different sectors. It might be fruit picking, it might be assisting with other harvests, it might be working in hospitality. I think it's certainly worth mentioning and acknowledging that that type of program can have quite a broad application.

In terms of the inducements being offered by the Queensland government, according to the honourable member, to entice tradies and skilled workers to Queensland, I do agree that it's absolutely outrageous that they call themselves paradise when clearly we are the best state as well as being the most livable city. I don't know if the member is aware that Western Australia has also invested quite heavily in advertising. I certainly know that when I went to the movies a couple of months ago, there were all sorts of ads trying to encourage, again, I think it was particularly tradies, from memory, and others to move to Western Australia.

All of those programs are a reflection of the very tight labour market that we have and the skills shortages that we have across the country, not just across the state. There are a number of ways that the Malinauskas Labor government is looking at trying to address our skills shortages and our workforce shortages. The member has already mentioned the ten-pound Pom program, which is also a ten-euro program, and there are a range of other initiatives.

One of the really important things, though, is we also want to make sure that we always have a balance between attracting those from overseas and interstate and actually training up the workforce from within our own state. That's why so many of the pre-election commitments made by the Labor Party, which we are now on the way to implementing, focus on training and skills.

We need to ensure that, when we need a skilled workforce, we are doing everything we can to train that workforce from within the population of our own state. That includes, for example, the announcement of five new technical colleges, two of which will be in regional areas: one in Port Augusta and one in Mount Gambier. It includes the additions of funding into TAFE and ensuring that we are able to really focus on those areas that have critical skills needs.

I think it's certainly worth inquiring whether we have considered a particular type of program of the type to which the honourable member refers, but I guess it does highlight that we will then be competing state against state to try to attract workforce. What we want to do is certainly not rule out programs that might show a good return on investment, and I think that's the most important thing. We don't want to be spending money on advertisements or enticements if they don't actually result in improving the workforce situation here, but at the same time we can look at whether there is a return on investment from those sorts of programs.

But, even more importantly, we need to ensure that we are skilling up those who are already here in South Australia, who don't then need to have the challenge of relocating, who can actually form the workforce for the future, because we don't just want to be looking short term. We want to be looking at a generation to come and even further.

The PRESIDENT: A supplementary question, the Hon. Mr Pangallo.

TEN-POUND POM SCHEME

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:47): Can the minister clarify if the ten-pound Pom or ten-euro scheme is only restricted to British nationals, or was it open to others, to Europeans? If not, why not?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:48): For that detail, I am happy to refer to my colleague the minister in the other place and bring back that information.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Curran, you have a supplementary question.

TEN-POUND POM SCHEME

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN (14:48): Can the minister please inform what plans are underway to ensure that there will be adequate accommodation available for those travelling to South Australia under the expanded ten-pound Pom scheme and whether their arrival will impact the availability and cost of local accommodation in the regions where they are located, noting a recent Beyond the Housing Crisis—A Home for All report revealed that there are more than 6,000 South Australians who are currently experiencing homelessness each night?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:49): I thank the honourable member for her supplementary question. She certainly does allude to a very important issue. Housing is the top issue in terms of workforce in our regional areas and it's something I have spoken on myself, as indeed the Hon. Mr Simms did yesterday as well. Those housing issues are ongoing, and I have talked about some of the initiatives that the Malinauskas Labor government is undertaking to address some of those issues.

We do need to, however, also bring in extra people. I do not think there is a suggestion from the opposition that we should not be bringing in extra people to try to meet some of those labour demands, and so I am certainly not trying to imply that that was the intent of the honourable member's question.

Many of those who were attracted to the ten-pound Poms may actually be backpackers and therefore will utilise the backpacker accommodation and, apart from that, they are likely to be staying for relatively short periods of time, and that is part of the ongoing challenge that we all have, and I would suggest that we can probably best command solutions if we do work together about what those solutions might be.

We need to do that because we need to ensure that those people who come here temporarily can fulfil some of the work shortages that we have, because we know that the local workforce is currently not sufficient and that the types of accommodation, just anecdotally, would be more likely to be focusing on things like backpackers and tents and things like that, rather than necessarily adding a lot of extra pressure to long-term accommodation. However, obviously we do not necessarily have a lot of data on that. We need to be addressing housing issues in tandem with other workforce issues.

KANGAROO ISLAND BUSINESS HUB

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:51): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development about Kangaroo Island.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: A local survey indicated that two-thirds of businesses on KI say that the Kangaroo Island Business Hub is important for their business and they want it to continue beyond its June 2022 funding date. My question to the minister is: will the Labor government commit to investigate the KI Business Hub's future uses through consultation with the KI Industry Association; and will the minister confirm that they will provide funding for the KI Business Hub beyond the June 2020 date and, if not, why not?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:52): I thank the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition for her question. I am happy to refer that to the minister in the other place. The member has not indicated what program is funding that, so I am happy to make inquiries and bring that information back to the chamber.

AUSVEG AWARDS NIGHT

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister update the council on the recent AUSVEG awards night that was held in Adelaide last week?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:52): I thank the honourable member for his question about this excellent event. It was great to have the opportunity to both speak at and present awards at the 2022 Vegetable Industry Dinner and Awards Night, which was hosted by AUSVEG.

The event was well attended, with roughly 280 attendees, representing the vegetable industry. I think in fact it has always been pretty well attended by all sides of politics. I acknowledge that the shadow minister for primary industries and regional development was there, as well as the Hon. Frank Pangallo and a number of MPs from the House of Assembly. It was a night to celebrate this critical industry and acknowledge the hard work that so many have contributed over the last 12 months.

In particular, I want to acknowledge the winners of the 2022 Vegetable Industry Awards for Excellence. Emmanuel Cafcakis, from Cafcakis Nominees, was announced as the Grower of the Year. Emmanuel has been a grower in Virginia for many years and has overcome many obstacles to be where he is today. The past couple of years has seen the business expand with new hydroponic greenhouse buildings as well as upgrades to existing greenhouses and this has allowed the business to become one of the biggest producers of heirloom tomatoes in Australia.

Damian Manno, of Quality Harvest, was announced as the Young Grower of the Year. Damian is unique in that he set up his growing operation on his own and not within an existing family business, which is quite unusual. He was at the time training to be a winemaker and he started to grow hydroponic basil on the weekends. Within five years he had grown his farm to comprise a significant basil and hydroponic strawberry operation, and Damian also has a strong commitment to quality and has developed his own innovative 'Herbalicious' basil brand, which I would encourage members of this place to explore. That provides basil to consumers with root stock intact for a higher quality product and a better shelf life.

Steve Coventry, from Bugs for Bugs, won the Industry Impact Award. Bugs for Bugs is a relative newcomer in terms of their presence in the South Australian market. The company is a specialist breeder of a wide range of beneficial insects for use in intensive horticultural production. The company has a strong focus on research and development. It is significant in terms of potentially moving integrated pest management adoption into more of a mass market over a niche model by offering an alternative for growers looking to more slowly integrate IPM into their production system or who are looking to reduce the number of releases due to build-up of naturally occurring beneficials.

Jordy Kitschke is from Flux Robotics and he won Researcher of the Year. Jordy runs a startup agricultural robotics company which is developing field robots for vegetable and horticultural production which uses the latest technology to target spray weeds in crops. His company, Flux Robotics, has successfully developed a number of prototypes and is currently conducting trials throughout South Australia and Queensland which show the potential of this technology to improve resistance management through chemistry overuse and significantly reduce crop protectant volumes through targeted spraying. I had the pleasure of talking quite informally at the event with Jordy, who is certainly a very forward-thinking young person, and I am sure we are going to see much more of him in the industry going forward.

Phuong Le won the Women in Horticulture Award, which is proudly sponsored by the Department of Primary Industries and Regions. In the wake of the recent hailstorms on the Northern Adelaide Plains, and recognising the need for Vietnamese speaking outreach staff to support non-English-speaking growers, Phuong stepped into the role as a critical industry liaison working with AUSVEG SA and the SA government Department of Primary Industries. With support from industry and government, Phuong played a critical role in linking affected growers in her community with vital financial support, government recovery grants and waste removal assistance.

Anthony De Ieso, from Thorndon Park Produce, won the Biosecurity Award in recognition of his ongoing commitment to support the work of the SA government and industry biosecurity and education initiatives to protect industry on the Northern Adelaide Plains. Anthony has been a committed grower partner in a number of critical industry initiatives such as regional biosecurity monitoring, education initiatives around on-farm hygiene and safety to prevent spread of pests and disease and in supporting key research initiatives such as the iMap pests project and SARDI pest and disease diagnostics team.

On behalf of the state government, I want to offer my very sincere congratulations to all of these very worthy recipients and also take the opportunity to thank and acknowledge Jordan Brooke-Barnet from AUSVEG for all the hard work that he puts into this major event and also ongoing as a representative of the industry. Through my regular discussions with AUSVEG, both in opposition and now in government, something they consistently advocated for was to have the AUSVEG awards night rebranded so that it would further increase the status of the event.

I was delighted to announce at the awards that from next year the state government will sponsor the event and, going forward, it will be renamed the Premier's Horticulture Awards. The Premier is keen to attend the event next year if possible and to speak at this prestigious event for the industry. Once again, I want to congratulate all the award winners and I look forward to continuing to work with the horticulture industry as we go forward.

LEAD POLLUTION

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:58): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Minister for Regional Development on the topic of lead pollution at Port Pirie.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: InDaily reported yesterday that 42 public houses are located in areas of risk to children under the age of five because they are prone to lead dust. In the article it was stated that all of those 42 homes are currently occupied by at least one child aged under five. It is understood that there is a tender open for a maintenance contractor to facilitate the planning and completion of lead abatement related works in Port Pirie.

My question to the minister is: does the Malinauskas government intend to carry out the previous government's pledge to cut lead pollution at the Port Pirie smelter, and will the government rehouse affected families while the lead abatement project is taking place?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:59): I thank the honourable member for his question. I am happy to take that on notice and refer it to my colleagues in the other place who have direct responsibility for those matters.

LEAD POLLUTION

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:59): Supplementary: when can I expect a response?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:59): That will be as soon as possible.

RECONCILIATION

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. In terms of the next steps on the journey of reconciliation in South Australia, I ask what is the priority of the Malinauskas government: an Aboriginal Voice to Parliament or Treaty, which comes first?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for his question. It is indeed a very good question and there is not a unified, unambiguous view on this. This is something we will be consulting about and we have already started that consultation, not just with people in South Australia but around Australia. Certainly, many of those involved in the dialogue in the lead-up to the statement from Uluru, which was handed down I think five years ago last week, have sequencing as Voice as a first step, leading to a makarrata, including Treaty and Truth, but that is not a view that everyone who has thought and written about in this field subscribes to.

Certainly, I have had the good fortune of a number of discussions with many of those in Victoria. I think about six years ago, or thereabouts, the Victorian government started down the path of putting together firstly an advisory group and then an advisory body to start down their path of, initially, treaty discussions. That was similar to South Australia when we started. Our discussions about treaty were in the context of before the Uluru statement was handed down.

In the Victorian context, there is a First Peoples Assembly, an elected body of Aboriginal Victorians who represent views to government. It is not, as we described it, a voice to parliament, which is what is being looked at at the moment, but they are considering treaty negotiations as well as voice, effectively, at the same time. It is something that over the coming months we will look further at, but certainly the sequencing that many of those involved in the Uluru dialogues have had is Voice as a first step, followed by the makarrata, Treaty and Truth, but it is something that we will be taking further advice on as we go down this path. There is a good chance, like Victoria, that one isn't fully complete before the other necessarily starts.

RECONCILIATION

The Hon. S.G. WADE (15:02): Supplementary question: I thank the minister for his answer. When the minister says the government is going to look further at this, could the minister indicate whether he is anticipating a structured public consultation on the sequencing and the process, or whether he is envisaging a government, shall we say, private consultation?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:02): I thank the honourable member for his question. Certainly, we will be taking a wide range of views into account. Again, it is a balance between making sure we are taking as many views as possible into account and getting on with the job of doing these things. It is not something we will be starting from scratch with, fortunately. There has been much dialogue and consultation, not just in South Australia but across Australia, about sequencing, and we will take all of those views into account, as well as the consultations we are having and will have.

ABORIGINAL POWER CUP

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (15:03): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney-General update the council on the government's support for the recent Aboriginal Power Cup?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:03): I would be very pleased to, and I thank the honourable member for his important question, his support of Aboriginal reconciliation and his very strong support of the Port Adelaide Football Club, who have been part of the—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Shame!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —Aboriginal Power Cup. I will pay credit where credit is due: as a lifelong supporter and, for most my life, member of the Richmond Football Club, Port Adelaide, in my experience, have by far and away the best Aboriginal programs of any sporting club of any code anywhere in Australia, and I do commend them for that.

Now in its 15th year, the Santos Aboriginal Power Cup is a fixture of the South Australian sporting calendar and a real highlight for many students across our state. I know that, as a pretty ordinary goal umpire for the cup in previous years, it contributes some fantastic footy to our state and provides a lot of development opportunities for Aboriginal students, and it does incredibly important work in supporting Aboriginal young people through school, through their education and to set themselves up for a bright future.

The cup is and has been run by the Port Adelaide Football Club, in partnership with the South Australian Aboriginal Secondary Training Academy (SAASTA), and I am proud to say that my department, the Attorney-General's Department, is a major funder of this program through a \$100,000 grant per year. In fact, the Attorney-General's Department began as the cup's only partner in its first year 15 years ago, but now is one of many supporters.

The cup aims to use the love many Aboriginal kids have of football and of competitive sport to support educational outcomes and career pathways. Participating students this year took part in workshops across the first two terms of the school year, before forming football teams and undertaking tasks that earned them 10 credits towards the completion of their SACE. Students who continue to attend school and complete assessment tasks are invited to take part in the carnival, which was held last week in the Adelaide Parklands on Karen Rolton Oval next to the CBD, competing on behalf of their school with their jumpers designed by their own teams.

It isn't just a lot of fun and a lot of good sport—the program has had tremendous results. I am advised that this year more than 566 students from 65 schools around South Australia took part in the Aboriginal Cup. Of the year 12 students who took part between March 2020 to December 2021, I am informed that 96 per cent completed their year 12 SACE successfully. I also understand that 100 per cent of teachers who responded to the survey after the 2021 Power Cup indicated an improvement in students' engagement in school programs, relationships to each other and confidence from the beginning of the school year to the end.

Governments quite rightly support many important programs, but the results from these are obvious. It was a distinct honour to speak at the opening of the carnival last week on 26 May, National Sorry Day and the day before Reconciliation Week started, and then again on Sunday at Adelaide Oval at the awards ceremony. You could actually feel in the room the passionate excitement the students from around South Australia had for the game and the positive benefits they experienced from taking part.

I congratulate all those who participated and the teachers, families and carers who support them, and I particularly thank the organisers, in particular Santos as a major sponsor, for the incredibly important work they do to support the next generation of Aboriginal leaders. This is more than a sports competition or a game of football—it's real, positive work towards reconciliation and it makes a real change in the lives of young Aboriginal people.

SAFEWORK SA REVIEW

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:07): My question is to the Attorney and Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector. Can the minister please provide an update on the status of any review into SafeWork SA's handling of nurse Gayle Woodford's rape and murder while on duty as a nurse, including the subsequent decision not to prosecute Mrs Woodford's employer, and an update in terms of the meeting with the Woodford family and their legal representatives he committed to in this place some weeks ago?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:08): I thank the honourable member for her question. I'm pleased to be able to inform the honourable member that the government has appointed former Federal Court judge the Hon. John Mansfield AM QC to undertake an independent review into SafeWork's investigation into the death of Gayle Woodford and also importantly SafeWork SA's engagement with the Woodford family during that investigation.

Mr Mansfield is an eminently qualified South Australian lawyer, who was appointed Queen's Counsel in 1985 and has served as a judge of the Federal Court of Australia for nearly 20 years prior to his retirement in 2016. He is widely respected, both within the legal profession and the broader community. The review Mr Mansfield is undertaking is to be completed by 15 July and will make recommendations that will be publicly available. I am confident that Mr Mansfield will conduct a thorough evaluation of the investigation and communications with the family.

In relation to meeting with the Woodford family, through the Woodford family's representatives I have made myself available for a meeting. I'm not going to go into having met or not. I think that's something the Woodford family—I think it's their story to tell, not mine.

SAFEWORK SA REVIEW

The Hon. S.G. WADE (15:09): Supplementary question: I certainly welcome the review of the Woodford case, but considering the broader concerns about SafeWork's investigatory and prosecutorial decisions, will Justice Mansfield have the ability to look beyond the Woodford case?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:09): I thank the honourable member. That is an important question. There is in the terms of reference an 'any other matters' criteria that would allow Justice Mansfield, if there is anything as part of this investigation he wishes to look at or comment on more broadly, to do so. An election commitment was a review of the practices and procedures generally of SafeWork SA, which this government will conduct, and we intend the Mansfield review to form—to be able to feed into that broader review as well.

ALLEGED SEX OFFENDERS, BAIL

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:10): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions of the Attorney-General regarding bail for alleged sex offenders in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: On Thursday 19 May, just a few days ago, the Supreme Court released 37-year-old Mark Allen on home detention bail. Allen was accused of sexually assaulting a 15-year-old girl 26 times within a two-week period. The alleged offender is yet to plead to almost 40 charges, which include unlawful sexual intercourse and the supply of a controlled substance to a child. Although the accused was granted bail, the judge in question considered it—and I quote directly—'a borderline call'. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Does the Attorney support the Supreme Court's decision to release Mark Allen on bail?
2. Will the Attorney-General undertake an audit of the number and frequency of child sex offenders being released on bail and for what reason?
3. What percentage of child sex offenders are currently on bail in South Australia?

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 and his interest in these matters. I might take the last questions first in terms of response. I'm happy to see if there are statistics on those. I don't have any on hand, but if there are any that are readily available, I'm happy to bring them back.

In relation to: do I support something the Supreme Court does? Certainly, it is the role of an Attorney-General as the state's first law officer to support the work of the courts. It is not my role nor place to criticise what the courts do. The courts interpret and enforce the laws that the parliament has set down for them, and I think most people in this place understand that they do a good job doing that.

The people that have been appointed to courts as judges and magistrates over time, from both Liberal and Labor when in government, I think are generally recognised as eminently capable people interpreting what parliament says. Do I support what a court does? That is my role as Attorney-General, to support the courts, so I'm not going to stand in this place and criticise decisions that a court has made.

SOIL SCIENCE CHALLENGE

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:12): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about the soil challenge project?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:13): I thank the member for this question. SARDI researchers, in partnership with the University of Adelaide, are taking a leading role in determining the past, current and future drivers of soil change. Soil, obviously, is vital to our farming systems, and primary producers in South Australia have made substantial changes in on-farm management practices to sustainably manage their soils to enhance productivity. There's been a shift from cultivation to no-till systems, from cereal-on-cereal crop rotations to the inclusion of legumes and the use of soil amelioration strategies, including clay spreading, deep ripping and lime applications.

Over the past 20 years, the SARDI Molecular Diagnostic Centre has DNA tested more than 10,000 soil samples collected from across different soil types and farming systems. This valuable soil DNA archive provides a historical snapshot in time of the soil microbial community leading up to and resulting from the major shifts in management practices in our farming systems.

This new soil challenge project aims to determine how the soil biology diversity has changed in the last 20 years, as farming systems have changed. A subset of the soil DNA samples will be sequenced to identify the type of soil biota across regions and how this composition has varied through time.

Once identified, this information will help to determine the agronomic drivers of soil biology communities to either reintroduce past practices or amplify current practices that favour more diverse and active soil communities for improved soil health. Identified drivers of soil biology communities will be tested under controlled greenhouse conditions and then validated in field trials across South Australia, Western Australia and Victoria. A key feature of this work involves work on-farm to validate findings, and indeed this on-farm approach provides an excellent opportunity to help both ground and guide the research.

SARDI scientists and researchers continue to provide high-quality advice and research, which ultimately increases productivity, sustainability and adaptability of the state's agriculture, food and wine, fisheries, aquaculture and biosciences enterprises. This project will result in new and advanced knowledge that will help secure long-term agricultural productivity. I look forward to updating the chamber again in the future on the progress of this excellent project.

SOIL SCIENCE CHALLENGE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:15): Supplementary: can the minister inform the chamber when the Soil Science Challenge program was announced and by which government?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:15): The project is commencing in July of this year and will run until June 2025.

SOIL SCIENCE CHALLENGE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:15): Supplementary: when was it announced and by which government?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:15): I am sure that when it was announced would be publicly available, given an announcement by its nature is public, and my understanding is that it was announced by the South Australian government.

VICE-CHANCELLOR SALARIES

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:16): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the minister representing the Minister for Education on the topic of vice-chancellors' salaries.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: The Minister for Regional Development will be relieved they are off the hook. Australian vice-chancellors are some of the highest paid vice-chancellors in the world. That is certainly the case here in South Australia. The *Australian Financial Review* reported last week that 11 vice-chancellors in Australia received over \$1 million salaries, while making huge cuts internally, slashing staff numbers and putting infrastructure projects on ice as closed borders threatened the international student market.

These \$1 million salaries include the vice-chancellors of our local universities: the University of South Australia, Flinders University and Adelaide University. The *Financial Review* claims that Australia's vice-chancellors are paid considerably more than their peers in Britain and Canada. My question to the minister is: does the government agree that these salaries are excessive, and will the Malinauskas government commit to capping vice-chancellor salaries?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:17): I thank the member for his question. His longstanding interest, I think, is evidenced by legislation put before this place previously on this particular issue. I will refer those matters to the minister responsible in the other place and be sure to bring the honourable member a response back as soon as possible.

REGIONAL HOUSING

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:17): My questions are to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding regional housing. Which regional councils has the minister been approached by in relation to regional housing? What commitments have been sought by those councils and what commitments has she given to them?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:18): I thank the honourable member for her question. I certainly have ongoing discussions with councils, particularly, obviously, those who have approached me and also when I am going out and about in my regional visits. And of course, next week the Malinauskas Labor government, the ministers and CEs, will be in Mount Gambier for the first of our country cabinets as a new government, because it is very important to be able to get out and listen to the concerns in regional South Australia.

Generally, when we do have country cabinets, we will meet with the RDAs and we will meet with local councils and encourage the councils to make presentations to us. I don't have my final itinerary for country cabinet next week, but I am certainly very confident that the format will be similar.

So I think it's really important that we do include all those who can work in partnership to address the ongoing issue of the shortage of regional housing. I am sure that the various councils are also in contact with the minister in the other place, the Minister for Human Services, who has responsibility in terms of social housing, and also the Minister for Housing in the other place, who has responsibility for other types of housing that don't fall into that same category.

I think in terms of regional councils that's an important resource that we have there, because certainly they have shown in the past to be very keen to be involved in solving some of these really difficult issues. I think the term is still used of 'wicked issues', those complex issues which don't have a simple answer. If they did have a simple answer, we would hope that that would have been solved by now. Issues such as regional housing, which have such myriad factors feeding into them, is one of those more complex areas.

I think one of the real strengths of regional communities is their willingness to actually work together without establishing silos or empires and saying, 'No, I won't talk to you about this because I want to either take the credit or I want to issue the blame to you.' It's that kind of willingness to work across spheres of government, across industry, across community organisations, across RDAs.

When I was in Whyalla last week, I spoke with the Mayor of Whyalla and she was referring to some work that has been done by councils and RDAs in terms of trying to address some of these regional housing issues. I am more than happy to continue those discussions with anyone who has an interest in the matter, and I am glad to see that there is a new-found interest in issues such as regional housing from those opposite. If we can work collaboratively, that would be to the benefit of all the regional areas.

There are opportunities, I think, to work with non-government organisations and councils and RDAs and hopefully also the incoming federal government, which I understand has made a number of commitments around housing. It's really important that all of those sectors work together, because that's the way that we can come up with innovative solutions. They might not be the same solutions for every region. It may be that the solutions in the Riverland are different to the solutions on the Limestone Coast, which may be different to the solutions on Eyre Peninsula, which may be different to the solutions on Yorke Peninsula.

Each area has its own concerns in terms of both workforce, workforce availability, housing and accommodation, the types of housing and accommodation that is required for the workforce and for the existing local communities. All of those factors need to be taken into account and, of course, councils are very well placed to be able to both draw on that information but also then feed that back out to our government. Our government is, has been and will continue to be very open to hearing those representations.

REGIONAL HOUSING

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:22): Supplementary question: I asked some very specific questions, which the minister hasn't answered at all. Will she take those on notice and bring back a response to the chamber?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, are you going to answer that supplementary question?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Curran, you have a supplementary question.

REGIONAL HOUSING

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN (15:23): Can the minister confirm what discussions have been held with regional development boards in relation to regional housing, particularly to support regional industries?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:23): I thank the honourable member for her supplementary question. This is an issue that I was certainly very much aware of. Whilst we were in opposition, I remember attending an RDA conference up at Hahndorf, where half the day was devoted to regional workforce issues and the other half to regional housing issues. Unfortunately, as I recall, the Liberal minister at the time who was responsible did not attend. He did send a representative—I think it may have been the Hon. Stephen Patterson, but I'm not quite sure—who stayed for, I think, about an hour. In contrast, I was able to stay the whole day, because I think it is really important to listen to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I can hear the Hon. Ms Lensink interjecting, as though it's not important to actually stay and listen to the issues in regional South Australia—the issues that were being raised by the RDAs and yet—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Point of order.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, sit down.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will listen to the point of order. What is it?

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I ask that the minister retract that statement. It's not what the Hon. Michelle Lensink said.

The PRESIDENT: I am not quite sure what we are referring to with regard to what was—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Okay.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: And has the member been offended?

The PRESIDENT: It sounds like she has. Withdraw it and move on. Come on, please.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Please, minister.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am happy to withdraw if the member's harrumphing did not indicate that she didn't think it was important to attend. As I was saying about this very important issue, we had presentations from councils—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, leader! Minister, finish your answer, please.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: As I was saying, we had some very useful presentations from RDAs, from industry experts and also from representatives of councils at that event. The Hon.

Blair Boyer stayed there for the entire session that was to do with workforce, too, if I recall correctly. Those sorts of interactions I think are really important, and it is a shame that the then government didn't take the opportunity to listen to some of those creative ideas and listen to what the issues were that were being raised.

Since the election, one of the events that I was involved in was the Regional Australia Institute forum, which also had a heavy focus on housing in the regional areas. I was very pleased to be able to address that forum, talking about what I have learned from listening to stakeholders, listening to community members in regional areas, listening to RDAs and listening to councils, and share what it is that I have gleaned from all of those interactions. We can then look forward to a number of those presentations that were given through that forum being able to feed into the further policy development that we have around this very important issue which, unfortunately, has been ignored for too long.

Matters of Interest

NUCLEAR ENERGY

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:27): I rise today to speak about the fundamental need to secure our energy future in South Australia. More than ever, it is my firm belief that members of parliament at both state and federal levels have the responsibility to consider all options before them of energy production to alleviate the burden upon our constituents of spikes in our electricity prices in particular.

Just last week, we learnt that South Australian households and businesses could expect an increase of 7.2 per cent and 5.7 per cent respectively in these costs. There is evidently an increasingly urgent need for pragmatism in how we approach the issue of energy supply in our jurisdiction, and it is my view that South Australians deserve to have reliability and cost-effectiveness prioritised in their energy needs.

Members in this place may recall that, in my Address in Reply speech, I touched on my belief that we should be seriously looking at nuclear energy as a means of contributing to South Australia's base load energy requirements. I reiterate that nuclear energy has the potential to be the key to our future energy security. Despite misconceptions of nuclear power that would suggest otherwise, this form of energy is currently used safely and effectively in many nations. In fact, nuclear power plants are in operation in 32 countries around the world, generating approximately a tenth of the world's electricity supply from over 400 reactors currently in operation.

Although nuclear energy will almost certainly always have its detractors, many experts contend it is amongst the most affordable, cleanest and safest source of energy available, most notably due to significant technological advances and innovations over the past few decades. Indeed, our own state's Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission considered major incidents and issues regarding reactor safety and was nevertheless satisfied that there was sufficient evidence of safe operation and improvements within the industry to warrant further consideration of nuclear power looking forward. This suggests that nuclear power may be a viable option for South Australia, and we certainly should not dismiss the concept of nuclear energy without first considering its probity as a solution to our energy demands and suitability.

France is the perfect example of what Australia could expect by moving towards nuclear power production. That nation now acquires approximately 70 per cent of its electricity from nuclear power plants due to its longstanding policy founded upon energy security as its priority. In February this year, the French government announced plans to construct six new reactors and to consider building a further eight, in addition to those that are already in existence. Because of France's considerably low cost of energy generation, the country has become the largest net exporter of electricity in the entire world, gaining over three billion euros revenue annually as a result.

Interestingly, when I was in France some years ago I had a discussion with a French delegate regarding local electricity costs. I queried how much his monthly power bill was and I discovered that it was approximately one-tenth of what I am paying here in South Australia. The reason their power bills were so impressively low in France was, quite simply, they had embraced nuclear power as their primary source of energy.

South Australia is particularly well positioned for the potential development of a nuclear industry. Not only does our nation have a third of the world's known uranium reserves, it is also the third largest producer of uranium globally. With abundant uranium deposits at our disposal we have been content to export the natural resource to be utilised for nuclear power purposes overseas, yet we refuse to use it here in the same manner for our own benefit. This really is nothing short of stupidity in my view, not to mention absurdity, and perhaps even hypocrisy, and we should be seeking to use such an obvious opportunity to our advantage to help lower our cost of living and energy costs in Australia.

Reluctance to accept nuclear power as a credible energy option can arguably be attributed to the environmental movement, which has unfortunately gravitated too far to the political left by adopting agendas that abandon the nuclear option regardless of its advantages. Although I may personally have differing views pertaining to the relationship between greenhouse gas emissions and climate change, I do agree that we have an inherent responsibility to be good caretakers of our environment, of course. However, I am also of the opinion that this should be tempered with the recognition of the important need for reliability and cost-effectiveness when it comes to developing energy policies.

Nuclear power is unique in the sense that it boasts the attributes needed to satisfy all of the aforementioned considerations; that is, it uniquely provides necessary base load energy without producing carbon emissions. I strongly believe that nuclear power could well be the best way forward for South Australia, and indeed our nation. I urge the current state government to investigate this situation as a matter of urgency as power bills continue to rise and show no sign of abating.

HYDROGEN FUTURE

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (15:32): In 2017, I was at an event with then Premier Jay Weatherill where an expert from the energy sector got up and started talking about hydrogen. He spoke passionately about how hydrogen was the future of clean energy and how South Australia was so well-placed to be a leader in the hydrogen field. A minute or so into this speech I glanced at the then premier and noticed that he was intently focused on the speaker and was furiously taking notes. Not long after, Premier Weatherill and energy minister Tom Koutsantonis launched the South Australian Hydrogen Roadmap, a forward-thinking and nation-leading document placing South Australia at the centre of the hydrogen future.

Fast forward and tomorrow the Malinauskas Labor government will release its first budget, a budget including more than 200 election commitments made over the past term of opposition, commitments such as cost-of-living concessions for those who need help the most, greater support to attract events and tourists to our great state, and a serious commitment to health.

While this will be a budget with a strong focus on our health commitments, the fulfilling of our election commitment to build a hydrogen power plant is the next big step in creating a clean energy, nation-leading project. A proud achievement of the previous Labor government was its policy settings, which led to a dramatic investment in renewable energy for South Australia. From wind farms to solar energy and the big battery, Labor led the way.

This has enabled us to take the next step and utilise any excess renewable energy being generated and turn it into stored energy. Just like pumped hydro and battery storage, turning an excess of renewable energy into a medium which can be turned on when electricity prices are high or the wind and sun are low is a game changer for our state.

Utilising an excess of renewable energy to turn water into hydrogen has even greater benefits than battery storage, as hydrogen can be transported, and there is an international market for it. From use in vehicles in South Korea and Japan to heavy manufacturing in Germany, hydrogen will future-proof our state. And compare this to the previous government's plan to deal with an excess of renewable energy by turning off home solar. Clearly, this was short-sighted and would have a negative impact on many South Australians who have invested their hard earned in rooftop solar.

In South Australia's past we were proudly a manufacturing state. Over time, our reliance on manufacturing has declined but there are opportunities in the future, if we take them. Right at this

moment, people from all over the world are meeting at the Adelaide Convention Centre to discuss the future of hydrogen at the Australian Hydrogen Conference.

In Germany, they are currently trying to extract themselves from their reliance on Russian gas and they see that the future is hydrogen. Other countries are setting ambitious targets to combat climate change with a move to a zero carbon economy, and hydrogen is an important part of this journey. South Australia will be exceptionally well placed to benefit from these decisions as the world moves to a secure, reliable form of renewable energy.

Labor's plan to build an electrolyser and a hydrogen power plant will be the catalyst for cheaper electricity for industry. Frontier Economics has forecast that South Australia's hydrogen plant will reduce the wholesale cost of electricity to industry by 8 per cent. This investment in hydrogen is an investment in a lower input cost for business. In an increasingly competitive national and international economy a lower cost base will make South Australia an even more attractive place for business and industry to invest.

Up to 300 jobs will be created in the plant's construction phase, with many thousands more created through unlocking the pipeline of renewable energy projects, and a further 900 jobs are estimated to be created through the development of a hydrogen export industry. South Australia does not need to be a follower. We have the people, the ideas and the commitment to be a global leader in the hydrogen industry, and I look forward to future generations looking back at this Labor government and recognising them for their foresight and vision.

STATE BUDGET

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:36): I rise today to talk about the Malinauskas government's first budget. Budgets are a statement of priorities. They reflect what a government wants to achieve over the next four years and they reflect the values of the government. We are hoping that this new government will take some real action to reduce skyrocketing inequality in our state. We are hoping that this first budget will be one that is focused on increasing the wellbeing of all South Australians and addressing our climate crisis.

To that end, it is very disappointing to see the announcement of the Malinauskas government today, via the Minister for Energy, Tom Koutsantonis, that they will be axing renewable energy programs in tomorrow's budget. That is a decision to scrap the Home Battery Scheme and to dump the Switch for Solar program in order to save \$19 million. That might deliver a quick cash injection into the budget, it might improve the budget bottom line, but it is going to come at a significant cost to the South Australian community and to our environment. It is really disappointing to see those cuts being foreshadowed in the budget today.

The Greens are calling for the Malinauskas government to take some real action in terms of reducing cost-of-living pressures being faced by families. They could do this by putting more money into public housing. We know that South Australia is in the middle of a housing affordability crisis. Adelaide is the second least affordable city in Australia and has a vacancy rate of just 0.2 per cent.

Every week, my office is inundated with calls from South Australians who cannot find a place to live, who cannot break into the housing market in terms of being able to afford to buy a home, who cannot access a rental and who cannot find affordable accommodation. The government needs to take action to address that by building more housing. We know that a meagre investment of 400 new homes is just not going to cut it.

We need to see the government introduce rent capping as a way of keeping rents low. We can look at what has happened in other jurisdictions around the world—places like Ireland, Spain and the US—they have done this and it is time for Adelaide to do the same. We also need to see this government invest in our education system. We need to see a scrapping of public school fees in recognition of the fact that public education should be free for all South Australians.

We know that South Australian public schools are significantly underfunded by millions of dollars each year and it is parents who are forced to pick up the slack through exorbitant school fees. That needs to change.

We need to see an emphasis on the cost of living and bringing that down. That means also trying to increase public sector wages. It is concerning that the government has foreshadowed public

sector cuts in this budget. We hope that does not mean we are going to see job losses. We hope that does not mean we are going to see a reduction in salaries for our public sector workers.

The government should also be putting money into our public transport system. That has been neglected by the Liberal Party during their brief period in government, but it was also significantly neglected by the previous Labor government during their 16-year reign. The new government needs to take some action to address that: make it free and improve the infrastructure.

I talked about education. In a state like South Australia, no child should go hungry. That is why in the recent election we called for the government to provide free breakfast and free school lunches. That is something we could do if we ensured that the big end of town paid their fair share of tax. We know there are 23,000 South Australian children who live in poverty. This state budget should take efforts to address that.

The government was elected on a platform of wanting to create a better future for all South Australians. Tomorrow will be an opportunity for them to demonstrate their commitment to do just that. I hope they consider some of the ideas that the Greens have put on the table today.

DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN (15:41): I rise today to acknowledge the important work of the former Liberal government in preventing and addressing family and domestic violence. I am sure it will be no surprise to members of this place that I take a keen interest in this space as the shadow parliamentary secretary to the shadow attorney-general responsible for child protection and the prevention of family and domestic violence.

The issue of domestic violence is pervasive and all too prevalent in our society. It is an issue that cannot be resolved unless we face it together. The former Liberal government made enormous inroads tackling this difficult issue, but more can always be done. We must continue to challenge stereotypes and pursue equality and respect across every aspect of our society.

We all bear the responsibility of calling out inappropriate and disrespectful behaviour when we see it, of preventing abuse from happening in the first place by teaching children respect, and by reaching out to those around us who we may be worried about. We all have a role to play in addressing and ending domestic violence as a parliament, as a community and as individuals.

During its term, the former Liberal government allocated record funding to support South Australians suffering from domestic violence. This included prevention measures and a commitment of more than \$21 million in new funding towards a raft of new domestic violence measures. They introduced 40 new crisis accommodation beds for South Australians enduring domestic and family violence across Adelaide and the regions. This included nine beds for a perpetrator pilot through Community Transitions.

The former Liberal government committed \$5 million to introduce an interest-free loan to develop a new domestic violence support housing initiative, which funded important housing-related projects, including upgrades, expansions and renovations. Also, \$567,000 was spent to fund a new life-saving domestic violence app. The app works by linking at-risk individuals to South Australia Police through a 24-hour monitored security centre. As at 30 September 2021, 544 women had accessed the app by a specialist domestic violence service and the duress function was activated 99 times.

Jay Weatherill announced in 2015 that those opposite would consider the development of a domestic violence disclosure scheme, but by 2018 there was still no scheme in place. The Liberal government promised a domestic violence disclosure scheme and they delivered. Almost \$3 million was invested to fund the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme for the first time in South Australia. The scheme allows a person at risk of domestic and family violence to access information from SAPOL about a current or former partner's violent offending history. This enables them to make informed decisions about their relationships.

The former Liberal government worked tirelessly to support those in need and to promote measures to prevent family and domestic violence. I am sure that all in this place would remember the devastating murder of Hannah Clarke and her children, which heightened the community's

awareness of domestic and family violence, but it should not take the loss of a life, it should not take any form of abuse for our society to take a strong stance and say, 'Enough'.

Those suffering at the hands of family and domestic violence deserve to be free from violence and for their rights to self-determination to be upheld. They deserve the equity of accessible services and support. Importantly, they need services that are transparent, accountable and reliable and for perpetrators to be held to account.

I will be watching with great interest, as I am sure many South Australians will be, at tomorrow's budget to ensure that those suffering from family and domestic violence are given the support they need and, quite frankly, the support they deserve. Only by working together can we continue to put an end to domestic violence. I commend the former Liberal government on its achievements in strengthening and in protecting our community.

POKER MACHINES

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:46): The utter devastation poker machines are having on the lives of South Australians has never been worse. As I stand here right now, the lives of thousands of South Australians continue to be ruined by their addiction to these insidious devices. Some are taking their own lives after losing everything, including their loved ones. Others are being left destitute after losing their houses and life savings. Marriages and families are breaking down. The personal cost to these people is life changing, while the cost to the community, as we know, is indeterminable.

The blame for this lies directly and entirely at the hands of both major political parties in this place, which continue to deliberately choose to do absolutely nothing about it. As a direct result of that non-action, this crisis is at an all-time high.

A report undertaken by South Australia's Liquor and Gambling Commissioner, Mr Dini Soulio, late last year, but only tabled in this place a month ago, is setting alarm bells ringing. Disturbingly, the report revealed a massive spike in poker machine losses, which has seen the government reap a \$120 million revenue windfall in 2020-21, with total gambling taxes collected last financial year topping a record \$320.4 million. More concerning, the report found that \$769.8 million lost through these devices in 2020-21—that is one year—was a 50 per cent increase, or a more than \$250 million increase, on the previous financial year and the highest reported loss since 2006-07.

The report also revealed that, as of October 2021, South Australia's poker machine dens have had the capacity to operate 13,721 gaming machines, 640 more than the legislated target. The report revealed a statutory goal legislated in 2013, way before we took note acceptors away, to reduce the number of poker machines that can be operated in South Australia to 13,081 is unlikely to be achieved. In the report, Mr Soulio warned:

Without some form of Government intervention, it is clear that any prospect of achieving the reduction objective is unlikely at any time in the short term to medium term. This has led to advocacy that there now seems to be little reason to continue dedicating resources to chasing a statutory reduction in gaming machine numbers.

That is from our regulator. The report noted that for the past 11 years the state government has operated a trading scheme where each time a hotel or casino sells a set of gaming machine entitlements, a quarter of the sold entitlements are taken out of the system, the objective being to gradually reduce the state's gambling machine capacity, something we know has been an abysmal failure in this jurisdiction.

The commissioner's report revealed that this system has only resulted in the forfeiture of 173 gaming machines over that period of time. Commissioner Soulio estimated hotels and casinos would have to sell another 1,920 entitlements to reach the government's 2013 reduction target, yet only 1,169 entitlements have been sold in SA over the past decade.

Not surprisingly, two organisations at the frontline of gambling addiction who see the scourge of poker machine addiction every day, Uniting Communities and SACOSS, are scathing of the government's inaction in this space. Mr Henley has said:

Noting the gaming machines are still the source of more gambling harm than any other form of gambling in SA, it is extremely disappointing that the legislated reduction has not been met, meaning that gambling harm continues to be experienced – harm that is preventable.

SACOSS CEO Ross Womersley said:

Obviously as a matter of some urgency, there needs to be a very carefully thought-out re-design of the scheme to achieve these objectives given this has been allowed to simply flounder...

Something we all know. The newly formed Labor government will no doubt attempt to lay blame at the hands of the previous government, but that does not cut the mustard because we know both major parties are to blame for this. Collectively, they steadfastly refused to do absolutely anything to reduce the impact of poker machine gambling and addiction. That is because they are feeding an addiction of their own.

I do not think any of us will forget the day back in December 2019 and that landmark occasion when they removed from our legislation the single most effective harm minimisation measure that this jurisdiction has ever had. As a matter of urgency, the government has to reveal what they are going to do stop the scourge of machine gambling in this state, what they are going to do to address their own addiction to poker machine revenue and how they intend to address the 640 poker machines operating in this state above the legislated number.

ACORN PROGRAM

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:51): I think all of us in this chamber can agree the first 1,000 days of a child's life are critical to their development. For better or worse, a child's experience in their first 1,000 days shapes the way their brains and bodies develop for the rest of their lives.

We want all children to be cared for and nurtured in those first 1,000 days so they can reach their full potential, but almost one-quarter of children in South Australia are behind their expected development milestones by the time they start school—one-quarter. That is one in four kids who have not had access to all the resources and support they need to develop physically and socially, and it is indicative of concerning numbers of families having fallen through the cracks.

We on this side of the chamber believe that the first 1,000 days are a period of unique opportunity to shape children's lives for the better. We believe that mothers, especially new mothers and especially vulnerable mothers, need access to adequate support services, health services and education services, because we believe that no child, regardless of the circumstances into which they are born, should be left behind.

That is why we will establish a royal commission into early childhood education and care. We want South Australian kids to have access to two years of preschool and we want those preschools to be affordable and accessible and to deliver high-quality early education, so that by the time kids get to five years old they are well placed to start school. We are listening to experts, who tell us that the first 1,000 days are critical, who tell us that 90 per cent of a person's brain development happens in the first five years of life, who tell us that nurturing and access to quality education from a young age are of vital, lifelong importance.

Along with the Hon. Katrine Hildyard from the other place, the Minister for Child Protection and Minister for Women, I recently attended MeB4three's launch of the Acorn Program. The Acorn Program provides an opportunity for mothers of children aged zero to three years who are struggling with mental ill health to come together in a group. Australian research suggests that about one in five women experience prenatal or postnatal depression or anxiety. Some women suffer from serious mental disorders such as psychosis, PTSD or schizophrenia following pregnancy or childbirth.

Mental ill health does not discriminate. It can affect anyone, no matter their circumstances. Pregnancy is commonly the first time for many mothers to suffer from mental ill health. Having a child totally changes your life.

The Acorn Program is an early intervention program that allows mothers to support each other and to reinforce through their collective experiences of childbearing and motherhood that their emotions and struggles are normal and are okay. It helps mothers to learn parenting skills and strategies, to learn to connect with and teach their children through play, to reflect on their experiences and their own growth, and ultimately to strengthen their capacity as parents and their relationship with their child.

The program's motto is 'From small things, big things grow'. It is clear from the program's success that a little bit of the right kind of support can go a long way in improving the wellbeing of mothers and facilitating the development of their relationship with their children. It has helped over 500 women from all walks of life since its inception.

One mother who participated in the Acorn Program described the distress she felt when she brought her baby home from hospital for the very first time and did not know how to interact with her child. She shut down emotionally. She knew that as a mother she must love her child, but she did not feel like she could love her child. Through the Acorn Program, she learned how to bond with her daughter in a way that she says would not have been possible otherwise.

Another mother only realised that she was not alone in the issues she was facing when she joined the Acorn Program. She found a community who knew what she was going through because they were going through similar experiences. Her mental health improved and so did her relationship with her child.

Another mother arrived at the Acorn Program with such severe mental ill health that she had completely shut down. She felt like she could not speak, but before long she was overcome with relief and was able to open up when she heard the other mothers speaking and sharing very similar stories. She realised that her struggles were not hers on her own and she felt that she could find a new community to belong to. These stories are so important because while a lot of learning happens at preschool and at school, a lot of learning and development happens at home too.

NATIONAL RECONCILIATION WEEK

The Hon. S.G. WADE (15:56): This week is National Reconciliation Week, a time for all Australians to learn about our shared histories, cultures and achievements and to explore how each of us can contribute to achieving reconciliation in Australia. National Reconciliation Week is held each year between 27 May and 3 June. These two dates commemorate two significant milestones in the reconciliation journey: the 1967 referendum and the High Court Mabo decision respectively.

The theme of this year is 'Be brave. Make change.' The theme is a call to all Australians to make change through brave actions in their daily lives, where they live, work, play and socialise. It is a call for individuals, families, communities, organisations and governments to be brave, to tackle unfinished business in reconciliation so we can make change for the benefit of all Australians.

As we take the next step on reconciliation in this parliament, I believe it is important to recognise the progress that was made in the last parliament. Premier Steven Marshall was passionate about Aboriginal reconciliation. He was on the board of Reconciliation SA for eight years. He took on the Aboriginal affairs portfolio himself as Premier. Under his passionate leadership, the government had a record of being brave and making change through practical actions which supported the aspirations of Aboriginal people.

By the end of his term as Premier, South Australia had record numbers of Aboriginal students completing SACE, more government contracts going to Aboriginal owned and operated businesses, a record number of Aboriginal employees in the public sector and a record number of Aboriginal trainees and apprentices.

The Marshall team developed whole-of-government Aboriginal affairs action plans. The 2021-22 Aboriginal Affairs Action Plan outlined 41 specific actions, including the Marshall government's commitment to implementing the new Closing the Gap agreement. As a cabinet, we held six-monthly meetings with the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council. No previous South Australian government had done this.

The former Premier arranged for the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement, Dr Roger Thomas, to give an historic address to the parliament, setting out issues and challenges facing Aboriginal communities in South Australia. The Marshall Liberal government funded extensive consultation with Aboriginal people and communities about providing them with a Voice to the Parliament of South Australia, the cabinet, ministers and their agencies through the establishment of an Aboriginal representative body.

The Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People was appointed to assist Aboriginal families and communities to keep children safe in culturally appropriate ways and develop

policies and practices that promote the safety and wellbeing of Aboriginal children who are over-represented in the child protection system.

The government implemented South Australia's first standalone Aboriginal housing policy, backed by \$83 million of state and commonwealth funding. The government provided funding for the opening of a dialysis clinic on the APY lands by the Indigenous owned and run health service, Purple House.

The Marshall government invested more than \$9 million to upgrade infrastructure in 15 regional Aboriginal communities, including road repairs, improvements to waste management and community infrastructures. The Marshall Liberal government provided \$10 million in funding to extend the participation of Aboriginal men in violence prevention programs. We implemented a groundbreaking Aboriginal Strategic Framework through the Department for Correctional Services, the first of its kind in Australia, to ensure access to programs and services that are responsive to the unique cultural and gendered needs of Aboriginal prisoners.

In partnership with the federal government, we established the Circle—First Nations Entrepreneur Hub at Lot Fourteen to support Aboriginal innovation, entrepreneurship and employment. The Marshall Liberal government also provided \$86.5 million for the construction of a purpose-built facility to house South Australia's important cultural artefacts, including the most comprehensive collection of Aboriginal cultural materials in the world.

We provided annual funding totalling \$4.03 million in 2020-21 in grants and other support for Aboriginal arts and crafts and funded the expansion of art centres on the APY lands and a gallery and studio in Adelaide. We also funded, with the federal government, a First Nations art and cultural centre now being built at Lot Fourteen, to be opened in 2025, which will be a world-class facility putting Aboriginal cultures at the forefront, driving awareness, understanding and reconciliation.

Reconciliation is a shared responsibility for all of us in this parliament and in our communities. We need to be brave. We need to make change. It is important that, like the Marshall government, we drive practical actions across government and across the community to make real improvements in the lives of Aboriginal South Australians.

Members

MEMBER'S LEAVE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (16:02): I move:

That leave of absence be granted to the Hon. I. Pnevmatikos on account of medical issues from 31 May 2022 to 2 September 2022.

Motion carried.

Motions

ANTISEMITISM

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:03): I move:

That this council—

1. Endorses and adopts the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance definition of antisemitism together with its contemporary examples, which is: 'Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.'
2. Notes that this definition is to be understood in the contemporary examples given by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance, such as:
 - (a) calling for, aiding, or justifying the killing or harming of Jews in the name of a radical ideology or an extremist view of religion;
 - (b) making mendacious, dehumanising, demonising, or stereotypical allegations about Jews as such or the power of Jews as collective—such as, especially but not exclusively, the

- myth about a world Jewish conspiracy or of Jews controlling the media, economy, government or other societal institutions;
- (c) accusing Jews as a people of being responsible for real or imagined wrongdoing committed by a single Jewish person or group, or even for acts committed by non-Jews;
 - (d) denying the fact, scope, mechanisms (for example, gas chambers) or intentionality of the genocide of the Jewish people at the hands of National Socialist Germany and its supporters and accomplices during World War II (the Holocaust);
 - (e) accusing the Jews as a people, or Israel as a state, of inventing or exaggerating the Holocaust;
 - (f) accusing Jewish citizens of being more loyal to Israel, or to the alleged priorities of Jews worldwide, than to the interests of their own nations;
 - (g) denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, for example, by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavour;
 - (h) applying double standards by requiring of it a behaviour not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation;
 - (i) using the symbols and images associated with classic antisemitism (for example, claims of Jews killing Jesus or blood libel) to characterise Israel or Israelis;
 - (j) drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis; and
 - (k) holding Jews collectively responsible for actions of the State of Israel.

I am pleased to move the adoption of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance definition of antisemitism, and I would like to acknowledge Reverend the Hon. Frederick John Nile MLC in the New South Wales parliament for moving the motion there earlier this year.

South Australians are affiliated with more than 100 religions, including Christian, Buddhism, Islam, Hinduism, Sikhism, Bahai, Aboriginal Australian traditional religions and Judaism. I hold the view that all communities of faith should be able to follow their beliefs free of discrimination but subject to the laws of Australia. It is in this context that I speak to the motion today, seeking the support of the Legislative Council to adopt the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance definition of antisemitism.

The IHRA definition of antisemitism is not a legal instrument, but it is designed to assist governments and administrators with what it means to be antisemitic. The IHRA definition has two parts. The first part is the definition stating:

Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.

The second part provides:

Contemporary examples of antisemitism in public life, the media, schools, the workplace, and in the religious sphere could, taking into account the overall context, include, but are not limited to:

- Calling for, aiding or justifying the killing or harming of Jews in the name of a radical ideology or an extremist view of religion.
- Making mendacious, dehumanising, demonising, or stereotypical allegations about Jews as such or the power of Jews as collective—such as, especially but not exclusively, the myth about a world Jewish conspiracy or of Jews controlling the media, economy, government or other societal institutions.
- Accusing Jews as a people of being responsible for real or imagined wrongdoing committed by a single Jewish person or group, or even for acts committed by non-Jews.
- Denying the fact, scope, mechanisms (e.g. gas chambers) or intentionality of the genocide of the Jewish people at the hands of National Socialist Germany and its supporters and accomplices during World War II (the Holocaust).
- Accusing the Jews as a people, or Israel as a state, of inventing or exaggerating the Holocaust.
- Accusing Jewish citizens of being more loyal to Israel, or to the alleged priorities of Jews worldwide, than to the interests of their own nations.

- Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, e.g., by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavour.
- Applying double standards by requiring of it a behaviour not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation.
- Using the symbols and images associated with classic antisemitism (e.g., claims of Jews killing Jesus or blood libel) to characterise Israel or Israelis.
- Drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis.
- Holding Jews collectively responsible for actions of the state of Israel.

It is axiomatic that you cannot deal effectively with a problem without defining it. It needs to be pointed out that the IHRA definition does not prevent criticism of Israel. Indeed, it has a specific provision that 'criticism of Israel similar to that levelled against any other country cannot be regarded as antisemitic'. However, if you vilify Israel alone in a manner different and demanding a standard different from other countries, you cross a line.

All mainstream Jewish organisations in Australia emphasise the importance of the IHRA definition of antisemitism as a useful tool for education and guidance. The Australian Jewish Association has been advocating for its adoption since 2019. Eight hundred organisations have adopted the IHRA definition of antisemitism, including 19 US states, 204 local government bodies in the United Kingdom and 314 educational institutions.

Australia became a full member of IHRA in 2019, but it was only in late 2021 that the federal government adopted the IHRA definition. Former Prime Minister Scott Morrison made the announcement, and the current Prime Minister, Anthony Albanese, then opposition leader, also stated his support. Since the federal announcement, both the New South Wales and Victorian state governments, again both with bipartisan support, have also adopted the IHRA definition of antisemitism in full.

Antisemitism is associated with one of the darkest chapters of human history. When humanity abandons civilised moral codes, societies and ideologies which embrace it typically suffer a major decline, if not complete destruction. Antisemitism is a political doctrine that led to the mass extinction of the bulk of European Jewry between 1933 and 1945.

Reports from the United Kingdom, numerous European countries, the United States, Canada, South America and Australia point to a dangerous resurgence of antisemitism: 490 antisemitic incidents were recorded by the Community Security Group in Australia in 2021, a 38 per cent increase on the year before. The CSG states that it is highly likely that there remains significant under-reporting and that the true number is much higher. The single highest category of antisemitic incidents reported was abusive behaviour at 424 incidents, and three incidents involved schoolchildren.

What is going on? That it is happening within living memory of the Holocaust should shock all people of goodwill. At a minimum in Australia, all federal and state bodies, including schools and universities and media, should formally adopt the working definition of IHRA.

In recent years the ABC reported on a wave of pro-Nazi and antisemitic posters and stickers appearing around Adelaide, including on university campuses and at Adelaide Synagogue. Some of the material featured images of swastikas, Nazi leader Adolf Hitler and offensive depictions of Jewish people. University of South Australia Student Association president said at the time:

Certainly we have seen on all four university metropolitan campuses stickers and posters with Nazi imagery and racist slogans.

I have been contacted directly by students at the University of Adelaide thanking me for bringing forward this motion and expressing to me that they feel too afraid to identify as Jewish on campus. I am asking that South Australia join with the bipartisan approach shown federally and also adopted in New South Wales and Victoria. While this does not solve antisemitism, it would be a powerful signal that Australia stands united against antisemitism.

In closing, I would like to thank Dr David Adler, President of the Australian Jewish Association, for drawing my attention to this important motion. It has been a great privilege to

introduce the motion to the Legislative Council of the South Australian parliament, and I would like to reiterate that I believe in people's right to maintain their culture and belief practices in Australia in a way that fosters a unified Australia, good relationships and respect between everybody.

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

Bills

MINING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF PRIVATE MINES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:11): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Mining Act 1971.

Second Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:12): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The bill that I am moving today, the Mining (Environmental Impact of Private Mines) Amendment Bill, is an amendment to the Mining Act of 1971. For continuing members this is not a new bill. I introduced this back in the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, and I am bringing it back because it is a good idea to ensure that, when we are looking at private mines, the same obligations in terms of consultation apply and that the same rules in terms of respect for our environment apply.

It is very timely for me to put this bill forward at this time because we know that the people of Bragg will soon face a by-election and this is a really important issue for that local community. Indeed, members may be familiar with the White Rock Quarry and the push to expand that and what that represents in terms of encroachment on private land and community amenity. It is a big issue in that community and I know people in that area will be watching this debate with great interest.

When I first introduced this bill back in the previous parliament I provided a bit of history in my second reading speech, and I will refer to that today. Back in 1971, private mines were exempt from the Mining Act, which means that, unlike other tenements under the Mining Act, a private mine cannot be forfeited, relinquished, suspended or cancelled and it does not expire. Private mines are antiquated. They are an old-fashioned scheme and they have different legal protections to other mines in South Australia.

The Mining (Environmental Impact of Private Mines) Amendment Bill seeks to amend the Mining Act of 1971 to improve community consultation and ensure consideration of the environmental and health factors associated with private mines. So under the current act private mines are exempt from the broader definitions of the environment that commercial mineral operations are required to adhere to. I will read them into *Hansard* for the benefit of members. That is, other mines are required to consider the impact on:

(a) land, air, water...organisms, ecosystems, native fauna and other features or elements of the natural environment...cultural artefacts...existing or permissible land use...public health, safety or amenity...geological heritage values of an area...the aesthetic or cultural values of an area.

What this bill does is to remove that limited definition of 'environment' that exists specifically for private mines and, instead, ensures that the broader definition that applies for other forms of mining is so applied in this instance.

To give you a sense of the problem, there are approximately 222 private mines across South Australia, 136 of those are understood to be actively mined and 86 are inactive. That is as determined by their royalty returns. It really is time that we had a consistent regime and that is what this bill is seeking to provide.

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

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (MINISTERIAL DIARIES) AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:16): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Freedom of Information Act 1991. Read a first time.

Second Reading

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

The bill that I am introducing today seeks to amend the Freedom of Information Act to require the publication of ministerial diaries. This is a really important transparency measure. It happens in Queensland and the ACT, and it is time for it to happen in South Australia. I think the community has a right to know who has the ear of their ministers of government. All that I am proposing is that these official diaries be made publicly available and that they be published periodically online, as occurs in some of those other jurisdictions.

It is well-known in our democracy that sunlight is the best disinfectant. This is a really good way of seeing, with politicians who are performing key decision-making functions, who it is who has their ear, who is seeking to influence them and who is seeking to lobby them. This is information that the public has the right to know.

We know that faith in democracy and democratic institutions is at an all-time low. People are not happy with business as usual and one of the reasons for that, I think, is a lack of faith in our politicians and in our elected representatives. One way we can redress that is to ensure that there is maximum accountability and transparency. This is a simple measure that is being proposed that I think would assist in achieving that.

I hope that all parties will get behind this. I intend to bring it to a vote in coming weeks, and I do hope the Labor Party gets on board. Now that they are in government this would be a really important reform for them to champion and to demonstrate a real desire to be more accountable and transparent with the South Australian community. For the opposition, this is an opportunity for them to demonstrate their desire to see government function differently in this state. I hope all parties will get on board and I look forward to further discussions in the weeks ahead.

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

*Motions***SELECT COMMITTEE ON HEALTH SERVICES IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:20): I seek leave to move the motion in an amended form from that which I gave notice of yesterday.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I move:

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on health services in South Australia, with particular reference to—
 - (a) the opportunities to improve the quality, accessibility and affordability of health services including through an increased focus on preventative health and primary health care;
 - (b) the South Australian experience around health reform in the state, specifically Transforming Health, EPAS, the reactivation of the Daw Park Repatriation Hospital and other related projects and or programs;
 - (c) the federal government's funding of state government services and the linking of other federally funded services in South Australia, such as Medicare-funded GP services, and Adelaide Primary Health Network and Country Primary Health Network; and
 - (d) any related matters.
2. That the minutes of evidence presented to the select committee of the Fifty-Fourth Parliament on health services in South Australia tabled in the council on 26 October 2021 be referred to the select committee.

3. That this council permits the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it sees fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being presented to the council.

For the benefit of all members, there is an addition of paragraph No. 2 in the amended motion, which reads:

That the minutes of evidence presented to the select committee of the Fifty-Fourth Parliament on health services in South Australia tabled in the council on 26 October 2021 be referred to the select committee.

That was just to make it clear that the interim report and the body of work that has already been undertaken by the previous parliament can be considered by the committee when it is re-established.

The motion itself is to ensure the continuation of the health services select committee, which I think many of us will agree carried out a very important role in the previous parliament in giving people with lived experience within our public health sector, giving our medicos, our medical professionals, doctors, nurses, ambulance officers, all medical professionals, and other stakeholder groups and organisations and representative groups the opportunity to share the experiences that related to the state of our public health system in South Australia.

The terms are very clear in terms of what we were looking at. Initially, the committee was established at the end of 2018. I remind members that, at the time it was established, it received unanimous support across all sides of the Legislative Council. The terms of reference that I am proposing, as I have just said, do not deviate in substance from the previous motion, but in particular they enable us to continue to inquire into opportunities to improve the quality, accessibility and affordability of health services through an increased focus on preventative health and primary health care.

As I said, that committee played an invaluable role in terms of bringing to light issues which have contributed to our public health crisis. It provided a forum for those who were at the coalface of our broken health system to share their lived experience and to share their experiences more generally and propose how and where improvements can be made.

It provided the opportunity for, frankly, issues occurring in our health system which never would have seen the light of day to come to light, issues that were very much in the public interest. These were issues such as those around the Women's and Children's Hospital and the state of mental health care in the Women's and Children's Hospital, around cardiac care provided at the Women's and Children's Hospital, and around the tragic cluster of deaths amongst babies and infants that occurred at the Women's and Children's Hospital during COVID.

There are myriad issues, all of which were canvassed in the interim report that was tabled last year, that formed the basis of that interim report and were canvassed by the committee in its previous form. It is my sincere hope that the government and the opposition ought to be equally supportive of having the same level of scrutiny going forward until this committee finalises its report, as a bare minimum.

As far as the government is concerned, I think it is more than fair to say that it went to the polls and indeed won the election off the back of the health crisis that this committee looked at for all that time. It relied on the evidence presented to that committee during that period, time and time again. I suppose there is no need for the government to be concerned that we are going to be traversing old ground and going over the errors in terms of Transforming Health; we have done that as a committee. That was all done in the interim report. We have done the bad stuff, in terms of what Labor did wrong previously.

We have had a good look at what the Liberals did when they were in government, but there is still work that needs to be done by this committee. So, as an absolute bare minimum, what I am asking members of this place to consider is to enable that committee to finalise its report and report on the very important evidence that was provided to this parliament by stakeholder groups in relation to our healthcare system.

In total, prior to tabling the interim report, the committee heard evidence on 22 occasions and received about 25 submissions. It received evidence from SA Health, Asthma Australia, the South Australian branch of the Nursing and Midwifery Federation, the Ambulance Employees

Association SA, the Health Performance Council, the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, SASMOA, the Rural Doctors' Association of South Australia, the South Australian branch of the AMA, the Mental Health Coalition, the Women's and Children's Hospital Alliance, the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, the Australasian College of Emergency Medicine and the list goes on.

The committee also heard evidence from a number of parents whose children received less than satisfactory treatment while in the care of our public health system. It heard from other patients in the care of our public health system and the level of care, or otherwise, that they received. As I said, it heard evidence from the Women's and Children's Hospital Alliance, Women's and Children's Hospital staff and parents of patients.

It heard evidence from outspoken critics of some aspects of our healthcare system, including Professor John Horowitz. It heard from Professor Warren Jones. It heard from Adjunct Professor John Mendoza; Oakden whistleblower, Stewart Johnston; and countless doctors and nurses, particularly doctors who were heads of departments at our hospitals at the coalface of our public hospital crisis who came and gave us a very frank assessment of the state of our public health system.

To date, it has canvassed issues such as hospital operating costs, succession planning, ambulance ramping, emergency departments, country and rural services, mental health and paediatric cardiac surgery at the Women's and Children's Hospital and the design of the Women's and Children's Hospital. We covered a lot of ground.

It is only reasonable that that committee be re-established and be able to finalise the report that it commenced back in 2018. Importantly, and this really cannot be underestimated in terms of its value, everything that committee heard was very much in the public interest. Every South Australian deserves to know what the state of our public healthcare system was when the Liberal government was in power—that is the period within which this committee existed—and they deserve to know about the crises that were occurring behind closed doors that would otherwise not have seen the light of day.

That is a really critical factor when we are considering our public health system going forward because if there is one thing that I would put my house on it is that the public health system crisis is not over, and it is not going to be over for some time. Just because Ash the ambo is not on our screens telling us about the state of our health crisis or we are not hearing about ramping at hospitals every day or we are not hearing about the concerns about Hampstead and the transfer of acute patients from the Royal Adelaide to Hampstead every day or understaffing and under-resourcing issues that have occurred to the extent that we were hearing about them last year and the year before that—and nobody is expecting that this government would come in and fix that in a heartbeat or an instant—does not mean that they are not continuing to occur.

That has been the biggest benefit of this committee. It has provided a vehicle through which those issues have been able to be aired publicly so we all know what the state of our Royal Adelaide or our Lyell McEwin or Women's and Children's Hospital or Queen Elizabeth Hospital or Flinders Medical Centre is, because the people at the coalface have been providing us with that evidence. It is heard from management of those hospitals, it is heard from our senior bureaucrats, it is heard from the administration of the hospitals, the people in SA Health, the chief executive, who have had to come and account for the issues that have raised concerns among the public.

So it is only fair—and I am not going to go on about this, but it is only fair—that that committee have the opportunity to continue doing its work but that as a bare minimum it have the opportunity to report on the work it has done to date. That is a huge body of work that ought not be lost. I have to say that prior to introducing this motion I engaged with various stakeholders to get their input into whether the continuance of this committee was necessary or not. My view was firmly clear, but it is also worth mentioning on the record that those same bodies were unequivocal in terms of their support for the committee and ensuring that it be able to continue the important work it has done.

I am happy to speak to this motion again with members individually, if you so need and if you were not here at the time it was first introduced in this place. I am hoping that both the government, which went to this election on the back of a health crisis, and the opposition, which were part of that

health crisis for four years while they were in government, are going to see fit to do what they did previously and provide their unanimous support for the re-establishment of this committee so that it can finalise its very, very critical work.

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. N.J. Centofanti:

That, during the present session, once a notice of question has been given and placed on the *Notice Paper* pursuant to standing order 98b, an answer to the question shall be delivered to the Clerk, pursuant to standing order 98c, not more than 30 days after the date on which it had been first printed on the *Notice Paper*.

(Continued from 18 May 2022.)

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:33): This motion relates to the timely production of documents and responses to questions. The Greens are certainly supportive of this. It is something that we have advocated for governments of both persuasions to do. It is not onerous to require a government to produce this information within a set time frame. Indeed, it is this standard that the Labor Party requested of the Liberals when they were in government and it is only right that they should apply the same standards to themselves.

The Hon. R.B. Martin: Times have changed.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I hear the Hon. Reggie Martin say, 'Times have changed.' Well, there is a change of government, but the same level of transparency and accountability that the Labor Party urged of others when they were in opposition should also apply to them. That is only appropriate, and I would be very interested to hear what argument the new government can possibly have against supporting this simple change.

The Greens are certainly supportive of it. We supported it when the Liberal Party were in government and Labor were in opposition, and we are supportive of it now that the chairs have changed. As I say, I will be very interested to hear what arguments the government has against this. One can only assume when governments do not want to provide this sort of information in a timely way that they are trying to dodge accountability in some way.

That is not a welcome development in this parliament, particularly in the early days of a new government. I hope that they reconsider and that they support this reform. I hope that they will undertake to get this information to members in a timely way, because that is entirely appropriate and that is what the community expects of their elected representatives, in particular those who are fortunate enough to occupy the government benches.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:36): I rise to support the motion and to echo the sentiments just expressed by the Hon. Robert Simms. The Hon. Mr Martin interjected previously that times have changed. My, my, have they changed. My, my, do they change when we are on the opposite side of the chamber. That is generally what happens when you go from opposition to government.

You become accountable for your decisions and there is an expectation that you will provide answers, as you demanded and insisted you would get in opposition, in a timely manner, because that is in the public interest. We ask those questions in here. It is only reasonable that we expect, that the public expects, that when we raise issues on behalf of our communities and our stakeholders and people we represent, we are going to get an answer from the government, not when it suits them politically—

The Hon. R.A. Simms: Not in the never-never.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: —not in the never-never, but in a reasonable time frame. That precedent was set in the last parliament. We all deemed 30 days to be a pretty reasonable period. Anything above that stinks of politics. It absolutely stinks of this government doing what it can to keep people in the dark about the decisions it is making. Times might have changed in terms of where you sit in this place, but the expectation in terms of the information being provided to members in this place in a reasonable manner and time frame certainly have not changed, and we are wholeheartedly supporting this motion.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (16:38): The Labor government will be opposing this motion.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! No bullying and harassing the Attorney-General, thanks.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We note the desire to change sessional orders in a non-bipartisan way. That will be a precedent that the opposition chooses to set. I know the Hon. Rob Lucas had views on these sorts of things, but if that is the precedent that the opposition chooses to set that is up to them. There were many questions that went unanswered by the last government, and we will be able to provide statistics in due course on those, and then some of the answers that were given in an attempt to comply with that 30-day rule were one-sentence answers—single-sentence answers along the lines of saying, 'We are working on this,' full stop.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I inform the chamber that we will not be dividing on this, but we do note what a mockery the former Liberal government made of trying to keep to their own rule with one-sentence answers. I assume the current Liberal opposition will expect similar answers to what was given by them in government.

The Hon. R.A. Simms: What about the crossbench? We want good answers.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: They are very special.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:40): I would like to thank members for their contributions to this debate. I would like to in particular thank the Hon. Connie Bonaros and the Hon. Robert Simms for their support on this very important matter. I think it is extremely telling that the Labor government are again refusing to be transparent to the people of South Australia by opposing this motion. They say that transparency is the antidote to hypocrisy, and clearly this government do not want this motion. I wonder whether that is because they are simply afraid that the South Australian public will find out that they live by the motto: do as I say, not as I do.

Again, it was not my intention to move this motion. I went to the Leader of the Government and asked him to move this motion himself on behalf of his government, but he and his Premier and his colleagues refused, so it is up to us, the opposition and the crossbench, in moving and supporting this motion to ensure that the Malinauskas government is held to account and that questions on notice are answered within a reasonable time frame of 30 days. We could do it when we were in government, and I am not sure why they cannot. With that, I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC AND ACTIVE TRANSPORT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. R.A. Simms:

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on public and active transport with particular reference to—
 - (a) the availability and quality of public transport, including:
 - (i) infrastructure and services in metropolitan and regional areas;
 - (ii) the impact of fares and frequency; and
 - (iii) the efficacy and impacts of on-demand public transport.
 - (b) the role of government in enabling and encouraging active transport, including:
 - (i) measures to enable more participation;
 - (ii) the effect on community health and wellbeing;
 - (iii) the effect on climate change mitigation; and
 - (iv) measures to improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists.

- (c) the use of e-scooters and potential opportunities for expansion or further regulation;
 - (d) any other related matters.
2. That this council permits the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it sees fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being presented to the council.

(Continued from 18 May 2022.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:42): I rise to speak briefly in support of the motion from the Hon. Robert Simms. I thank the member for bringing this motion to the chamber to establish a select committee to inquire into and report on public and active transport. To be honest, being from a scientific background, the use of the term 'active transport' originally brought up horrific memories of university lecture theatres, learning about molecular movement across cell membranes. However, luckily for me, this is not the meaning of the term 'active transport' in this context.

Active transport is an important mode of transport. I think we would all like to see more of our community embrace active transport and just being generally active in some way, in a regular way. A good way to achieve this is walking or cycling to work. Active transport and public transport are complementary, with the majority of public transport journeys involving walking or cycling to some extent.

We all know that public transport plays an important role in minimising the costs of congestion and maximising economic productivity in our state. In fact, according to the Tourism & Transport Forum, the economic benefits of public transport are significant and include the effective connection of wealth and labour to the marketplace, removal of productivity bottlenecks and maximising opportunities for individuals, business and government to increase income and asset value.

A national study of transportation costs revealed that the average commuter working in a CBD in one of Australia's major cities could save more than \$5,490 per year by leaving the car at home and commuting to work on public transport five days a week. Indeed, the International Association of Public Transport argue that public transport costs less to the community, needs less urban space, is less energy intensive, pollutes less, is the safest mode, improves accessibility to jobs and offers mobility for all.

In regard to our regions, we know that regular route services operate across regional South Australia and link major cities to Adelaide. Services operate in the Barossa Valley, Murray Mallee, Mid North, Upper North, Riverland, Eyre, South-East and Fleurieu regions. Dial-a-ride door-to-door services can supplement regular timetabled services in our regions and can be more flexible for these communities; however, dial-a-ride door-to-door service patronage, which is operating in some regional areas, has continued to decrease by an average of 5.7 per cent per year.

This decline has been attributed to an increase in online services such as banking and shopping, as well as more people generally choosing to use their cars rather than travelling long distances on the buses. I think a conversation around declining use of public transport in our regions is important in the context of this committee going forward.

In closing, the Liberal Party supports a transport system that enhances positive community health and wellbeing outcomes as well as the greater environmental benefits that may come with increased public and active transport usage. We, the Liberal Party, acknowledge the need for future transport planning in addition to studies in order to produce robust travel demand forecasts, including looking at the scale and distribution of population, upgrades to the transport network, as well as the cost of parking, public transport fares and fuel costs. We are looking forward to participating in the Hon. Mr Simms' committee and hearing contributions from relevant stakeholders and members of the community on this important matter.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:46): I rise on behalf of SA-Best in support of the motion from the Hon. Robert Simms to establish a select committee into public and active transport. Going by the terms of reference, this will be a wideranging inquiry encompassing a number of key areas of public transport both in the metropolitan area and in the regions, as well as active transport such as cycling, as well as any impact climate change can have. From it, hopefully the committee will have

recommendations that may provide answers and remedies and an insight into the patronage of public transport, particularly as we begin the transition from the dark days of COVID restrictions.

It will be interesting to see updated data on usage of our buses, trains and trams and what the government intends on doing to encourage more people to leave their cars at home and hop onto public transport. I expect we will see an increase because of the high costs of fuel coupled with a worrying spike in the cost of living, from groceries through to electricity and interest rates. However, I have yet to see in recent times a concerted and effective advertising campaign emanating from the government and its agencies to encourage more people to use public transport.

It was commendable to see the Malinauskas government commit to a policy that both the Greens and SA-Best pushed strongly before and during the recent elections, which will enable concession cardholders unlimited free access to public transport. I am unsure as to whether this has been implemented as yet, but we await the announcement, probably from the Treasurer tomorrow.

This inquiry will no doubt look at the de-privatisation of our train and tram services and what costs will need to be borne by taxpayers in the government's promise to rip up its contract with Keolis Downer. I note that the minister, the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis, has also flagged he will be looking at the deal involving buses.

There are a couple of areas I have taken an interest in that will be covered by this select committee: firstly, e-scooters. While we accept that this cheap form of transportation is here to stay and we will see more of them clogging our footpaths, neither the government nor any local government area that has sanctioned their use has turned their attention to regulating them and considered the safety of others, such as pedestrians and disabled persons.

I am still seeing e-scooters dumped at pedestrian crossings, creating an unnecessary hazard and a hindrance to pedestrians, particularly those with visual impairment. I am hoping that this committee can come up with solutions to control numbers, where they are parked, and where they are used. We need to remember that under the current regulations, approved by the previous Marshall government, e-scooters are labelled as powered motor vehicles. The speed these vehicles can reach must be governed. I have ridden one and hit a speed of 25 km/h.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Pretty good; it will get me on the front row of the grid!

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Yes, I was on the footpath and I was wearing a helmet. But of course that is where these contraptions are able to travel. If I struck a pedestrian at that speed I could cause them serious harm, even death. I have had many constituents come to see me about being hit or injured by riders or tripping over them. The companies operating them have inadequate liability insurance cover, which enables them to slither through compensation claims. In one recent case a claim was rejected because the rider was under-age and smoking.

Another elderly constituent had tripped over a discarded e-scooter on the corner of King William and Hindley streets and suffered serious leg injuries. The pensioner was unable to access any video footage of the incident because Adelaide City Council conveniently buck-passed her request to SA Police, which said they do not keep footage after 30 days. I find that puzzling and worrying in these days of heightened security concerns.

You would think 90 days would be the minimum to retain footage in the city. The pensioner, unfortunately, is unable to seek any compensation for her injuries. So proper regulation of hire e-scooters, and whether privately owned e-scooters should be allowed on public roads and footpaths, must be a consideration for this committee.

I am also moving an amendment to include looking at whether there is an urgent need to resuscitate the state's moribund rail network. Members in this place would know that I am a strong advocate, quite passionate, for rail transport, particularly in our regions and also in the Adelaide Hills. Labor and the Liberals in this state, over decades, have totally abandoned our system of regional rail lines, which could easily be used for freight and the reintroduction of passenger services.

Talk to many in our regions, as I did during the election campaign, and they strongly support an expansion of freight rail services and would also welcome limited passenger services, because bus services from regional towns are too infrequent and restrictive, especially for seniors who are unable to drive between towns or the city. I constantly shake my head in bewilderment and frustration when politicians, from both the major parties in this state, are so dismissive of the enormous economic and social benefits of utilising rail.

For decades, the road freight industry has been heavily subsidised through various tax breaks, to the detriment of rail. Our regional roads have not been maintained to a high standard to cope with increased heavy vehicle traffic, yet a regional rail network has been allowed to fall into disrepair by governments who simply refuse to exercise terms of contracts they signed with rail operators. South Australia is a laughing-stock of the world when it comes to its rolling stock capability. Rail is one of the bedrocks of First World, and even Third World, economies. It moves people and freight quickly and efficiently over long distances.

During tough economic times, when fuel prices are through the roof, rail can and does provide a valuable solution, but not in South Australia. Elsewhere in this country there are major rail projects in progress. A small state like Victoria has one of the best regional networks in the world and its Labor government is committing billions of dollars to upgrade it. We could not even get the previous Marshall government to contribute funding to keep the *Overland* rolling in from Melbourne—the Victorians had to chip in.

The Marshall government would not even entertain supporting the tourist train venture in our acclaimed Barossa Valley that was put up by Chateau Tanunda's entrepreneurial operator, John Geber. Mr Geber was not after money, he just wanted the then government to commit a nominal amount to fix its own dilapidated rail line in the region, which should have been maintained by the licence holder.

When Mr Geber spoke out, the former government responded by cutting the existing rail line between Tanunda and Nuriootpa and installing a massive, ugly roundabout. Talk about being short-sighted. You only need to travel to California's Napa Valley to see them reaping the enormous benefits of a tourist rail journey through their vineyards. I hope this Labor government takes another look.

The current government also now seems to be hedging its bets on a passenger rail service from Mount Barker into the city when there appear to be viable options on the table. Going by the mixed signals over recent days, I am starting to get an uneasy gut feeling about exactly what is going to happen with the next stage of the Torrens to Darlington north-south corridor project.

As I pointed out before the election, there are other economically sound options put up by a former Department of Transport major projects engineer, the respected Luigi Rossi, who can shave up to a billion dollars from the almost \$10 billion cost of tunnels and overhead roadways. The current minister, the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis, is not convinced by Mr Rossi's sensible proposal for the section between Anzac Highway and Daws/Oaklands roads that are mainly industrial and business premises.

One aspect that has conveniently been ignored, of having four or five kilometres of tunnels in the project, is that Hazchem vehicles, like fuel and chemical transport, or emergency service appliances, are banned from using tunnels. Mr Rossi's proposal eliminates that by incorporating an overhead roadway, saving the need for compulsory acquisition of properties or having to relocate affected businesses elsewhere.

As this is a significant infrastructure project, I note that it does fall within the guidelines of this committee's scope. I look forward to participating on the committee and commend the motion to the chamber.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, just before you sit down would you like to formally move the amendment standing in your name.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I move:

Paragraph 1 subparagraph (a):

After subparagraph (iii) insert:

- (iv) reactivation of passenger and freight rail lines in regional South Australia.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (16:59): The purpose of a select committee is to examine a specific issue and then such a committee subsequently disbands. The view of the government is that the proposed select committee does not focus on a discretely defined issue and nor does it focus on a specific topic. Arguably, it may relate to any of the following topics or more: trains; buses; taxis; access cabs; rideshares, such as Uber; e-scooters, as the Hon. Mr Pangallo referred to; cyclist safety and/or pedestrian safety.

Furthermore, the issues in which it proposes to inquire may relate to matters of policy, infrastructure, climate change, or otherwise, which further broadens the scope of the proposed select committee. A select committee should be focused and, as such, this motion is opposed.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:00): I am quite baffled to hear that the government are opposed to this. That is the first I have heard of it. It would have been—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: —appropriate, I think, to have advised me of that prior to this being discussed. I will be bringing it to a vote, as indicated, and I will be seeking a division. It is pretty shocking, a day after supporting the declaration of a climate emergency, that the Labor government would seek to oppose establishing a committee to look at active transport and to look at public transport and the role of government in trying to encourage those things.

I find it extraordinary that the Labor Party would seek to do that and would break what I consider to be a convention in this place, that is, that members wanting to establish select committees have the opportunity to do so, within reason. It is pretty extraordinary that a committee such as this would be opposed and pretty extraordinary that no-one in the government had the courtesy to advise the mover of their position. It is a very disappointing turn of events and a very bad omen for how things might operate in this chamber, I suggest.

From my perspective, this is a really important inquiry. We have seen public transport infrastructure neglected over many terms of parliament and by governments of a range of persuasions, but we also have not seen an appropriate focus on active transport. We have not seen an examination of policies looking at what we can do to encourage walking, what we can do to encourage cycling. We know that is really important because motor vehicles are one of the most significant sources of carbon emissions in our state. If we are serious about reducing carbon emissions, we need to look at alternative transport options.

This inquiry is simply going to come up with some suggestions and ideas and recommendations to government. I hope that this parliament will vote to establish such an important committee.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:03): I move:

That the select committee consist of the Hon. J.E. Hanson, the Hon. D.G.E. Hood, the Hon. T.T. Ngo, the Hon. F. Pangallo and the mover.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

That the select committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from place to place and to report on 30 November 2022.

Motion carried.

PAYROLL TAX

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (17:05): I move:

That this council—

1. Commends the Marshall Liberal government for scrapping payroll tax for all small businesses in South Australia; and
2. Calls on the Malinauskas Labor government to retain this benefit to more than 3,200 South Australian small businesses and more than 135,000 microbusinesses and sole traders who can now create more jobs knowing they won't be hit with an extra tax as soon as they employ more South Australians.

When the Marshall Liberal government was elected in 2018, it swiftly implemented its policy to remove payroll tax for small businesses. Within its first year in office, the former state government delivered on this promise, benefitting more than 3,200 small businesses in South Australia and providing confidence to over 135,000 microbusinesses and sole traders, who could expand their operations knowing they would not be dealt with another tax simply for providing more South Australians with employment.

The Marshall Liberal government demonstrated leadership in boosting our economy through implementing this important measure that directly, or at least indirectly, benefitted every South Australian. The average annual cost of doing business in South Australia over the past few years has reduced by over \$4,900, while small businesses are saving some \$7,450 a year on average.

The previous Liberal government recognised the need to address the barriers to the creation of job opportunities that were experienced for years under Labor. Payroll tax had been imposed on businesses with payrolls of just \$600,000 or more, effectively meaning that small to medium-sized businesses, which should be given the most incentive to prosper, experienced the most strain.

The previous Labor government relied on this stream of revenue for a quarter of its tax income, with South Australia having the lowest payroll tax threshold of almost any state and territory in the entire nation under the previous Labor government. This arguably prevented our state from reaching its economic potential—after all, fewer jobs inevitably lead to greater reliance on welfare payments, with less money being injected back into our local economy.

Given payroll tax was potentially deterring business owners from growing their enterprises and would have possibly caused entrepreneurs to reconsider basing their ventures in South Australia, the Marshall state government focused on creating an environment in which existing businesses could thrive and to which startups were attracted.

Of course, this measure could not have come at a better time for our state, as none of us could have predicted the immense impact the global pandemic was to have on our business sector. In the midst of the lockdowns and restrictions that were necessary for our communities to avoid the worst of COVID-19, South Australian businesses deserved any relief from financial burdens that our state government could offer, and the Liberals' policy was indeed fortuitous and well-timed in that regard.

Even in the midst of managing COVID-19 and having to deal with the unprecedented challenges, ABS figures have shown that the previous Liberal government transformed the South Australian economy into the fastest growing economy in the nation. Under the previous Liberal government, under our stewardship, the state led the nation in increasing our skilled workforce, with more than 52,000 apprentices, pre-apprentices and trainees commencing their training since the Marshall Liberal government was elected in 2018.

Having witnessed the positive effects that the removal of payroll taxes for small businesses was having in South Australia during the 2022 election campaign, the Marshall Liberal team announced it would extend the payroll tax exemption on all apprenticeships and trainees for two years, which would have saved employees \$18.2 million and provided excellent career pathways for South Australians, preventing our young people from leaving the state, or the so-called brain drain as it is called.

Unfortunately, under the Malinauskas Labor government our businesses may not be afforded the same opportunity to capitalise on such a scheme, which would have helped to ensure we had the skills required to accelerate our economy and prevent the widening of skills shortages in key industries.

The Marshall Liberal government's initiative was widely welcomed by business owners and relevant interest groups. For too long excessive and unnecessary regulatory burdens have hindered businesses from flourishing, with payroll tax being a consistent point of contention. The former Liberal government adopted a pro-jobs, pro-growth and pro-economy agenda, boasting an innovative vision that spanned beyond its term in office. It did not limit its policies and actions to those which obtained short-term gain at the expense of South Australia's future economic vibrancy and competitiveness but rather sought to fuel investment and stimulate growth at every opportunity.

Given that there are over 145,000 small businesses operating in our state right now, providing employment to a third of our entire workforce, we cannot afford to have any of these enterprises at risk of closure simply because the reinstatement of payroll tax encumbrances render their operations unviable. Instead, we must continue to incentivise business expansion, which underpins a strong and thriving economy and is vital to lowering our unemployment rate.

I would strongly urge the Malinauskas Labor government to continue providing payroll tax relief to small businesses, which will contribute considerably to South Australia's long-term success and which was initiated under the Marshall Liberal government. I commend the motion to the council.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. R.B. Martin.

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 31 May 2022.)

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Mr President, I draw your attention to the state of the council.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:15): I rise to speak to the Address in Reply. Of course, I support the motion and I want to thank Her Excellency the Governor for her remarks. It is often said that when you change the government you change the country, and the same is also true of our state. We know that change in South Australia is desperately needed.

Over the last few years, we have seen the impact of a climate crisis that has ravaged our state with fire and flood. We have also seen the effects of a pandemic, one that has resulted in the tragic loss of life and the destruction of businesses and of livelihoods, and we have seen the growing gap between the rich and poor. These are the challenges that the new government must confront and that we must confront collectively in the Fifty-Fifth Parliament.

The Greens are committed to working with the new government, and indeed all parties in this place, to improve the lives of South Australians. There are contrasting views about the role of third parties in parliaments. My view is that we have a responsibility to hold the government's feet to the fire, to keep them accountable and to ensure that they deliver good outcomes, but we must also play a proactive role; that is, we need to offer positive ideas and solutions.

My colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks and I will continue to do this, as we have done in the last parliament. We will continue to fight for action on the climate crisis. This parliament has declared a climate emergency, and we have talked about that in great detail and we welcome that. We welcome the new government's commitment to deliver hydrogen power and we look forward to seeing the detail of this. We also welcome the government's desire to better fund our hospital system, something that we know is desperately needed.

But we need to do so much more. Poverty is rising in our state. In Australia, there are 3.5 million people who live below the poverty line, and in South Australia a survey from the Anti-Poverty Network showed that one in four respondents has less than \$14 a day remaining after they have paid for rent. That is if they can find a rental property, with vacancy rates at an all-time low, most recently reported at 0.2 per cent.

More and more South Australians are homeless. It is morally wrong that there are people sleeping on the streets of our state this winter, and the government must take action to address this.

We know, and I have stated this many times, that the new government's resolve to build just 400 new homes is welcome but simply not enough. It is a drop in the ocean. We need more public housing in our state and we need more affordable housing in our state. The government has a responsibility to deliver it and the Greens are fighting to ensure that that happens.

Amid a rental affordability crisis, we have a rental system that is stacked against renters in favour of landlords. We need urgent reform of our rental market to bring South Australia into line with other states—legislating a presumption in favour of tenants, ending no-fault evictions, ending the unethical practice of rental bidding that drives up rent prices, and we need rent capping to stop prices from soaring out of control.

We also need to see leadership on transport. It was very disappointing to see the Labor government oppose setting up a simple committee to inquire into active transport and public transport. We know that cars are significant carbon emitters, yet there is no strategy to reduce car reliance to enable active transport. SA continues to underinvest in cycling infrastructure. Public transport infrastructure is woefully inadequate, particularly in the regions. We will be pushing to ensure that that gets the focus it needs during this term of parliament.

I note this government's resolve to make South Australia a leader in education. We welcome that ambition, but the solution is not university mergers and the inevitable cuts to staff and the reduction in student satisfaction that will follow. The solution is more government funding to appropriately resource our universities. We need governance reform to ensure the voice of students is heard, and we need to curb the exorbitant salaries being paid to uni bosses. We will continue to pursue these measures in the parliament.

Finally, I want to congratulate all members who were elected to serve in this place. I welcome the new members—the Hon. Mr Reggie Martin, the Hon. Ms Sarah Game and the Hon. Ms Laura Curran—and I congratulate all those members who are returning for another term. It is the greatest honour in our democracy to be elected to serve the community. For me, this was a special occasion, a special election, as after a few false starts in my political career I have finally been elected in my own right, and that is a real honour.

For the Greens, this was a breakthrough election. We secured a record vote in both houses of parliament and for the first time we secured the election of a member without the need for preferences, and I was third elected to this council. Last weekend's exciting results at the federal election demonstrate that the wind is at our backs here in South Australia. I am delighted to see that Barbara Pocock has been elected to join my colleague Senator Sarah Hanson-Young in the federal parliament. I am excited about what our Green team can achieve in the years ahead.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank everybody who worked on the Greens SA campaign: our many candidates who ran in 43 lower house seats, our upper house ticket team, our campaign staff and all of the members and volunteers who gave their time and energy to the election campaign. The Greens are a people-powered movement and we would not have achieved the results we saw on 19 March without all of their hard work and dedication. I want to highlight some of the really exciting results that we saw in Kavel, Heysen, Unley and West Torrens. All of these are areas where we can hope to make gains in future elections.

I would also like to thank my family for all of their support over the years. As all of us who are in political work understand, it does often have a big impact on families. I have been really lucky to have the support of my mum and dad over many years. I first ran for office when I was 19, and my dad has been putting up corflutes for me in every election. He is now 75.

I did point out that next time I am up for election he will be in his 80s, so he is off the hook for the Robert Simms re-election campaign. I will let him off corflute duty. I will get him out there on election day handing out how-to-votes, though. But I have really appreciated all of the support, particularly from my mum and dad, over the years and all of my friends who have stood by me. I reflect on when I lost the Senate seat back in 2016. It was a challenging time. I had many friends who encouraged me to stand again for office, and I am really appreciative of that.

Earlier this month, I notched up 12 months in this job. It is hard to believe it has been a year on 4 May, so I want to thank my parliamentary team, my office team, for all of the work they have

done over this first year in office. It has been a busy and rewarding time. I feel really excited about what we can achieve together.

Might I also say a big thankyou to all of the parliamentary colleagues with whom I have had an opportunity to work over the last 12 months. Whilst of course we have differences in this place, I have really enjoyed the respectful environment and the camaraderie we have seen right across the chamber. I always welcome a lively contest of ideas and I look forward to seeing that continue over the eight years that I spend in this parliament, and hopefully beyond. Robs have a very proud track record of long service in this chamber. With that, I conclude my remarks and wish everybody all the best for this term of parliament.

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

At 17:26 the council adjourned until Thursday 2 June 2022 at 11:00.