

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 15 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 (14:18): I bring up the ninth report of the committee.

Report received and read.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

Regulations under National Schemes—

Health Practitioner Regulations National Law—Professional Indemnity Insurance
SA Health's Response to the Deputy State Coroner's Finding of 4 November 2021 into the death of Theo Nikolas Papageorgiou

Ministerial Statement

DECLARATION OF ELECTRICITY MARKET SUSPENSION

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:22): I table a ministerial statement made in the other place by the Minister for Energy and Mining.

Question Time

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector regarding Return to Work. Does the fact that the carriage of the return to work legislation has been transferred to another minister in another house indicate a lack of confidence from the Premier in you as Minister for Industrial Relations?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:23): No.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:23): Supplementary.

The PRESIDENT: I will listen, but I just don't see a miracle happening here, the Hon. Ms Bonaros.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Does the passage of the bill in the other place indicate this government's intention to ram this bill through this parliament in a short time frame?

The PRESIDENT: That is not a supplementary question. You may ask that question when it gets to you. Second question, the honourable Leader of the Opposition.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): My questions are to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector regarding Return to Work:

1. Was Business SA present at the negotiations between the Premier and unions on the proposed changes to the Return to Work scheme, or were they brought in after the deal was struck?
2. When was Business SA advised of the latest proposed changes to the Return to Work scheme and the impact on the average premium?
3. Did the government advise Business SA that modelling had been undertaken to ensure the 1.9 per cent premium impact was certain?
4. Were other business groups such as the Master Builders, Housing Industry Association, Tourism council, Wine Industry Association and Motor Trade Association consulted?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:24): I am going to continue the often-stated procedures that the Treasurer would extol: when there are private discussions that take place, I think people have the understanding that they are private discussions, and I'm not going to go into the nature of them.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (14:25): Supplementary: does the minister feel that the members of Business SA have the right to know what Business SA has agreed to, and shouldn't that be disclosed in the chamber?

The PRESIDENT: I am not sure that is a supplementary question. You can answer, if you wish.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:25): I don't think that has anything to do with my responsibilities as Minister for Industrial Relations.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:25): Supplementary question: what about the public of South Australia?

The PRESIDENT: You can answer it, if you choose.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:25): I don't think that has anything to do with the original question.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector regarding Return to Work.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The average premium rate proposed under the changes to the Return to Work scheme is 1.9 per cent. My questions to the minister are:

1. Can the minister categorically claim that premiums will not rise above 1.9 per cent as a result of these changes?
2. Can the minister provide premium rates by industry and the impacts per each separate industry premium rate resulting from the proposed changes to the Return to Work scheme?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:26): I thank the honourable member for her question.

Estimated premium rates are that, they are estimates. In relation to guarantees about different industries, I think there are some 550 different premium rates throughout the whole of South Australia. The APR, or average premium rate, is an average of all of those.

GREEN TRIANGLE TIMBER INDUSTRY AWARDS

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:26): My question is to the neglected Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development.

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: Three questions in a row and none to me—it's amazing.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: I know; it's outrageous. Will the minister update the council on the recent Green Triangle timber awards held in Mount Gambier?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:27): I thank the honourable member for his question and his ongoing interest in the Green Triangle. I had the pleasure of attending the recent Green Triangle Timber Industry Awards that were held at The Barn in Mount Gambier last Friday night that had well over 450 people attending, mainly the industry's key stakeholders.

In many ways it was a case of third time lucky because, unfortunately, the awards had had to be postponed previously due to COVID restrictions. Unfortunately, that also meant the Premier was unable to attend on Friday night, whereas he had been booked in to attend each of the two previous scheduled dates. However, I was delighted that he was able to send a pre-recorded video message.

I am also delighted to be able to advise the council that the event was an overwhelming success. It celebrated the success of this vitally important industry and acknowledged the remarkable achievements of individuals in the forest industries. I would also like to acknowledge the member for MacKillop and the member for Mount Gambier, who were also in attendance, as well as the member for Barker.

I would like to particularly congratulate the Green Triangle Timber Industry Awards committee, ably chaired by Adrian Flowers, which has come together to create this significant event that we are able to celebrate. The awards committee certainly had a very tough job selecting the winners from the respective categories because it was truly a very inspiring list of representatives from right across the Green Triangle.

I would like to congratulate the following individuals for winning awards: Mr Clayton Thompson of OneFortyOne, who won the Sawmilling and Processing Excellence Award; Mr Matt Tilby of Merrett Logging, who won the Operations Harvesting and Infield Chipping Excellence Award; Mr Leigh Hein of OnSite Hydraulic and Mechanical Maintenance for winning the Silviculture and Timber Support Services Excellence Award; Mr Graham Earl of Moreland Holdings for winning the Logistics Excellence Port Operations, Marshalling and Timber Haulage Award; Ms Belinda Williamson of OneFortyOne for taking out the Environment and Sustainability Award; Ms Maddison Bowden of Tegle Contracting for winning the Trainee Award; N.F. McDonnell & Sons for winning the Safety Excellence Award for businesses with over 30 employees; Reid Logging for winning the Safety Excellence Award for enterprises with fewer than 30 employees; and the inaugural Timber Legend Award, which went to the late Mr Pat 'Rusty' Lamb.

Forest Industries is one of the most significant contributors to the economy in the Green Triangle region, and this government is committed to build on this with a commitment to supporting the industry to invest, expand and grow. The industry has increased domestic production and continues to underpin thousands of regional jobs. In fact, according to the South Australian Forest Products Association, forestry in South Australia provides 18,000 direct or indirect jobs.

That is why I was delighted also to be able to speak at the awards on Friday night and to reaffirm this government's commitment not only to the Limestone Coast but to Forest Industries in South Australia by speaking about:

- our record \$19 million investment, which includes a \$50 million forestry centre for excellence, which will bring long-term certainty and stability to research in the sector and which will be based in Mount Gambier;

- \$2 million over three years to develop a forest products domestic manufacturing and infrastructure master plan, including a focus on future skills needs;
- investing \$2 million to support a landscape-level fire detection program while ensuring that existing fire towers remain serviceable during transition to new technologies; and
- supporting and expanding the role of FIACSA as an ongoing platform for government and industry to work together.

I certainly look forward to working with all of the forest industry players going forward into the future. This government is committed to supporting the industry and understands the significant contribution it that it makes to the state.

Congratulations once again to all the award nominees and all the winners. I would like to thank them for their contribution to the industry and to regional South Australia. These awards really are a wonderful opportunity for everyone to come together to celebrate, and I look forward to attending many more in the future.

LIVE ANIMAL EXPORT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:31): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development on the topic of live export mortalities.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The 2018 McCarthy review, as endorsed by both PIRSA and the South Australian Rural and Regional Council, recommends a goal to reduce the 'reportable mortality level' for sheep being exported, from 2 per cent to 1 per cent. My questions to the minister are: what percentage of South Australia's live export sheep have been considered reportable mortalities in the past reportable year, and has this decreased since the time of the McCarthy review? Also, by what metric is a live export mortality deemed reportable, and how many unreportable deaths have occurred?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:32): I thank the honourable member for her question and her interest in this topic. As it falls under the responsibility of my colleague in the other place, who is responsible for animal welfare, I will seek some information and bring it back to the member.

LIVE ANIMAL EXPORT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:32): Supplementary: yesterday the minister indicated that she was responsible for live export issues, and this was a question about a review endorsed by PIRSA. Can the minister please explain why she is not across the issue?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:32): I think the member is mistaken in claiming that I said that I was responsible for animal welfare. That is the responsibility of the minister for the environment.

Personal Explanation

LIVE ANIMAL EXPORT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:33): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I never said that the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development was responsible for animal welfare. I noted, however, in her answer that she said she did have carriage of the live export issue.

*Question Time***RETURN TO WORK SCHEME**

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (14:33): My question is to the minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector regarding Return to Work. What consultation has the government undertaken with the business community outside of Business SA?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:33): I thank the honourable member for her question. The government regularly undertakes consultation with the business community over a whole range of issues, over many, many issues that affect many, many areas of government and policy. In relation to changes to the Return to Work system, and in relation to a number of different possibilities of reform to Return to Work, I know a number of industry bodies in particular were consulted along the way.

I want to put on the record the reason why we are where we are with time frames that aren't great in relation to looking at the Return to Work system. It is the result of the deliberate decisions made by the former Liberal government—deliberate decisions made by the former Liberal government. The Summerfield decision was first handed down—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —in May 2019.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: An appeal was dismissed by the Full Bench of the South Australian Employment Tribunal in June 2020.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: An appeal of the Full Court of the Supreme Court was dismissed in March 2021.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The former government deliberately made a policy decision that the average premium would go to 2.2 per cent by virtue of deciding to do nothing.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (14:35): Supplementary: can the minister provide a list of organisations outside of Business SA that he has consulted with? I am happy for you to take it on notice, if you'd like to.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:35): A number of organisations have been consulted. As the former Treasurer was fond of saying, he is not going to go into private conversations.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Hood has a supplementary question and I would like to hear it.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:35): Thank you, sir. Minister, who were those organisations?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:35): A number of business organisations.

The PRESIDENT: A further supplementary question arising from the original answer, the Hon. Mr Hood.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:35): What were the names of those organisations?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:35): I have answered the question. There are a number of them.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: He is refusing to answer questions.

The PRESIDENT: And that's his prerogative.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:36): Supplementary question arising from the original answer: is it the minister's position that this is a rubbish bill because he didn't have enough time to do it properly?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Attorney.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! If you are going to answer the question, stand up and answer the question. If you are not, we will move on.

NATIONAL RECONCILIATION WEEK

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister inform the council about the Property Council's Reconciliation Week breakfast?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs has the call.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:36): I feel that Reconciliation Week is an important week on our national calendar and, as the chamber is aware, it ran from 27 May to 3 June. This year's theme for National Reconciliation Week was Be Brave, Make Change, and that is exactly what was on display at the Property Council's Reconciliation Week breakfast, where I had the privilege of speaking on 2 June, on budget day in the last sitting week. Uncle Mickey O'Brien welcomed everyone in attendance to country and gave all of us occasion to reflect on how far we have come in the celebration by non-Aboriginal Australians of Aboriginal culture.

Many of the organisations represented at this Reconciliation Week breakfast, including event partners Sarah Constructions, Renewal SA and KONE, had developed reconciliation action plans. Since 2006, reconciliation action plans (RAPs) have enabled organisations to sustainably and strategically take meaningful action to advance reconciliation. There are four reconciliation action plan types—reflect, innovate, stretch and elevate—that allow organisations to continuously develop their reconciliation commitments. Based around the core pillars of relationships, respect and opportunities, RAPs give organisations a framework to contribute to the reconciliation movement. Reconciliation action plans deliver tangible and substantive benefits for Aboriginal people and increase cultural safety in the workplace.

This year was the Property Council's first Reconciliation Week breakfast, and it was great to see so many business leaders, industry leaders, government and non-government, both Aboriginal

and non-Aboriginal, coming together to mark how far we have come but, just as importantly, how far we have to go. We know that industry groups like the Property Council's group and their members have many opportunities to further the work of reconciliation by the way they go about their businesses, whether it is committing to a reconciliation action plan, making a conscious effort to recruit Aboriginal employees or engaging with Aboriginal businesses in contracts and procurement.

The work of reconciliation requires many to get involved: individuals, governments, parliaments, community organisations and businesses alike. That's why I was pleased to see the Property Council proactively engaging through the hosting of this event. There was an opportunity to hear from the reconciliation experience of panellists, including football legend Shaun Burgoyne, Chris Menz (Chief Executive of Renewal SA), Joseph Fuschtei and Belinda Wood of Sarah Constructions, and Janette Pearce of KONE. I thank them all for their time and for sharing their experiences, and I commend those who were involved in this particular reconciliation breakfast.

AGRICULTURAL TEACHER SHORTAGE

The Hon. S.L. GAME (14:39): I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to addressing a question to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Education, Training and Skills, about the shortage of agricultural teachers in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: There are 785 schools in South Australia and only 60 of those have a current agricultural studies pathway in line with the mandated national food and fibre curriculum. Out of those 60 schools, eight are unable to secure any agricultural teachers and several have more teachers from non-food and fibre backgrounds stepping into the role without proper training or any guidance from the SACE Board. There was one single graduate of the Master's in Agricultural Teaching in 2021, and there will be potentially two graduates this year.

These numbers are abysmal. There are already shortages and absolutely no room to expand this important curriculum. My questions to the Attorney-General representing the minister are:

1. Has the government consulted with the Agricultural Teachers Association of South Australia on their proposed ideas and solutions to this ongoing problem?
2. Will the government commit to ensuring this key South Australian industry of food and fibre has a future by ensuring that all students have access to this important curriculum?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:40): I thank the honourable member for her question and will refer it to the minister in another place and bring back a reply.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector regarding Return to Work. Has the minister met with members of the ReturnToWorkSA board to discuss proposed changes to the Return to Work scheme and, if so, who has he met with and when?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:41): Once again I will repeat what I have said in relation to a couple of questions. There has been a range of stakeholders in a lot of different areas that have been involved in discussions over possible and different changes to the ReturnToWork board and I'm not going to reflect upon any private discussions that have been held in relation to those.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (14:41): Supplementary: has the minister met with members of the ReturnToWork board?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:41): I just answered that question.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:41): Supplementary: why is the minister refusing to disclose to the public of South Australia who he has met with over this important legislation?

The PRESIDENT: Attorney?

The Hon. R.P. Wortley interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: For someone who is only partly dressed, I wouldn't be interjecting. I expect that tie on tomorrow, too, Russell.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN AGRICULTURAL TOWN OF THE YEAR AWARD

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:42): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development: will the minister inform the chamber about nominations for the 2022 South Australian Agricultural Town of the Year Award?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:42): I thank the honourable member for his question. Nominations for the 2022 Agricultural Town of the Year (also known as Ag Town of the Year) opened on 23 May 2022. Of course, there are hundreds of small towns across our state that are wonderfully diverse in their offerings, but they also perform an important function as both the business and social centre of so many of our regional farming areas. The support and sense of belonging that a local community provides is incredibly important for families and businesses so that they can live and thrive both on farms and in rural townships.

Ag Town of the Year is an initiative of the government of South Australia and is managed and delivered by Solstice Media through a sponsorship agreement. It is now in its fourth year, and the Ag Town of the Year Award recognises South Australian towns that are excelling in agricultural practices and also the flow-on effects to townships and communities. The award highlights the vital role that agriculture plays in the regional landscape, being of course the backbone of regional communities. Approximately 27 per cent of the state's population live in the regions. Ag Town of the Year not only recognises our primary producers but also highlights the importance of the communities that support them.

Following the closing of town nominations on 17 June (which is I think this Friday), public voting will occur through to 25 July. In August, the top five towns according to public voting will be announced, and visits by the judging panel to each of the top five towns will be undertaken in September.

South Australian regions contribute around \$29 billion each year to our state's economy, with agriculture playing a vital role through local employment and business opportunities. Entering the awards provides regional communities the opportunity to reflect on their contributions to South Australia's primary industries and regional development and to also receive public recognition of their town and their contribution. The award recognises the resilience, creativity and strengths of our regional towns. Past winners are Cleve in 2019, Pinnaroo won in 2020, and Kimba won in 2021.

Speaking as a resident of another small town, Port MacDonnell, I can attest the importance of such initiatives as Ag Town of the Year because it focuses on shared community achievements and it fosters an increased sense of community pride. Small towns have an important and unique relationship with the farms that surround them. They are intrinsically linked, facing many shared challenges but of course also many shared successes.

The 2022 South Australian Ag Town of the Year Award is now open for nominations, as I said, so I really do encourage regional communities to get involved and nominate their town. I encourage all members of this place, as well as the other place, to think about encouraging people in their local communities, or communities they know in regional areas, to nominate and be part of this exciting award.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN AGRICULTURAL TOWN OF THE YEAR AWARD

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): Supplementary: if the minister is so supportive of agricultural towns, why has she allowed her Premier to take an axe to the PIRSA budget?

The PRESIDENT: It is tenuous, but you can choose to answer it. You refuse to answer?

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:46): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Industrial Relations a question about the Return to Work scheme.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: There is currently a case before the Court of Appeal in which ReturnToWorkSA is challenging the correctness of the Summerfield decision. The clear implication of the action taken by ReturnToWorkSA is that the Summerfield case may well be overturned. The action by ReturnToWorkSA in the Williams case appears to be entirely inconsistent with the government's proposed changes to the return to work legislation, which is very concerning.

The Williams matter involves a worker who sustained injuries to his knee due to repetitive climbing up and down the ladder at a specific point in time whilst carrying out his work duties. The judge found that it was exactly the same cause that injured his right knee and his left knee and determined to combine the impairments to reach a final percentage. The Full Bench decided the judge was wrong to have combined the impairments.

Mr Williams is appealing because it was exactly the same sort of circumstances that caused both his left and right knee injuries, hence the same cause. Williams lost the appeal before the Full Bench of the Employment Tribunal and has applied for leave to appeal to the Court of Appeal about whether his multiple work injuries are from the same cause or arising on the Supreme Court Summerfield decision.

The corporation has filed a notice of alternative contention, which has the goal of achieving an outcome that strikes down the Summerfield decision. In order to properly deal with the matter, the president is believed to be considering sitting five judges, which has the potential to overturn the decision in Summerfield. My questions to the minister are:

1. Have you intervened in the Williams case to date, or do you intend to intervene to withdraw the challenges to the correctness of Summerfield?
2. If not, have you or anyone from your department had any discussions with ReturnToWorkSA about withdrawing the challenge to the correctness of Summerfield?
3. If not, what will be the ramifications to the operation of the scheme if the Court of Appeal upholds ReturnToWorkSA contentions that Summerfield was wrongly decided in circumstances where the government says it is embracing the correctness of Summerfield?
4. Do you accept that, if you do not ultimately intervene in that case, failing to do so is entirely inconsistent with what your government is telling the public about its intention to fully embrace the court's decision of Summerfield?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:48): I thank the honourable member for her question. I have requested a briefing on the Williams case, where it is up to, and the nature and effect of what the possible decisions may be in Williams in relation to how that would affect the modelling that has been done in relation to the new scheme. We wish to see the scheme on the modelling it is, so if there is a possibility the Williams case may affect that, that is why we requested the briefing, to make sure that the assumptions the modelling has in relation to Summerfield—it is our desire to see them maintained.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:49): Supplementary: does that involve consideration by you of intervening in that case or asking ReturnToWork to withdraw their application of alternative contention?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:49): I thank the honourable member for her question. As I said, I am receiving a briefing. I am not going to suggest a particular course of action without having done that yet.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bonaros, you have a supplementary question arising from the original answer.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:49): From the original answer. Does the minister accept that, in the event that the Court of Appeal overturns or otherwise waters down the Summerfield decision, in that case the increase of the threshold of the whole person impairment to 35 per cent to seriously injured workers will catastrophically affect injured workers?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:50): I thank the honourable member for her question. The legislation is based on estimates that have been made in relation to how many will reach 35 per cent and how many injured workers will be able to combine where they couldn't combine for seriously injured before. It's our intention that those numbers are maintained in the system.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:50): Further supplementary: does the minister accept that the bill that he discharged in this place yesterday was done so on the basis that this government intends to maintain the Summerfield decision?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:50): Yes, that is what I have said.

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:50): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the parliamentary secretary to the Premier regarding her role and responsibilities.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: As a proud member of a union and member of the Labor Party, why is the parliamentary secretary so miffed at her loading as a parliamentary secretary when it's actually higher than the minimum wage of Australian workers?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:51): I find it an extraordinary question because it wasn't at all a comment or a statement that I made yesterday. It's, as the honourable member opposite would say quite often in this chamber, verballing the member.

I am not at all upset. I am very much enjoying the role that I have. I enjoy the role that I have because, again it will not surprise you, I get to support the team that is now in government—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Interjections are out of order even if they are from your own team.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: —because that's what we do over on this side of the chamber. We support each other. I feel incredibly privileged and honoured to be in this chamber. Whether that is on the front bench, the backbench, it is an honour to be here, and I think we should all respect the privilege that it is to be in this chamber when there are other people out in the community who are struggling to find ways to pay their bills.

I feel very privileged and honoured to be here and I will fight for every South Australian so that they can have the dignity to have a roof over their head, to have access to the services that they

need, not to have them privatised by governments that, when they come in, decide to find privilege and decide to privatise the very services that people in our community rely on. Privatising public transport is just shameful from those opposite. For you to stand over there and ask me a question about my loading is quite extraordinary when you were the government that decided to privatise a service that those in our community who do not have any other form of transport to get to work so very much need.

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:53): Supplementary: did the parliamentary secretary support the privatisation of the lotteries, the Motor Accident Commission and the other things that Labor privatised when they were last in office? It's a direct question, sir.

The PRESIDENT: It's not a supplementary question. I heard nothing out of the answer that came from that. We move on. The Hon. Mr Martin.

LOWITJA O'DONOGHUE ORATION

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (14:53): My question is for the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister please inform the council about the recent Lowitja O'Donoghue Oration delivered by the new commonwealth Minister for Indigenous Affairs?

The Hon. J.E. Hanson: That's how you do it.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hanson, we don't need your help.

The Hon. J.E. Hanson: It's just a great question.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hanson!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:54): I wish to thank the honourable member for his question and his ongoing and continuing interest in this chamber and outside this chamber in Aboriginal affairs. It indeed was an honour to attend the Lowitja O'Donoghue Oration on Tuesday 31 May, hosted by the Don Dunstan Foundation at Adelaide University.

This year, the oration was delivered by the Hon. Linda Burney. It was particularly notable to have Linda Burney speaking on that night. Earlier that day, Linda Burney had been in Canberra and had been elected to the federal Labor front bench at a caucus meeting. The following morning, the Wednesday morning after speaking in Adelaide, Linda Burney travelled back to Canberra to be sworn in as the Minister for Indigenous Australians, the first Aboriginal woman in that position and also ever to serve in a federal cabinet.

To have the now minister come to Adelaide to speak about her vision for reconciliation, amongst all the history-making events that she was part of in Canberra earlier that day and then on the next day, was a distinct honour for South Australia. It is a testament to what a strong partner South Australians, particularly Aboriginal South Australians, now have in the federal government, a minister who will go above and beyond and invest the time in South Australia.

This was the 15th Lowitja O'Donoghue Oration, an annual event hosted by the Don Dunstan Foundation. The event honours Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue, a trailblazing leader and a great South Australian. Born in Indulkana (Iwantja), Lowitja and two of her sisters were taken from their family and community to a mission. It is worth noting and worth remembering that it was institutions around the country and even parliaments in the past that created things like the Aboriginal Protection Board, which removed children like Lowitja from their families.

Remarkably, she went on to lead a varied and trailblazing career. She was a nurse, working for many years at the Royal Adelaide Hospital after initially being refused training there because she was Aboriginal. She worked in the Public Service, including in the state and federal departments for Aboriginal affairs. She chaired the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) after its establishment by the Hawke government, providing a voice for First Nations people across the country.

The annual Lowitja O'Donoghue Oration is an important way to honour this remarkable South Australian and to ensure her legacy of work for Aboriginal people is continued. Minister Linda Burney, like orators before her such as Pat Anderson, Noel Pearson, Marcia Langton and Senator Pat Dodson, forms an important part of this legacy.

I am looking forward to working with the new federal minister, Minister Burney, on many areas that affect and seek to help overcome the disadvantage so many Aboriginal South Australians face. While Lowitja was not able to make it to this year's event herself, it was clear that everyone on that night deeply valued the leadership she has displayed for so many decades in this state and across the nation.

LIVE ANIMAL EXPORT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:57): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development on the topic of the Livestock Act 1997.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Earlier today, the minister claimed that she was not the minister for animal welfare and therefore had no responsibilities for the welfare of sheep and the report that had been done by the federal agricultural department and endorsed by PIRSA. My question to the minister is: what is her understanding of the workings of the Livestock Act 1997, in particular the industry codes of practice, the livestock advisory groups and the roles of inspectors in terms of animal welfare?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:58): I thank the member for her question. She referred in her question to what I said earlier, which I think was in response to her claim that I had said that I have responsibility for live export in this place yesterday. I would like to read out the *Hansard* from yesterday where, in response to the question on whether I would be the lead minister on the issue of live sheep export, I said:

We certainly work as a team on this side of the chamber.

I went on to say:

My colleague in the other place the Hon. Susan Close is the minister with responsibilities for animal welfare.

I think the claim that I said that I was responsible for live export is incorrect, and the member might like to consider withdrawing that. In terms of the other questions that she has asked, if she has interest in all those things, I think we could certainly talk for several hours on that. I am more than happy to meet with her, as I always am, to discuss all those issues, but they are certainly beyond the scope of an answer in question time.

LIVE ANIMAL EXPORT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:59): Supplementary: has the minister read the Livestock Act 1997? Does the minister understand those three categories I outlined in the act and what her role is in administering this act?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:59): I have read all of the incoming briefs upon coming to the position as minister.

LIVE ANIMAL EXPORT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:59): Supplementary: can the minister please tell the council what an inspector does under the Livestock Act 1997?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:59): Certainly. They inspect.

LIVE ANIMAL EXPORT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:00): Supplementary question.

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: From the original answer?

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Yes, from the original answer. Supplementary: can the minister please outline which livestock advisory groups she has met with since becoming a minister?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, you can choose to answer.

An honourable member interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:00): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector regarding Return to Work.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The legislative changes proposed to the Return to Work scheme were prepared by parliamentary counsel at 8.55pm on 14 June 2022. My question to the minister is: was the draft bill approved by cabinet prior to introduction to the other place and, if so, when was it approved by cabinet?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:01): Again, following on from the procedure adopted by my predecessor who stood in this exact place, the Hon. Rob Lucas, I am certainly not going to go into anything that cabinet does or does not decide, but certainly as a general process cabinet gives—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Of course it does. When did cabinet approve it? I am not going to go into any of the deliberations of cabinet.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:01): Supplementary question arising from the answer. The question is very simple: was due process followed?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:01): Yes.

COMMERCIAL FISHING INDUSTRY

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about the government's electronic catch and disposal record project for the commercial fishing industry?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:02): A key component for the management of our precious aquatic resources is ensuring of course that only a certain amount of a species is removed from the water. This ensures that there are plenty of fish left to breed, and maintains the sustainability of our fish stocks. To monitor these quota amounts, commercial fishers are required to complete a catch and disposal record at the end of each trip and forward this information to PIRSA.

Currently, there are still many commercial fisheries who still submit catch and disposal records to PIRSA through a paper-based system, and to enter the information from these records into the relevant systems and ensure that quotas are managed appropriately requires significant time and resources. With the department receiving over 15,000 paper catch and disposal records a year, it was important that a solution was developed to improve the efficiency of this process.

Recently, PIRSA has committed to undertaking a 12-month project to improve the submission of catch and disposal records for the commercial fishing sector. At the end of this process, all quota-managed fisheries will be able to submit catch and disposal records electronically.

This digitised system will be beneficial to both stakeholders and PIRSA in managing our precious marine resources.

This project will result in significant efficiency improvements for industry, and will increase the integrity of the quota management process. As an example, currently the paper-based process can take up to eight days from when the fisher completes their catch and disposal record, submits it to my department and it is entered into the system. This project will see this time significantly reduced to near real-time submissions.

The lack of real-time reporting and the need for manual processes to integrate data from different systems are creating an unnecessary administrative burden on industry as well as on government. This project will enable PIRSA to keep track with other jurisdictions, such as the commonwealth, whose fisheries are well advanced in their digital applications such as for licensing and quota management.

The outcomes of this initiative will result in further benefits to industry, including: near to real-time reporting; improved customer interface; ability to access up-to-date quota balances; improved data integrity; removal of manual data entry errors; more effective management of sector quotas; possibly cost savings as a result of the reduction in resources required to process paper-based forms; and the ability to expand the service in the future as needs and technology dictate.

The commercial fisheries that will be included as part of this project will be: marine scale fish; blue crab; northern zone rock lobster (noting, of course, that southern zone rock lobster already submit their data electronically); central, southern and western zone abalone; sardine; West Coast, Spencer Gulf and Gulf St Vincent prawn; vongole; and pipi.

To provide industry with flexibility in this process and allow them to consider the most appropriate digital solutions for their specific circumstances, they will be provided with several options from which to choose. These options include submission through PIRSA's commercial fishing app, submission through a third-party provider of their choosing, or submission through the PIRSA website and myPIRSA portal.

The government will be investing approximately \$720,000 over the next 12 months to ensure the project's success. My department will be consulting with all the fisheries involved to ensure the success of the transition to this new digital phase for the sector.

I look forward to further improving the services that are available as we implement digital transformation across the sector. Importantly, this project, the first step in digital transformation, is urgently required to meet the growing needs and expectation of industry with respect to red-tape reduction and operational efficiencies.

COMMERCIAL FISHING INDUSTRY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:06): A supplementary: can the minister again confirm the anticipated start time for that digitised program?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:06): We have committed to the 12-month project, and I'm advised that that will be starting imminently. I don't think it's actually up and running yet, but it should be very soon.

COMMERCIAL FISHING INDUSTRY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:06): A further supplementary: is that 12 months in terms of developing the program before it actually commences or 12 months before we see the program come into effect?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:06): My understanding is that I think it is being introduced imminently, but if there is additional information I'm happy to bring that back for the honourable member.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:07): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Industrial Relations a question about the Return to Work scheme.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: During the last sitting week, I asked the minister questions about a bill moved in this place by the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos, namely the Return to Work (Impairment Assessment Guidelines) Amendment Bill, aimed at addressing the manner by which the former industrial relations minister made changes to the guidelines which, in this minister's words, 'drastically change the Impairment Assessment Guidelines that affect some of the most vulnerable injured workers in South Australia'. As we know, that bill passed this chamber with the full support and endorsement of the Labor Party. My questions to the Attorney are:

1. Has the government committed to reverse changes made to the Impairment Assessment Guidelines by the former industrial relations minister? If so, when and how will this occur?

2. Does the minister stand by his commitment in this place to make Impairment Assessment Guidelines disallowable legislative instruments?

3. Does the minister acknowledge the changes by the former government focused almost exclusively on injuries that were the subject of cases where ReturnToWork was unsuccessful in its legal challenges?

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 questions. I am not sure I'm taking them in order but, yes, this government remains committed to making changes to those guidelines as a disallowable legislative instrument, yet many of the guidelines that were published by the former minister in the former government we will seek to reverse. There are a few of those that are acknowledged, I think, by all those who use the scheme as useful parts to give clarification or interpretation on some areas but, yes, by and large we intend to reverse those and make future guidelines disallowable instruments.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:09): A supplementary: how and when will this process of reversing those detrimental guidelines occur or take place?

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 for her question. Of course, one of the criticisms of the guidelines previously was the lack of consultation that is required in making the guidelines. We are committed, as I said, to reversing those ones that are problematic and difficult and make it harder for injured workers.

Some of those that are almost universally agreed to be better for the administration of the scheme we will look to retain. We are looking at that now; given the legislative requirement for guidelines to have consultation, that is something we will be looking at doing. We are committed to doing that and creating a way for changing the legislation to allow for the guidelines in the future to be a disallowable instrument.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:10): Further supplementary: what is the anticipated time frame for those changes?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:10): When there is a firm time line I will be happy to let the honourable member know, but as soon as is reasonably possible.

The PRESIDENT: Final supplementary, the Hon. Ms Bonaros.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:10): Is a reasonable time frame before the deliberations of a bill that we are expected to debate in this place in coming weeks?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:10): In terms of the reversal of old ones, I don't think that is a time line that will be achievable.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:10): My questions are for the minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, regarding Return to Work.

1. When did ReturnToWorkSA request actuarial advice from Finity regarding the proposed changes to the Return to Work scheme?
2. Has Finity provided formal and final advice regarding the 1.9 per cent premium level resulting from the compromise deal, including new aspects of the legislation?
3. Has Finity provided assurance in the operating sustainability of the scheme, should the proposed changes to the Return to Work schedule come into effect?
4. Does ReturnToWorkSA endorse the government's position that the premiums will not rise beyond 1.9 per cent?

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 her question. These are very similar to questions the honourable member asked previously. Again, I think the final question was about giving guarantees for something that is ultimately a board decision, in relation to percentages. I will reiterate what I have said before: the situation that we find ourselves in now is a direct result of the former Liberal government's deliberate policy decision, a deliberate policy decision to do nothing—a deliberate policy decision to do nothing.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The Full Court of the Supreme Court dismissed the application in the Summerfield case in March 2021, well over 12 months ago, 12 months before the last election. The former government made a deliberate policy decision to do nothing about it—a deliberate policy decision to do nothing about it. Their policy was a rate rise estimated at 2.2 per cent. That was the former government's policy.

When you take a deliberate decision to do nothing, when you take a deliberate decision to do nothing in policy—their policy was a rate rise of 2.2 per cent. A rate rise of 2.2 per cent was their deliberate policy. The estimate of the average premium rate for the changes that are being proposed now is 1.9 per cent. That's the difference between what the former government and anyone who sat around the cabinet table of the former government decided, a difference of 2.2 per cent and the estimated rate of 1.9 per cent.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary question, the Hon. Ms Girolamo.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:13): What we are asking for is clarification over the 1.9 per cent, to determine that you have actually sought professional advice—not just advice from your party room but professional advice—around that 1.9 per cent to ensure that it is actually achievable.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:13): Advice has been sought from those who run and manage the scheme and have experience in these things.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary question, the Hon. Mr Hood.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:13): What company did the government engage to provide actuarial advice in this case?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:13): We don't provide them, the ReturnToWork board, and I think Finity are the actuaries that they use in these things.

The PRESIDENT: Further supplementary question, the Hon. Ms Girolamo.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:14): Are we able to table the advice that was provided by Finity?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:14): The internal advice I don't think, I am not aware, has been tabled. Again, I want to repeat: we find ourselves in this situation as a result of one thing—as a result of one thing—and that is the deliberate policy of the former Liberal government, who wanted an average premium rate of 2.2 per cent. That's what the former government wanted. That was their deliberate policy, to go up to 2.2 per cent.

We don't apologise for looking to do something that makes a sensible compromise between a massive premium rate that would have cost hundreds of millions of dollars to small and medium businesses across this state while still maintaining protection for the most seriously injured workers. That wasn't the policy of the former government, but if that's the policy that this opposition wants to continue, good luck to them.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:15): Supplementary: is the Attorney circling around this because there is no independent verification of that number?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:15): No.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Bonaros has a supplementary.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:15): Does that deliberate policy decision arise from changes to the scheme that were made when this government was last in power?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:15): I thank the honourable member for her question. The deliberate policy decision that the Liberal Party took was deciding to have no response to the Summerfield decision. That was their deliberate policy decision.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Further supplementary question, the Hon. Ms Bonaros.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:15): I am going to ask the question again: does that deliberate policy decision arise from changes that were made under the former Labor government?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:16): No, the Liberal Party's deliberate policy decision arises out of their inaction.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:16): Final supplementary: the minister spoke about receiving advice from Finity. Has Finity provided formal advice regarding the 1.9 per cent premium level resulting from the compromise deal, including new aspects of the legislation?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:16): I thank the honourable member. We don't seek advice from actuaries. We seek advice from the ReturnToWork corporation, which makes the estimates on those things, using the experts that they have available.

VICTIM SUPPORT SERVICE

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:16): My question is to the—the performance of the opposition left me stunned.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney-General inform the council about the recent funding announcement for victim support services in the South-East?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:17): I thank the honourable member for his excellent question in relation to victim support services. Having returned with my colleagues, including the Hon. Clare Scriven, who hails from the South-East in Port MacDonnell, to the South-East country cabinet with other members of the cabinet, it was an excellent opportunity to have a look at the important issues that affect regional South Australia, particularly the South-East.

At the community forum that was held, there were hundreds of people and it was standing room only. It showed the huge interest that regional South Australians have in engaging with government after four long years of the former Liberal government scrapping country cabinets and not being able to have that direct engagement.

I think I spoke yesterday of the fact that the members of the Liberal Party laud that one or two have gone to country areas. This is an opportunity in regional areas for regional constituents to hear from the whole of the cabinet and chief executives. It is something that I know when Labor was last in government was very much appreciated by regional South Australia, to have that opportunity to hear not just from the cabinet ministers but also from the chief executives who are there.

It is valuable for people living in the regional areas to get that sort of access to decision-makers, to ministers and to chief executives, but it is also, and perhaps even more so, invaluable for ministers and chief executives, so that they can understand directly the issues that are facing so many people in country areas. That's why I was pleased to be a part of the South-East community cabinet last week, and we had an opportunity to hear not just from constituents but from local decision-makers. It used to be called SELGA and now I think it is the Limestone Coast Local Government Association. The members who make up those local governments from around the South-East presented to cabinet to discuss the issues that are important to them and their associations, which was extraordinarily valuable for both ministers and chief executives alike.

I am especially pleased that in areas where I have responsibility, I was able to meet directly with people involved in those areas. One of those areas is in relation to victim support services and I am very pleased to be the Attorney-General in the Malinauskas government that is boosting victim support services to South Australia and also in particular to the South-East. The Victim Support Service has now received an additional \$250,000 a year for the next four years to better support victims of crime across regional and metropolitan areas of South Australia.

For decades the Victim Support Service has played an invaluable role in supporting victims in this state. It was formed in 1979 and is a world leader in the work it does. The Victim Support Service has been advocating for and delivering high-quality trauma-informed services and justice support for victims of crime and abuse. The current chair of the Victim Support Service, Cecilla White, and the entire team are doing fantastic work developing programs including one around the National

Redress Scheme where adult survivors of institutional childhood abuse are guided through the application process.

These independent and volunteer-run services provide invaluable support to victims as they work their way through the justice system. This new government funding—after it was cut by the last government—to the Victim Support Service will target services right across South Australia, but including specifically to regional South Australia, including Mount Gambier. The funding will facilitate the expansion of existing programs such as court companions, which coordinates volunteers to provide support to victims in court when they provide evidence and are dealing with the justice system. This program is open to adults, children and young people and is a free and confidential service.

I was pleased, as part of my time in the South-East, to meet not just with the CEO of the Victim Support Service but, even more critically, with a number of volunteers in Mount Gambier who provide court companion services. These are people who give up their time to help guide victims of crime and their families and witnesses through the criminal justice system. Some of the work these volunteers do is quite remarkable. They are interacting with people at some of the most distressing times in their lives when they have been victims of serious crime.

I particularly want to pay tribute to the volunteers that I met, but not just the ones that I met in Mount Gambier, the volunteers right across South Australia who give their time particularly for areas like the Victim Support Service and the court companion service. It was also interesting and valuable to hear about how they support each other in terms of providing that support. Obviously, when you are dealing with people going through traumatic experiences, it has an effect on you, and to see the level of support that was provided to each other was welcomed.

The Safer Spaces initiative is another program which will benefit from this funding, in assisting people to disclose, report and navigate the legal system. This program was in fact founded in Mount Gambier through local philanthropic funding from Soroptimist International and OneFortyOne, where six volunteers provided support for the writing of victim impact statements. As people know, the South-East is a number of hours from Adelaide and it is important that these services are provided in a personalised and professional way, as they are by the Victim Support Service.

Matters of Interest

EDUCATIONAL DISADVANTAGE

The Hon. S.L. GAME (15:24): I rise to highlight the intersection of childhood poverty and educational disadvantage. According to Data.SA's index of educational disadvantage (the 2021 listing), out of the 43 most highly disadvantaged schools in South Australia, those classified as tier 1 on the disadvantage index, 31 are based in regional or remote areas. In the second highest ranking, there are 35 regional and remote schools. There is no denying it: there is educational disadvantage in large swathes of regional and rural South Australia.

Multiple peer reviewed journal articles (the examples we viewed dated articles from 1987 through to 2021) all show that, when tracked, multiple levels of educational, social and economic disadvantage linger from childhood to adulthood in what is called 'ongoing co-existing disadvantage'. A child who grew up in poverty in an unstable household with educational disadvantage is more likely to continue to hold those disadvantages throughout their life.

In a practical sense this means, firstly, one in three children from our most disadvantaged communities do not meet one or more key developmental milestones before starting school; in fact, they are likely to perform worse in language and impulse control measures before they even turn two. Secondly, they are likely to be two to three years behind their general cohort in reading and arithmetic throughout their entire schooling. Thirdly, they are likely to remain undiagnosed or underdiagnosed if they have a learning, behavioural or cognitive disorder, or are diagnosed but lack consistent and appropriate access to interventions and therapies. Lastly, their aspirations and opportunities may be narrowed, as they are unlikely to experience the extracurricular activities their peer groups participate in.

There is a net effect to poverty. It encompasses lives, from hunger to housing instability, to mental anguish, to non-attendance and behavioural issues at school. The compounded trauma of net effect is not new or surprising, and there are plenty of studies from both here in Australia and around the world that clearly show that without effective intervention or incredibly good luck a disadvantaged child is more likely than the general population to become a disadvantaged adult.

The statistics vary from study to study—up to over 75 per cent in some of the literature—but there is strong consistency of above a 50 per cent chance of cyclical disadvantage. An international literature review released on 17 May this year indicates clearly that poverty is a leading cause negatively affecting student academic performance and social performance in primary schools. This all sounds very doom and gloom, but all children have an ace up their sleeve: experiences shape learning, and learning can help to shape brain development and cognitive function.

There have been lots of traditional programs aimed at improving learning in a classroom setting. This is a space where teachers have great influence to intervene in outcomes, and these programs remain important. However, programs based on providing positive and diverse experiences outside the classroom are a fantastic way to reset aspirations and build positivity towards learning. It is also invaluable for those children who struggle for one reason or another with classroom-based learning.

Giving children access to extracurricular experiences outside the traditional classroom is what makes lifelong learners. This includes things like being part of a team or club, visiting a museum, gallery or cultural centre, or walking onto a TAFE or university campus for the first time and knowing it is a place they belong. In South Australia we are moving in the right direction. The extension of the school sports voucher to assist families in encouraging kids into sport, the statewide initiatives of the children's university program assisted by the outreach team at the University of Adelaide, and interschool competitions like the Adelaide Eisteddfod or the Oliphant Science Awards.

Heading back to our own regions in South Australia, particularly those with identified educational disadvantage, it is important that there are programs and initiatives giving these children the opportunity to experience activities that city kids take for granted. Creating experiences unique and freely available in our regions will help build aspirations for children with an initial educational disadvantage.

The obvious out-of-classroom experience for children in the regions is sport, which has tremendous benefits, including health and mental wellbeing, team work and fellowship skills. Sports are also safe settings to introduce rules and boundaries, important life skills that are sometimes not available to those in the most disadvantaged of situations, but there are far more avenues for additional experiences. These may be cultural or artistic experiences, working with community elders, special interest clubs, community organisations, local youth boards and council interaction, local newspapers and community radio stations, music, religious groups and social clubs. Our regions are full of innovative and inspiring community leaders, and I look forward to working with them to create new opportunities for children living in country South Australia.

Time expired.

SUPERBUGS

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:29): I would like to speak about the amazing research currently being done into finding a cure for the superbug. I recently attended the annual Australian Society of Medical Research dinner. At that dinner I met three amazing researchers: Dr Katharina Richter, Dr Adrian Abdo and Ms Laurine Kaul. They are all part of a team looking for a cure for the superbug, and I would like to acknowledge their presence today in the gallery.

I am sure you have heard about the rise of superbugs, meaning more and more bacteria like golden staph become resistant to our best medical care with antibiotics. By the year 2050, a person will die every three seconds from a superbug infection. This is more than the number of people dying from cancer and diabetes combined. In the near future, superbugs will account for 10 million deaths every year, causing a \$100 trillion burden to the global economy and pushing 28 million people into poverty.

You may ask: how did we end up in this position? Penicillin, the first antibiotic, was discovered almost 100 years ago. Alexander Fleming, Ernst Chain and our Adelaidean hero Howard Walter Florey received the Nobel Prize for their pioneering discovery, saving millions of lives around the world. Little did they know then how fast resistant superbugs would emerge and spread, leading to a present global healthcare crisis. The first superbug that is resistant to every antibiotic in our treatment portfolio was identified in 2015, and it is only a matter of time until this becomes the next pandemic. Therefore, we really must act now. This is a battle against bacteria and every one of us must face the fight.

One reason why bacteria become resistant to known antibiotics is they live in protective castles called biofilms. Biofilms are clusters of bacteria embedded in a wall of slime. This acts as a fortification that protects bacteria from the immune system and medical treatments and makes them up to 1,000-fold more resistant to antibiotics than single bacteria. Eighty per cent of infections are caused by biofilms, yet best medical care with antibiotics does not kill these superbug biofilms effectively. Millions of people suffer and die from devastating biofilm infections, and a significant number of our aged population has problems with superbugs. We have to ask ourselves: is this what our parents and grandparents deserve, and is this what we want to face when we retire?

Novel treatments are urgently needed and medical research has to strike back. We do not need to look far for cutting-edge science to fill this gap. Researchers at Adelaide University like Dr Katharina Richter and small and medium enterprises like RiBu Plasma are developing innovative treatments that are different from antibiotics. In the pipeline are applications based on cold plasma technology. Plasma is the fourth state of matter and is made of an ionised gas that contains so much energy that superbugs get a deadly lightning strike when it hits them. This has been proven in pre-clinical studies and is soon ready for first trials in humans.

Dr Katharina Richter and the start-up RiBu Plasma have the goal to bring these urgently needed treatments to commercial products that are made right here in Adelaide, to revolutionise infection control and wound care. By leveraging the outstanding facilities of Adelaide BioMed City and the research and development capacity of our universities and hospitals, small and medium enterprises like RiBu Plasma can truly be a game changer in the war on superbugs, but they need our help. To fulfil their mission to improve health care they are looking for allies in this war.

This research is expensive as much as it is important for the health of millions of people. More funding for medical research is needed, as well as smoother, less bureaucratic pathways from the lab to the clinic to the market. This is where we as politicians can make a difference by supporting local research and businesses, creating the right environment for innovators to discover the next penicillin. So let's partner up. This is a war we can only win by working together for a healthier future for all.

BIOSECURITY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:34): So often have I stood up in this place and spoken about biosecurity and its importance to the economic viability of this state, and I do so again today with even greater urgency. South Australia's biosecurity status is one of the state's greatest environmental, economic and social assets. A strong biosecurity regime underpins the quality of South Australian food and wine as well as the integrity of our agricultural and livestock industries.

Biosecurity must be front and centre for the government. It must be front and centre to prevent pests and diseases entering our state. It must be front and centre to mitigate and respond to an outbreak. It must be front and centre to recover from the devastating impacts that pests and diseases leave in their wake: the economic impact, the environmental impact, the impact on primary producers and the impact on local communities. Our leaders must pursue aggressive and well-funded policies to protect South Australia's strong biosecurity status and to ensure continued market access for our state's products. This includes maintaining high standards for any emergency response.

The Liberal government appreciated the importance and value of investing in biosecurity. Over the last four years, we invested heavily in biosecurity measures, measures such as rebuilding the South Australian dog fence, implementing the wild dog trapping program, adopting the Kangaroo

Island feral pig eradication project and supporting weed control services. More than \$70 million was committed to the fight against fruit fly to protect the state's \$1.3 billion horticultural industry, to protect jobs, to protect businesses and to protect the fresh food supply chain.

The Liberal government put biosecurity front and centre. The contrast to the first Malinauskas Labor government budget could not be starker. Not only was funding for fruit fly eradication response reduced to just \$13 million in 2022-23 compared with \$33 million in our last year of the Liberal government but the biosecurity targets listed on the budget for 2022-23 failed to include foot-and-mouth disease. This is despite the devastating foot-and-mouth disease outbreak in Indonesia, the imminent threat to our livestock industry and an agricultural industry on high alert. It is absurd and it simply is not good enough.

When it comes to biosecurity, we must be proactive not reactive. We know the fight against fruit fly continues. We know Japanese encephalitis has been detected. We know other threats are either here already or have the potential to arrive. We do not need to find ourselves scrambling to react to an outbreak. If we prioritise, if we work with industry and if we commit resources effectively and efficiently, we can put ourselves in a position of strength. We must be vigilant and invest in our state's biosecurity.

Last week, the New South Wales government committed an additional \$164 million to address growing biosecurity concerns that threaten its agricultural industry. The funding was provided in response to the outbreaks of lumpy skin and foot-and-mouth disease in Indonesia. The New South Wales Deputy Premier and Minister for Regional New South Wales, Paul Toole, said:

We want to make sure biosecurity does not become the next big issue.

The \$164 million in funding will go towards developing vaccines, improving surveillance and testing resources and more effectively managing pests. I commend the New South Wales government for their commitment to ensuring their state's agricultural industry is better equipped in the future to respond to any outbreaks. As a government, they acknowledge the importance of investing in biosecurity. They acknowledge the importance of protecting the thousands of farmers and farming families that contribute to their state's economy.

The New South Wales government appreciates that biosecurity practices and procedures must evolve and adapt to provide primary industries and farmers with the best tools to manage biosecurity risks and to prepare against the threat of disease and pests. In South Australia, it is disappointing that we are seeing the opposite with the new Labor government. Instead of increasing biosecurity funding, the Malinauskas Labor government has reduced spending on biosecurity. Where is our government's investment in additional biosecurity measures? Where is our government's investment in the state's agricultural future?

These are important questions that the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development needs to answer in this chamber on behalf of her government. The minister and her government must acknowledge that their failure to prioritise biosecurity is a mistake, and they must do so and make amends before it is too late.

DUST DISEASES

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (15:38): I would like to take this opportunity to speak about a topic that is very important to me, and that is the topic of dust diseases. In the late 1960s, the government closed the Osborne power station and engaged a company to demolish the site. As we would hope companies would do today, they wanted to not just demolish the site but they wanted to recycle, reuse, scrap and sell as much of the metal from the premises as they could.

They engaged about 10 young men, aged in their late teens and early 20s, to do the work. Most were from the Port Adelaide area, and from a low socio-economic area. They jumped at the opportunity to have a well-paying job as there were not many around, and for these young men from around the area a well-paying job was something they were not used to, and they were not inclined to raise any matters of safety if doing so could cause them to lose their job.

So after pulling apart a lot of the machinery that had been used in the power station it came time to tackle one of the more difficult tasks, and that was to make sure that the steam pipes that were throughout the site could be scrapped and resold. What they needed to do was to get rid of all

the thick, white material that was attached to these steam pipes. The material was used to insulate the pipes and was so well adhered to the pipes that the young men needed power saws and hammers to chip off the white fibrous material.

But what these young men did not know at the time, and what no-one told them, was that the white material covering these pipes was asbestos. And for at least one of these workers this short-term job would have lifetime consequences, and that person was my father, Brian Martin. He tells the story that when knocking off what he now knows to have been asbestos from the pipes there was so much asbestos dust in the air that it looked like it was snowing. For some of the workers the dust became so bad that they threw bolts that they found lying on the floor through the upper windows to try to get some air circulating.

Fast forward 30 years and my father is diagnosed with asbestosis. It was both bad luck in that he had got one of the barbed asbestos fibres in his lungs but also good luck in that it had not turned cancerous. It had, however, caused some damage to his lungs and at that stage he had lost about 25 per cent of his lung capacity, but with most dust diseases there is no chance of it getting better and these health issues would need to be managed for the rest of his life.

Over the past six months, another 10 years after the original diagnosis, the damage has now gone from 25 per cent to about 75 per cent loss of his lung capacity and he is now permanently on oxygen. What has always troubled my family is at the time there was a lot of information out there about the hazards of asbestos with cases of asbestosis and other dust disease issues dating back to the late 1800s in England.

It is a true tragedy that my father's experience, and that of tens of thousands of other Australians, could have been avoided if governments had acted faster to address the risk posed by asbestos. Despite there being overwhelming scientific evidence in Australia from as early as the 1930s that asbestos was carcinogenic, and the primary cause of asbestosis and mesothelioma, Australia did not move to completely ban asbestos until December 2003.

While there are no official figures on how many people die in Australia each year from causes associated with asbestos-related diseases, it is estimated that there are over 4,000 deaths per year directly attributable to asbestos exposure, and this is a figure that should shock us all. It is with this figure in mind that I raise the dangers of a more modern dust disease, silicosis. A report released in 2019, the Safe Work Australia Occupational Lung Diseases Report, identified an increasing number of cases of an accelerated and rapidly progressive form of silicosis emerging among engineered stone workers.

In response to concerns about this rise in silicosis, the National Dust Disease Taskforce was convened to examine the re-emergence of silicosis as an occupational dust disease. The taskforce identified that modern-day silicosis is primarily caused by the inhalation of the silica generated when cutting, grinding or polishing engineered stone materials that are now so often used when renovating kitchens.

The final report found that an astonishing one in four stone workers are now suffering from silicosis or other silica-related dust diseases. It found that the laws and regulations have failed to adequately protect the health of workers and it requires urgent reform. It notes that, like asbestos, the health effects of silica exposure can take many years to develop, so there are a number of people already at risk although they do not yet know it.

Before time expires, I would just like to say that we cannot sit idly by and place another generation of young workers at risk, and I am glad that this government is taking action and has committed funds to assist with the education and awareness of dust diseases.

GREENSLIDE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:44): I rise to talk about the 'Greenslide' that we have just seen in both the federal and state elections this year, and what that means for politics in Australia moving forward. It is clear that the community's appetite for the two major parties has diminished. The third party nationally now is the Greens, where we have achieved here 12 per cent of the vote. We now have more elected Greens MPs than ever before, and I will note that the Greens, where they have

taken those seats in lower houses, are not known for losing those seats once we have picked them up. Indeed, the Greens are here to stay, and we are here to grow.

We picked up three new seats in the federal lower house, all in Queensland, or 'Greensland', as we like to call it now. New South Wales and Victoria have also seen us come close in other seats such as Richmond and MacNamara—not what once would have been thought typical Greens heartlands. People are backing the Greens in greater numbers than ever before. We have a massive mandate to act on the climate crisis and the inequality crisis, and this is just the beginning for our ever-growing movement.

What is being demonstrated by the Greens, and by our candidates and our volunteers, is that we can do politics differently. Going out and talking to people, meeting them where they are actually at, and listening to the issues that matter to them, is bringing people back into politics and showing them that we can achieve real, positive outcomes in their communities. In a time where people are more disillusioned, disaffected and disappointed by status quo-politics, this is a revolutionary thing.

These successes, the Greens' successes, are a reminder not only of the kind of representation people want in their politics but also of what we can collectively achieve when we are all committed to a politics that is truly representative of our community. The biggest asset the political establishment—the old parties, the vested interests—have is that people have low expectations of them. We have reached a quite depressing point in our political debate, and in politics at large, where people no longer expect politics to improve their lives at all. Our politics remind people that power does not have to be this way: power for and power from, rather than power over, is the way of the future.

Politics can and should materially improve our lives. Hope, and large-scale and long-term vision, is making people come back to politics, to community involvement, and the Greens have been part of facilitating that change. During those last elections we did not have a narrow platform, a small target for the next four years. Indeed, we did not focus on just maintaining the status quo. Instead, we talked to people about what our state and our nation could look like not just in 10 years or 15 years but well and truly into a meaningful and bright future.

We talked about the transformational effect that progressive politics and representation can have, and we reminded people that in a wealthy country like Australia everyone should, and can, have a good life. We need to get back to the basics of good health care, education, a livable income, housing and a safe climate. We were honest with the voters: we know that real, meaningful, lasting and positive change does take time, and it is hard, but what is quite incredible about the recent election results, what is so bright about the future we have moving forward, is that people have chosen to take that first step with us. They are certainly choosing lasting, positive change.

The message is clear to the old parties: let go of your sense of entitlement. These seats do not belong to you or your party, they belong to the people you represent. If you no longer represent them, and if you no longer represent their values, they will vote for somebody who will. Every day people are rediscovering that their power in politics is in their voices and in their communities.

What is clear is that blue ribbon seats are no longer safe. Those seats are becoming more of a three-cornered contest than ever before, and I must say that I am also excited for the future of the Greens in this state as we see, right now, a by-election in Bragg. Once a blue ribbon seat for over 50 years, held by only three Liberal members, there is a real chance that in a three-cornered contest Bragg can be given back to the people of Bragg, that their voices can be heard in the other place in this parliament and that their votes will no longer be taken for granted.

We have a great candidate in Jim Bastiras and he is already demonstrating, as we have known for some time, that people want politics done differently.

ROTARY CLUB OF ADELAIDE CENTRAL

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:49): It is a great honour to rise today to congratulate the Rotary Club of Adelaide Central. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council and as the shadow minister for communities, I had the honour and pleasure of representing the leader of the Liberal party, the Hon. David Speirs, on 1 June 2022 at the civic reception at the Adelaide Town Hall.

I want to thank Lord Mayor Sandy Verschoor, Councillor Jesse Khera and the City of Adelaide team for hosting the reception to celebrate the formation of the Rotary Club of Adelaide Central.

The reception marked the celebration of a combined 100 years of 'Service Above Self' to communities by the Rotary Clubs of Adelaide West and Adelaide South, which amalgamated in 2020 to form a new force for the future. It was a wonderful opportunity for me to catch up with so many community leaders and great friends from the Rotary Club of Adelaide Central, including the inaugural president, Glenda Sherwin-Lane; youth services director, Cathy Chong AM; membership and marketing director, Bill Marles; and guest speaker coordinator, David Griggs; among the many dedicated board members and distinguished guests.

Please allow me to speak briefly about the history of Rotary. In 1905, founder Paul Percy Harris, with his business colleagues, established Rotary with the initial goal of creating a club of professionals and businessmen for friendship and fellowship. Soon, Paul Harris realised that Rotary needed a greater purpose. When Paul Harris was elected as the third president of the Chicago Rotary Club in 1907, the club initiated its first public service project, which was the construction of public toilets in Chicago. This step transformed Rotary into the world's first service club.

In July 1910, Paul Harris married a wonderful Scotswoman named Jean Thomson. She supported the organisation but was never allowed to join because she was a woman. However, they became a formidable team. Jean travelled the world with Paul Harris in support of Rotary. She helped to make women an important part of Rotary, eventually leading to all Rotary clubs admitting women as full members.

Over the period of 117 years, Rotary International has grown to over 46,000 member clubs worldwide, spreading over 200 countries and territories, with a global network membership of 1.4 million individuals, neighbours, friends, leaders and problem solvers known very proudly as Rotarians, who see a world where people unite and take action to create lasting change across the globe and in our local communities.

Solving real problems takes real commitment and vision. Rotarians are people of action and are using their passion, energy and skills to do something important and to take action on sustainable projects. From literacy and peace to water and health, hardworking Rotarians around the world have worked on projects that make a difference and improve lives for over 110 years.

It is a great honour to have the opportunity to place my special thanks on the public record and acknowledge the Rotary Club of Adelaide Central as they celebrate a combined 100 years in the amalgamation of the Rotary Clubs of Adelaide West and Adelaide South. It is indeed fabulous to see that the members of both Rotary clubs have decided to come together to share and enrich their knowledge and experience to run a range of worthy projects to continue the great work of Rotarians by supporting a range of local and overseas projects.

Over the years, Rotary Club of Adelaide Central has donated significant amounts of time, money, products and expertise to a wide range of causes identified by their members, including \$300,000 worth of cash and products to worthy local and overseas projects. The Rotary Club of Adelaide Central has donated food and products from the Adelaide Central Market traders to support four Adelaide homelessness charities, worth over \$150,000 over the last 11 years.

The club has successfully organised many fundraising activities as well; the list goes on and on. My congratulations go to the amazing team and members of the Rotary Club of Adelaide Central. I wish them all the very best as they embark on a bright new future by building on 100 years of foundation.

PERIOD POVERTY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:53): Evidence about the impact period poverty is having on the lives of young women is growing by the day. It is why the Queensland government announced last week that all its state schools will be given the opportunity to receive a dignity vending machine, which provides free period products to students, after a \$13.3 million commitment in next week's state budget.

The Queensland premier correctly stated that access to essential period products should never be a barrier to learning. Making the announcement, she said:

Access to period products and misplaced stigma around periods should never be issues students face at school. We know providing access to free period products can make a real difference, especially for students whose families are doing it tough, have unstable accommodation or are fleeing domestic and family violence.

Her announcement comes as new research reveals period pain is taking a toll on girls' academic performance, as they report not being taught enough about menstruation before their first period. Western Sydney University surveyed more than 5,000 girls aged between 13 and 25, who reported that menstrual health literacy has a direct impact on young people's quality of life, health, academic and professional performance.

So the problem is twofold: schools need to improve the way they teach young girls (and boys) about the impacts of periods while also ensuring they have access to free sanitary items at school to prevent young women from having to skip school because they are menstruating and do not have the necessary products available to them.

It breaks my heart to think that young girls across the country continue to go to school without the necessary period products for something as natural as a period or, worse still, are not attending school at all because a family cannot afford to purchase any of these sorts of products. The access to and use of these products in schools has to be normalised. Over 60,000 South Australian households are living below the poverty line, so this is a reality for many families.

Three years ago, the Commissioner for Children and Young People released a major report, *Leave No One Behind*, which highlighted the impact of period poverty on South Australian schoolkids. We are still talking about that report. She followed this up with an in-depth report entitled *Menstruation Matters* a year later, after surveying and speaking with more South Australian students. We are still talking about that report.

Our end goal must be to mirror a world-leading initiative in Scotland, where period products are free for anyone who needs them, whether that be at school, university, a community club or a domestic and family violence shelter. As members of this chamber know, in 2019 and again in 2020 I introduced a co-sponsored private members' bill in this place which sought to establish a pilot program in 15 South Australian schools for the provision of hygiene products. The second bill passed the upper house but languished in the lower house.

In the meantime, the former education minister rolled out a lame trial at disadvantaged schools to the tune of \$10,000 per school. Confusingly, schools were free to spend the grant money in any way they chose, so there was very little in terms of accountability. Following the trial in February 2021, the then Liberal state government announced it was allocating \$450,000 over three years to provide sanitary products to school students from year 5 upwards.

When you consider that amounts to just \$3 per student per year, we obviously still have a long way to go. That is probably one box of tampons or pads on special at Kmart or Coles or a chemist. It would have been so much better had the Liberal government of the day got on board with that co-sponsored bill in 2019. Back then, SA could have led the nation in this area of providing free period products for public school students. Like many other things, it failed.

Since then, Victoria has taken the front running, committing \$20 million—compared to \$450,000—in 2022 to installing dispensing machines in its over 1,500 public schools. And now the Queensland government has followed suit. A wonderful opportunity now exists for the Malinauskas government to follow in the footsteps of its interstate Labor counterparts and make period products freely available in South Australian schools. It supported my proposal in opposition. It co-sponsored that proposal in opposition and now it is time to step up to the plate in government and do precisely the same. Its support for a bill for a permanent rollout of the provision of period products in all South Australian schools is an absolute must.

Motions

STALKING VICTIMS

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:00): I move:

That this council recognises that—

1. According to the 2016 data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, one in 15 men and one in six women are victims of stalking in Australia;
2. The stalking figures are likely an under-representation of the true scope of people affected by stalking;
3. Stalking victims are often reluctant to report the behaviour of the perpetrator for fear of retaliation by the perpetrator;
4. Police are not resourced adequately to deal with stalking in South Australia and victims are often left to prove their own case at their own expense such as fitting CCTV cameras, installing car cameras or paying for a private investigator;
5. It can be difficult to prove a case of stalking due to the wording in the legislation that requires proof of intent to frighten or harm the victim;
6. The fear of violence is among the most common and debilitating concerns faced by stalking victims;
7. Many abusers use stalking to intimidate and control their victims;
8. There is a real and frighteningly significant connection between stalking and violent assault;
9. There is a significant connection between stalking and intimate partner homicide;
10. In many cases victims are stalked for years with no resolution; and
11. More needs to be done to assist victims of stalking in South Australia.

There is no such thing as a typical stalker. According to a 2012 study, stalking is a behaviour that falls under the umbrella of symptoms for various disorders. This study listed motivations for stalking to include a delusional belief in romantic destiny, a desire to reclaim a prior relationship, a sadistic urge to torment the victim or a psychotic over-identification with the victim and the desire to replace him or her.

Obsessive behaviours come via a host of mental health disorders and disabilities. The same study also noted that stalkers can fall under a variety of diagnoses including psychotic disorders, personality disorders, such as narcissistic personality disorder, and delusional disorders such as erotomania, which is a belief that another person—often a prestigious or famous person—is in love with you. A 2018 study which interviewed over 300 prosecuted stalkers noted that over half had a substance disorder, which again notes to the addictive personality traits often exhibited.

The stalking itself can take multiple forms and is often unpredictable. A stalker can change tactics suddenly, escalate or de-escalate, it can be active and aggressive, it can be subtle and creepy. Current legislation is not equipped to keep up with the random and changing nature of stalking and, most importantly, it cannot protect victims from future harm.

The current legislation is reactive, not able to pre-empt or to enforce upon initiative. In some cases, horrendously, people need to be physically hurt or even killed before police are able to take action. Alarmingly, we found 17 journal articles, all published within the last 15 years, that describe the ongoing psychological impact all this pressure has on the victims. The studies report high rates of post-traumatic stress symptoms, anxiety, depression and suicide ideation, as well as a higher than average presentation for specialist assistive psychological services than the general population.

The current legislation is very difficult to enforce due to the key wording of 'requiring proof of intent to frighten or harm the victim'. If the stalker's current modus operandi involves stuffing hundreds of pages of love letters into a letterbox there is no clear intent to frighten or harm. Again, flurries of text messages, sometimes over 30 within the space of minutes, declaring how someone cannot live without you, is not displaying an intent to cause harm or an intent to frighten them.

But it is frightening and it is distressing. I know this because I have a stalker. Due to the current legislation, the burden fell on me to prove that this was happening and that my family's life was under threat. For victims of stalking without access to resources or the ability to borrow money to obtain those resources, they have next to no hope of ever bringing the nightmare to an end under the current system.

The Legal Services Commission of South Australia admits in their online law handbook that there has been 'considerable concern over the inability of the police to intervene where a person "stalks" someone', and that:

It is very difficult to prove a person is guilty of stalking as the police will have to show that these behaviours occurred on at least two separate occasions...

And also that:

In some instances the mental element of the stalker is more squarely focused on 'possessiveness' and 'love' rather than any intention to cause serious physical or mental harm or serious apprehension or fear.

Thousands of stalking victims do not have the resources, energy and self-advocacy to push for systemic reform. They feel a true fear that taking action would incentivise the stalker into retaliating with violent and damaging behaviour. I intend to utilise my position of great privilege here in the Legislative Council to represent all victims of stalking and to advocate for systemic change to the legislation, to better protect victims and to prevent future harm, and to believe the victims first and foremost.

These situations cannot be allowed to drag on for years, destroying confidence and quite literally putting a halt to victims' lives. South Australian families deserve better and I promise I will bring this matter back to the chamber with actionable legislative proposals. I commend the motion to members.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. N.J. Centofanti.

Bills

WORK HEALTH AND SAFETY (CRYSTALLINE SILICA DUST) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:05): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Work Health and Safety Act 2012. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:05): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise today to introduce this bill that would ban any work in South Australia that would expose people to crystalline silica dust. This is not the first time I have raised in this place concerns about the consequences of exposure to crystalline silica dust, but over the years we have seen increasing warnings about the consequences of inaction, and we have seen continued inaction or inadequate action on addressing the problem. The Greens therefore seek to put an end to manufactured or engineered stone in South Australia because of its inherent health and safety risks to workers and others involved in its production.

Complete bans on a product can be fiddly to do, of course, at a state level, so we have chosen to put a ban on the exposure of persons to crystalline silica dust. The penalties are in line with category 2 offences under the Work Health and Safety Act 2012. Engineered stone is made from processed quartz, a material containing silica levels as high as 90 per cent, or twice the amount found in granite.

When slabs are cut and finished to fit, large quantities of silica particles are released into the air. Without proper protection, workers inhale this fine crystalline dust, leading to silicosis, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), lung cancer or kidney disease, and alarmingly young workers are being diagnosed with these. Silicosis or scarring of the lungs is a serious, incurable lung disease, and it is caused by the inhalation of crystalline silica dust. In severe cases, damage to the lungs caused by silicosis can require a lung transplant or may even lead to death.

Estimates hold that 230 people per year develop lung cancer as a result of silica dust exposure at work. There have been warnings that these cases are likely and probably will be far more widespread over the next few years. The standard response to the silicosis epidemic is that

workers should use control measures and personal protection. However, there is actually increasing evidence that dust control measures do not reduce the level of silica to non-hazardous levels.

Many companies also use a mixture of dry and wet cutting, particularly when installing the products. As with asbestos, there is simply no way to safely use this material. Manufactured stone is considered so dangerous that the industry that sells it cannot get product liability insurance. We have seen from inquiries interstate—and I do commend the work of my colleague in New South Wales, the former Hon. David Shoebridge, now Senator-elect David Shoebridge of the Greens, for his wonderful work in bringing these issues to light. This is a global first and it cannot be ignored.

If a building product cannot get insurance because of its risk of killing people, then it should not be for sale, it should not be manufactured and people should not be being exposed to it, whether they are the ones actively producing it or being exposed to its by-products and manufacture in other ways. Insurers are looking at the long game, and they can see that manufactured stone is a product that will bring a surge of future litigation. It is time that all politicians took note of that and not just the dollars it will cost but, more importantly, the lives it will take.

There is serious risk of history repeating itself here. We have seen where this leads before with James Hardie and asbestos victims: long drawn-out court battles, more unnecessary suffering and injured workers, and then their families being short-changed on compensation payouts, and of course those payouts never truly compensating for the loss of their loved ones.

Silicosis is already killing workers with young families, affecting people whose entire lives should be ahead of them. According to the CFMEU, nearly one in four engineered stone workers who have been in the industry since 2018 are suffering from silicosis or some other dust-related disease. If one in four workers in any other industry were being poisoned by their work environment, there would be widespread outrage and demands for action. It should be no different for stone and construction workers.

The AWU national secretary, Daniel Walton, has previously warned that approximately 600,000 workers in Australia are currently exposed to silica dust and that we will 'see a tsunami of silicosis in the coming years and decades if swift preventative, regulatory and compensatory measures are not quickly adopted by governments to protect workers exposed to silica dust'. Manufactured stone is not essential to our economy or to our society. It is currently in fashion, but it has really only existed since the 1990s and we have done quite well without it for a long time. If it is quite literally killing and harming our workers, we can do without it again.

What is worse is that, while the workday for many of those workers might end at 5pm, the ongoing risks and hazards of crystalline silica dust follow them home. They follow them home to their friends, to their families, to anyone they spend time with. Currently, a lot of the risks of silica dust are managed by requiring workers to use wet-cutting techniques when cutting manufactured stone to prevent dust particles becoming airborne. However, the sludge produced when wet cutting does eventually dry, turning back into a powder and becoming airborne once again.

Workers can wear a mask, but if they have facial hair that sticks out of that mask then the dust gets caught in it and the mask is rendered essentially useless. Dust is then dried on their boots, on their clothes, on their protective gear, on everything. You take that dust home with you. You take that dust with you to the shops. You take that dust as you drive around in your car. You take these dust particles that are so tiny that you cannot meaningfully get rid of them once they are airborne or embedded in your clothes or your belongings. You take it with you.

Of course, the risk of being exposed to silica dust and the risk of developing silicosis is not limited just to workers producing or cutting manufactured stone. There are real risks to people living near quarries. For example, I ask the chamber to think back to some of the myriad debates we have had in this place on White Rock Quarry. When the White Rock Quarry expansion was being proposed members of that community voiced their rightful concern and outrage. Their quality of life was being directly impacted by this quarry being in such close proximity to their homes.

There were health concerns, as the quarry produces respirable crystalline silica, or RCS, which is known to cause silicosis. Bear in mind that according to the Cancer Council there are no safe levels of RCS inhalation. What is even more concerning is that, while we have workplace

standards for exposure to silica dust, inadequate as they may be, there are actually no standards for people exposed by the nature of where they live. Indeed, the workplace standards of some eight hours of exposure per day are no comfort to residents with non-existent standards, as their exposure is actually 24/7 potentially.

It took 70 years for Australia to ban all forms of asbestos. We need to learn from that disaster and immediately ban artificial stone. We cannot just continue to let Australian workers die so that we can have cheap, fashionable kitchens. We cannot continue to expose workers and residents to respirable silica dust when we know that there are no safe levels of exposure. Control measures have consistently failed. We have to try something else. We have to act. I commend this bill to the council.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon N.J. Centofanti.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (NAZI SYMBOL PROHIBITION) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:15): Introduced a bill for an act to amend the Summary Offences Act 1953. Read a first time.

Second Reading

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise to introduce my amendment bill on Nazi symbol prohibition to the Summary Offences Act 1953. There are strong reasons why this law should be introduced in South Australia. For anyone who thinks this is a minor issue, please take a closer look.

Sticker campaigns brandishing the Hakenkreuz have littered Adelaide Stobie poles and university campuses of the past few years. These same stickers were out in force during the recent state election campaign, slapping hate symbols on the corflutes of people in this very room. Only last week, *The Advertiser* ran a full-page article on a convicted Neo-Nazi who was actively spreading hate messaging from his prison cell. The week before, there was national reporting of an auction of various Nazi memorabilia and paraphernalia, people making money buying and selling historical items not for the purpose of education and historical categorising but for celebrating this horrific time.

This movement is active worldwide, and it is gaining ground. There is a swell of activity through social media and the dark web across continents, spreading Nazi ideologies and fostering a hatred of Jews. This movement openly denies the impact of the Holocaust and celebrates the worst kind of fascism this world has witnessed.

This growing problem is acknowledged by our peers interstate. In Queensland, the Palaszczuk Labor government has introduced similar legislation. In Victoria, the Andrews Labor government has introduced similar legislation. In New South Wales, Chris Minns, Labor Leader of the Opposition, has announced similar legislation very recently. Finally, in Tasmania, the Attorney-General, Elise Archer, from the Liberal government, also announced this week that they are introducing this legislation.

I have consulted widely with the Jewish community. Many young Jewish adults are extremely hesitant to identify publicly as Jewish as they genuinely fear for their safety. No South Australian should have to live like that. People should be able to celebrate their heritage, not have to hide it for fear of Neo-Nazis and hate-based violence. Banning Nazi symbols is one tool law enforcement can utilise to deny Neo-Nazis and antisemites one part of their communication campaign. Similar bills that have been introduced in Queensland, Victoria, New South Wales and 17 countries worldwide have adopted this ban of Nazi symbolism and memorabilia on a national level.

This bill and others similar elsewhere offer protection against offence and distress for Jewish people and really for anyone who abhors the disgusting and terrible annihilation of six million people in Europe during World War II. Where this legislation differs slightly to other jurisdictions in Australia is the tightening of some of the definitions. One adaption is inserting a grandfathering clause around body modifications. Currently, no state has attempted to prosecute someone who currently has a

Hakenkreuz openly tattooed on their body, but here, once this bill is adopted, the new scarification, branding or implantation of a Hakenkreuz will be illegal moving forward.

Another tweak, as we learned from interstate and overseas legislation in action, is tightening the loopholes around the defence of hate thinly veiled as art. Section 35B(3) tightens the definition of 'legitimate public purpose'. A Hakenkreuz may be displayed as part of an art gallery's installation on, say, the effects of war on women or a museum's historical display on the cause of European migrations. There are no concerns for these kinds of institutions when the display of symbols is for legitimate public purpose. However, someone spray-painting a Hakenkreuz on a bridge along with the words, 'Don't believe the big lie', which has occurred in another jurisdiction, cannot hide behind the defence that their graffiti was art and therefore legal under the act.

Some jurisdictions are also currently reviewing the act and tightening the same loopholes as we have. Brazil, for example, has a suite of amendments currently under review, and I am watching these with close interest. Additionally, the South Australian law gives protection to police officers doing their jobs in the removal of such imagery. These strengthening laws are outlined in 35C and have been drafted based on outcomes from interstate and international applications.

The only Nazi imagery you should find in South Australia is in exhibits devoted to understanding the horror of the period, and I commend the bill to members.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. E.S. Bourke.

Motions

WORLD ELDER ABUSE AWARENESS DAY

The Hon. S.G. WADE (16:21): I am delighted to move the motion standing in my name:

That this council—

1. Notes that 15 June is World Elder Abuse Awareness Day;
2. Notes that elder abuse may be physical, social, financial, psychological or sexual and can include mistreatment and neglect;
3. Acknowledges the importance of being aware of the behaviours and signs of elder abuse;
4. Congratulates the former Marshall Liberal government on the establishment of the Adult Safeguarding Unit to make it easier for the community to report suspected or actual cases of abuse or neglect of vulnerable adults; and
5. Acknowledges the ongoing work of the Adult Safeguarding Unit in safeguarding the rights of adults at risk of abuse.

Today is World Elder Abuse Awareness Day, an annual opportunity to promote awareness of the insidious nature of elder abuse and as a community to recommit our determination to eliminate elder abuse. At a time when people are said to be more connected than ever, many Australians, particularly older Australians, feel lonely, vulnerable to abuse, even unsafe.

In recent years, the social, community and economic impacts of elder abuse have been laid bare by families, by whistleblowers, by the media, by services, by the parliament, and by the community. Elder abuse has come firmly into the spotlight. In South Australia, that spotlight exposed the shameful failings of the Weatherill Labor government for the care of residents in the Oakden aged-care facility. These patients were some of the most vulnerable members of the South Australian community and they suffered abhorrent abuse at the hands of services that were meant to be there to care for them.

One in 20 older Australians is experiencing some form of abuse at the hands of someone they know and trust. Data shows that in South Australia the majority of people experiencing abuse are women aged over 65 and that their abusers are most often their adult sons and daughters. Older people and other vulnerable adults often feel very uncomfortable calling the police in relation to a matter that may involve a member of their own family. That is why the Marshall Liberal government moved to establish a unit that is both approachable and empowered with the capacity to investigate and pursue matters, but that can work in a positive and wideranging way to help restore relationships.

Many older Australians feel much more comfortable engaging such an agency rather than the police. Anybody can ring the unit on 1800 372 310, whether they seek advice or information or in fact they want to make a report in relation to suspected or actual abuse. As part of its 2018 election commitments, the Marshall Liberal government introduced rights-based adult safeguarding legislation which established the Adult Safeguarding Unit, the first of its kind in Australia.

The unit has been operating since 1 October 2019 and has statutory responsibility to respond to reports of abuse or neglect of vulnerable adults. In response to the recommendation of the Safeguarding Task Force, the Marshall government brought forward the expansion of the legal mandate of the unit to include responding to reports of abuse or neglect of adults living with a disability two years ahead of its scheduled commencement, with the revised commencement date of 1 October 2020.

A key focus of the unit's work is minimising harm and intervening early, supporting multiagency coordination and information sharing, and placing the vulnerable adult at the centre of decisions. The unit has the power to investigate issues and require information to be provided by a range of organisations, including state government agencies or services.

The Adult Safeguarding Unit has a strong focus on the prevention of abuse through early intervention, community awareness and education. As part of this focus, engagement has occurred with culturally and linguistically diverse communities to seek advice and guidance on the delivery of culturally appropriate services as well as the development of culturally appropriate educational material. As part of its early intervention focus, from 1 October 2019 to 31 December 2021 the unit undertook 152 presentations to a diverse range of stakeholders, including community members, non-government and government organisations.

It is still early days—two and a half years—and while much has been achieved there is much more to be done. Considerable work has occurred to support the unit's operations, including formalising clear reporting pathways, the development of memoranda of administrative agreements with key stakeholders, a code of practice, a charter of rights and freedoms of vulnerable adults, and an annual community education campaign focused on raising community awareness about the unit as well as reinforcing the rights of vulnerable South Australians.

The Adult Safeguarding Unit complements a range of promotion and prevention initiatives undertaken by the Office for Ageing Well under the Marshall Liberal government. This included awareness campaigns such as the Stop Elder Abuse campaign. In South Australia half of all cases of elder abuse are financial, that is why the unit has worked with the banking and real estate sectors to try to combat this form of abuse.

Frontline financial services staff are in a prime position to pick up on unusual financial transactions on the accounts of older clients which may, in fact, be elder abuse. Real estate agents may also notice that family members or others are controlling a property transaction to the detriment of an older person, and they may also suspect financial abuse, but these practitioners may not know what to do or where to go for advice or support. That is why the Office for Ageing Well provides comprehensive information to the sector to help them identify the signs of elder abuse and to feel confident about where to go for advice, whether this is through their managers and individual workplace processes and procedures or through avenues such as the Adult Safeguarding Unit.

In conclusion, I commend this motion to the house. Certainly this house has had a longstanding bipartisan or multipartisan commitment to dealing with elder abuse, demonstrated in the strong support for the adult safeguarding legislation in 2018. Our work continues on this World Elder Abuse Awareness Day. This is not only an opportunity to continue to raise awareness of this insidious phenomenon but also, as a community and, to be frank, as a parliament, to recommit ourselves to doing what we can to eliminate elder abuse.

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

ANTISEMITISM

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. S.L. Game:

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

(Continued from 1 June 2022.)

The Hon. J.S. LEE (16:29): I rise today on behalf of the opposition to speak to the private member's motion moved by the Hon. Sarah Game. This motion calls on the Legislative Council to endorse and adopt the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance definition of antisemitism, together with its contemporary examples.

The International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA), formerly named the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research, was initiated in 1998 with the objective of uniting governments and experts to strengthen, advance and promote Holocaust education research and remembrance. Today, IHRA's membership consists of 35 member countries, each of whom recognise that international political coordination is imperative to strengthen the moral commitment of societies and to combat growing Holocaust denial and antisemitism.

IHRA experts determined that, in order to begin to address the problems of antisemitism, there must be clarity about what antisemitism is. IHRA's Committee on Antisemitism and Holocaust Denial worked to build an international consensus around a non-legally binding working definition of antisemitism, which was subsequently adopted by the plenary in March 2016. The contemporary examples of antisemitism outlined in the motion are intended to serve as illustrations to guide IHRA in its work to combat antisemitism.

Honourable members may be aware that Australia officially became the 33rd member of IHRA on 4 June 2019. The Australian government also officially endorsed the IHRA working definition of antisemitism in October 2021. Honourable members in this place on many occasions continue to inform the public about the devastation of the Holocaust, with the aim to educate our community to ensure that the atrocities of the past are not forgotten and never repeated.

In South Australia, the Adelaide Holocaust Museum and Andrew Steiner Education Centre is dedicated to tracing the history of the Holocaust and telling the stories of Holocaust survivors who made South Australia home. The museum's educational programs, exhibitions and collections encourage visitors to think critically about issues that remain relevant in our contemporary society and to be active citizens who take action against antisemitism or any form of prejudice, hate and racism.

The former Marshall Liberal government played an important role in providing funding to support the Holocaust Museum and Steiner Education Centre to develop their education program. I wish to particularly acknowledge the Hon. John Gardner, who helped to drive this support in his role as former Minister for Education, and James Stevens MP, the federal member for Sturt, who actively lobbied the former federal Liberal government for additional funding.

The education centre provides tours for school students and members of the public to learn about South Australia's connection to the Holocaust, which is not only of deep importance to our Jewish community but to all active and engaged citizens.

While recognising the good intention of the motion moved by the Hon. Sarah Game, such a motion can, however, provoke a range of different opinions and responses from community members who have different views. I am sure many honourable members have received dozens of emails from community members, including the chairperson of the Australian Friends of Palestine Association, all raising their concerns about this motion, in particular the adoption of the IHRA contemporary examples of antisemitism.

As we live in a multicultural and multifaith society, with people arriving here from all parts of the world, it is important that all Australians, no matter where they come from, uphold the value of respect for cultural diversity but have the opportunity also to raise their concerns and present their views for consideration.

As members of parliament, we are not strangers to receiving a range of diverse views, and it is important that these views, whether positive or negative, are being heard and presented here for consideration. I understand that community members and the Australian Friends of Palestine Association have deep concerns about the matter and have asked members of the Legislative Council to oppose this motion. In the email correspondence I received, the statement was as follows:

The IHRA definition is deeply flawed, and existing laws more than adequately provide for protection for all Australians from all forms of discrimination, including from violence or incitement to violence, irrespective of its motivation. The effect of the definition, if adopted, will be to stifle legitimate debate over Israel and Palestine.

These community members believe that some of the examples provided by IHRA may stifle legitimate debate about the policies and actions of the state of Israel and the ongoing conflict in Gaza and the West Bank.

While today we are debating this motion in South Australia, it is important to remind honourable members that foreign affairs and international matters are within the jurisdictions and responsibilities of the federal government. To this end, the Australian government has repeatedly stated its concerns about the escalating violence and humanitarian situation in Gaza and the West Bank, and has called on all parties to refrain from violence and to focus on direct and genuine peace negotiations.

More recently, Australia has also provided additional humanitarian funding for the Palestinian territories in 2021 to address critical humanitarian needs. Australia's ongoing development program and humanitarian assistance to the Palestinian territories is a practical demonstration of the Australian government's longstanding support for a two-state solution in which Israel and a future Palestinian state coexist in peace and security within internationally recognised borders.

It is also important to emphasise that neither the working definition of antisemitism nor the contemporary examples of antisemitism set out by IHRA are legally binding, and they are intended to serve only as illustrations or case examples of what antisemitism could look like, rather than legal prohibitions. In fact, the plenary of IHRA only adopted the working definition of antisemitism which is quoted in the first clause of this motion, not the list of contemporary examples outlined in the second clause of this motion.

I think it is important to acknowledge these concerns and note that the legitimate criticism of Israeli policies and actions is not inherently antisemitic in itself. These are important discussions that deeply affect diverse community members in South Australia, and ongoing dialogue must be acknowledged. I wish to thank everyone who has written to my office regarding this motion and who has raised their concerns with me.

I hold the same view as the Hon. Sarah Game, the mover of this motion, and many honourable members in this house, that all individuals and communities, regardless of their cultural background or religion, should be able to follow their beliefs and express their views free of discrimination or prejudice in accordance with the Australian rule of law. In this regard, I work with all honourable members to stand against all forms of hatred, discrimination and racism, including antisemitism. We will continue to advocate for a more inclusive and harmonious society.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (16:38): Members would probably be aware that I am not normally one who speaks on what you might call these internationally focused motions, or sentiments if you like, but in this case a motion, because generally I see them as outside the scope of this parliament, but I think in this case, in my view, it is worth making a contribution because of course antisemitism can occur in South Australia. No doubt it does at some level as well. That is the reason for my contribution today. As I said, normally I would not speak on these internationally focused motions, but I am choosing to do so for that reason today.

For that reason, I rise to strongly support the Hon. Sarah Game's motion to adopt the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance definition of the term antisemitism. I believe it is a vital step in assisting civil society in its understanding of precisely what constitutes antisemitism, and I thank the honourable member for her initiative in bringing this issue to the attention of our Legislative Council.

As the Hon. Ms Game detailed when moving her motion, it is imperative that a universal definition of antisemitism is recognised in order to better protect our Jewish citizens and inform policymakers and, indeed, debate in this place. As stated in her motion, IHRA defines antisemitism as:

...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.

IHRA then offers specific contemporary examples of antisemitic acts to guide and educate, which the Hon. Ms Game outlined in her initial contribution.

Although we do not hear about the antisemitic acts as defined by IHRA that are committed in our local communities very often now, we cannot deny that they are in fact occurring and perhaps at a higher rate than many of us are aware. Indeed, it is unfortunate that the Jewish community is one of the only groups within Australia whose places of worship, their schools, their communal organisations and community centres are required to operate under the protection of high fences in many cases, armed guards in some cases, metal detectors, CCTV cameras and the like, for security purposes.

Our nation's law enforcement agencies have long recognised the necessity for these measures due to the higher incidence of physical attacks against Jews and their communal property in recent decades, and the threats that can continue unabated. It is extraordinary to think that this is the case in our modern world, given the coverage of such incidents does not seem commonplace and appears to be disproportionate when we consider the level of attention similar acts of discrimination tend to receive when other ethnicities or religions are targeted. It is of great concern to me.

Unfortunately, there is evidence to suggest that antisemitic incidents are actually occurring in our nation and, indeed, across the world and may in fact be on the rise. During the 12-month period from 1 October 2020 to 30 September 2021, the Executive Council of the Australian Jewry reported that there were some 447 antisemitic incidents logged nationally. The total figure consists of 272 attacks, including physical assault, verbal abuse, harassment, vandalism and graffiti, and 175 threats made via email, telephone, postal mail or posters and stickers being used in a derogatory

way. In the preceding year, some 331 were reported and that equates to a 35 per cent increase in that particular year, in the number of reported antisemitic incidents over that period.

The Anti-Defamation League in the United States similarly found that there was a 34 per cent increase in antisemitic acts in 2021 from 2020, indicating that there may in fact be a broader trend. I note that both the ECAG and ADL—a lot of acronyms—utilised the IHRA criteria for antisemitic acts, which exemplifies the importance of having a clear working definition of antisemitism to maintain accurate and comparative statistics, the subject of the Hon. Ms Game's motion today.

In October last year, I was pleased that our then Prime Minister, Scott Morrison, announced that Australia would adopt IHRA's working definition of antisemitism. At the time, Mr Morrison, the Prime Minister, stated:

My government pledges to embrace the definition of antisemitism adopted by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance. Australia does so as a people, and as a nation. Antisemitism has no place in Australia. It has no place anywhere in the world. And we must work together, resolutely and as a global community to reject any word or any act that supports antisemitism towards individuals, towards communities or religious facilities.

It goes even further than that because our now newly-elected Prime Minister, Anthony Albanese, concurred with Mr Morrison whilst he was in opposition, confirming that an Albanese-led Labor government would also uphold the IHRA definition if elected. That has now come and I am not aware that we have had formal recognition of that but certainly he indicated that as opposition leader and I have no reason to suspect that he will not see that through.

Some Australian states have since proceeded to officially endorse the definition within their jurisdictions. MPs in the New South Wales parliament passed a motion similar to the one we are debating today with bipartisan support—indeed, I understand that it was broader than even bipartisan. The Victorian Premier, Daniel Andrews, also declared that his state's institutions would also be using the definition as a tool to fight antisemitism. The support is broad.

Australia was joined by 33 other United Nation member states that have adopted the definition, signalling its increasingly normative status. Despite the inconceivable atrocities from the Holocaust and subsequent global outcry at the state-sponsored genocide of the Jewish people in Nazi Germany all those years ago, antisemitic sentiment has persisted, unfortunately, at all levels of society throughout many nations ever since.

I believe that now more than ever our parliament has a responsibility to the South Australian Jewish community to do whatever it can to support local and global efforts to counter this phenomenon. I therefore strongly support the Hon. Ms Game's motion.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:44): I rise to speak briefly on this motion. Let me be clear, antisemitism is a scourge and must be combated vigorously and the Greens have long been calling for a broad ranging antiracism strategy. With a worrying local and global rise in far-right extremist politics and Neo-Nazi activity, the urgency of this fight has rarely been greater.

What is not as clear is what is a Semite? In my exploration of this issue, it has become clear that the definition is not as simple as it has been portrayed. Originally, a Semite was someone who spoke a Semitic language. This is a family of languages that came from areas that spanned from western Asia to Africa. The meaning includes a much broader range of people than the Jewish people. The definition of antisemitism clearly requires clarity in order to be understood here.

The motion before us faces some of that same challenge. Everyone in this chamber has received correspondence from the Australian Friends of Palestine Association (AFOPA). AFOPA has written to us and raised their concerns about the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance definition of antisemitism. They say:

Australian Friends of Palestine Association rejects anti-Semitism and other forms of racism and advocates a peaceful path towards a future of justice, equality and security for both Israelis and Palestinians.

Regarding the definition of anti-Semitism, Australian Friends of Palestine Association does not endorse the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance definition of anti-Semitism as its effect will be to silence valid criticism of Israel and its supporters. We see its adoption by governments and other organisations as an attack on the right to free speech for all Australians.

It goes on to say:

Jewish community leaders continue to push for the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance definition of anti-Semitism, ostensibly to fight racism, while invariably defending Israel which practices racism.

AFOPA, however, do support the Jerusalem Declaration on Antisemitism, which was launched in 2021 by an international consortium of 200 leading scholars. This declaration provides a more nuanced representative definition, which can be used as a tool to effectively identify, confront and raise awareness of antisemitism. This declaration is a direct response to the criticism of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance definition, which has faced substantial criticism for being unclear, open to different interpretations and weakening the fight against antisemitism.

Kenneth Stern, one of the lead authors of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance definition, has since stated that the 'weaponisation' of the definition has been used to silence critics of the Israeli government, when it was originally designed as an educational tool. He has gone on to state that its adoption in the United States, through an executive order by Donald Trump, would 'harm not only pro-Palestinian advocates but also Jewish students and faculty, and the Academy itself.'

The Greens share the concerns of human rights groups and Israeli and Jewish organisations that have warned against the consequences of codifying the definition, including the New Israel Fund, the Australian Jewish Democratic Society, the Australia Palestine Advocacy Network and the Progressive Israel Network. The capacity of this definition to be used to silence critics of the Israeli government for its human rights abuses of Palestinians is reason enough to be worried about the definition being adopted and potentially enforced. I note that little consultation has taken place with regard to bringing this particular motion here today. Certainly, the groups that I have spoken to were not consulted prior to this debate.

Given that the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance definition is controversial, even within the Jewish community, we agree with Harold Zwier of AJDS that the energy that has gone into formulating competing definitions 'would be better directed to actually fighting antisemitism and racism'. Jan Deckers and Jonathan Coulter, the authors of a comprehensive journal on the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance definition of antisemitism, raise many concerns with the definition in their review, including:

Readers unengaged with the debate over the definition might be forgiven for thinking that opponents are making a lot of fuss about nothing. However, this definitional lack of clarity poses significant moral issues as it leaves the door ajar both for those who wish to mobilise the definition for unfounded accusations of antisemitism and for instances of antisemitism that are not covered by the definition to go unchallenged.

To that end, the Greens have consistently called for an institutional societal response to all forms of racism, including antisemitism, through the establishment and funding of a national antiracism strategy and a coordinated plan to tackle far right extremism in all its forms.

In our work challenging racism and antisemitism, the Greens have either proposed or supported establishing formal parliamentary inquiries into the rise of the far right in Australia, as well as investigating the rise of far right nationalists and the risk that their plans and actions pose to the state, particularly in Victoria's multicultural communities, and also the banning of the public display of hate symbols, including those used by far right extremists and Neo-Nazis, as well as exposing and adopting a zero tolerance approach to the normalisation of far right ideologies and hate speech in mainstream politics and media. We strongly urge the Malinauskas government to adopt and fund such activities to ensure that antisemitism and all forms of racism can be challenged and mitigated.

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

ADELAIDE DOLPHIN SANCTUARY

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

That the Environment, Resources and Development Committee inquire into and report on further legislative and policy measures to better protect the dolphins in the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary and the Port River, with particular consideration to be given to:

1. Limiting dredging;
2. Banning heavy gauge fishing practices and the use of large hooks, live bait and trawling;
3. Larger fines for industry discharge into the Port River;

4. Further speed restrictions on the Port River;
5. Increasing marine safety officers and park rangers;
6. Installation of shellfish reefs;
7. Regular and increased water quality monitoring; and
8. The impact of the die-off of mangroves and saltmarsh at St Kilda on the Port River dolphins.

(Continued from 18 May 2022.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:52): On behalf of the Hon. Rob Simms, I move to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out all words after 'That' and insert the following:

1. A select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on further legislative and policy measures to better protect the dolphins in the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary and the Port River, with particular consideration to be given to:
 - (a) limiting dredging;
 - (b) banning heavy gauge fishing practices and the use of large hooks, live bait and trawling;
 - (c) larger fines for industry discharge into the Port River;
 - (d) further speed restrictions on the Port River;
 - (e) increasing marine safety officers and park rangers;
 - (f) installation of shellfish reefs;
 - (g) regular and increased water quality monitoring; and
 - (h) the impact of the die-off of mangroves and saltmarsh at St Kilda on the Port River dolphins.
2. The committee consist of four members and that the quorum of members necessary to be present at all meetings of the committee to be fixed at three members.
3. 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.

The opposition is supportive of the motion proposed by the Hon. Ms Franks and the amendment I have just moved on behalf of the Hon. Mr Simms that will see a select committee conduct an inquiry into the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary, including whether policies or strategies can be implemented that serve to protect the resident dolphin population in the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary.

At the request of the previous Minister for Environment, the member for Black, the Department for Environment and Water commenced an investigation on 21 August 2021 into the potential causes of recent dolphin deaths in the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary. This investigation included an evaluation of historical data and necropsy results from recent dolphin deaths.

During the term of the Marshall Liberal government, the current Minister for Environment, the Hon. Susan Close MP, repeatedly lobbied the government to release information as to the cause of death of multiple dolphins; however, since assuming responsibility for management of the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary, very limited information was provided to the community about the dolphin population in the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary until a media article was published last weekend on 11 June 2022 and there was a corresponding update to the Department for Environment and Water's website on 12 June 2022.

In these circumstances, the opposition is pleased to support the Hon. Ms Franks' motion and the amendment that I have moved on behalf of the Hon. Mr Simms.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (16:56): I rise on behalf of the government. We were happy to support this in its original form, and we are happy to support it in its amended form that has been put forward by the Hon. Robert Simms. The dolphins in the Port River and in the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary are of significant value to South Australia not only for their importance as an animal with extraordinary significance to the local ecology but also for their ability to draw people's attention to the plight of our local ecosystem.

Dolphins are often described as a flagship species, the animal most noticeable to the observer, and their health can often provide clues to the health of our environment. Unfortunately, recently we have seen our resident population of dolphins face enormous pressures, and there have been multiple deaths in a short space of time. Since 2020, 10 resident dolphins in the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary have died or gone missing and are presumed to have died, with three unexplained deaths occurring in short succession last year.

In light of this alarming trend, the Department for Environment and Water initiated an investigation into these deaths in the Port River and the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary. The investigation's goal was to identify what could be impacting the health of the dolphins by evaluating historical data, extensive testing and autopsy results from the recent dolphin deaths. Released last week, the report was disappointingly unable to determine a definitive cause of death, though stress and toxins have been identified as potential contributors. Further analysis of toxicology results is underway, along with other lines of inquiry.

In addition, other long-term studies are being undertaken in partnership with Flinders and Adelaide universities, the SA Museum and the EPA to explore potential food chain and water quality factors. The department investigation team will hold two further workshops to review all available data and key findings before finalising its report and recommendations to the Minister for Environment, which is due in the coming months.

The Labor Party has a proud history of working hard to provide protections for the dolphins of the Port River. The Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary was declared in 2005 under the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Act 2005 under a Labor government. In 2010, again under a Labor leadership, the marine mammal regulations were introduced, providing further protection for dolphins living in the sanctuary and allowing rangers to enforce legal approach distances for those engaged in dolphin watching. These regulations also provide for management of commercial tour operators.

I know she is very humble about her past achievements, but the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water has a long personal connection with the effort to protect these magnificent creatures, having been involved in the closure of Marineland in 1988 and an integral player in the creation of the sanctuary.

It is clear, however, that we need to do more to protect the dolphins in the Port River and the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary. The government takes this issue seriously, and that is why we are more than happy to support this motion. Bringing together experts, local knowledge and other government departments through this inquiry process can help guide our response to this alarming issue, and we support the motion in front of us today.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:59): I would like to thank those members who have contributed to this debate and/or indicated their interest in participating in the inquiry. The threats faced by our beloved Port River dolphins are an issue I have spoken about in this place a great many times at this point, but which I hope I will need to speak about less now that this parliament is taking this action through the formation of this select committee.

I have high hopes that the select committee will help tackle the issue. When our disagreements across parties are set aside, parliament is indeed of course meant to be a place where we can collectively work towards improving our state for all who reside in it, including these animals. These particular dolphins have often been placed in tragic situations, and have had their health and safety jeopardised, often largely due to our own impacts on their natural home. It is our responsibility to protect the animals in our state who are suffering and dying, and the Port River dolphins specifically and urgently need that protection, and I am glad to see this council agree.

The pollution in the Port River has been an issue for a long time, and as is the case when these issues go without being adequately addressed, we are seeing the consequences of that. The dolphins who inhabit the river have become susceptible to illnesses, which in turn pave the way for early deaths, for the afflicted dolphins. A recent SARDI report concluded that the deceased Port River dolphins suffered from 'stress, a level of immune suppression, and compounding factors including...diseases...that cause deterioration in condition and organ function, with subsequent starvation'.

We have seen dolphins with infected skin lesions, damaged lungs, ulcers, inflamed organs, depleted white blood cells, and ear infections. The parasites and toxins these dolphins are exposed to suppress their immune system, impact their hearing and reduce their capacity to hold their breath. They seem to be consistently malnourished, and not only are these dolphins suffering from illness, but the effects of such illnesses make them more susceptible to fall victim to accidents, such as being struck by boats.

We know of all of these health issues, and we know that the dolphins keep dying, but we still cannot say with complete certainty what the ultimate cause of death for these dolphins has been due to a lack of enough research and monitoring. That is why a select committee into these Port River dolphins is so important, and it is clear that these dolphins are suffering, that they are dying, and that we humans are not innocent in the pollution of the Port River that is proving to be so harmful to them.

We desperately need to identify the precise cause of death, and we need to ensure that everything that can be done is being done to better treat and care for the dolphins who are currently suffering in the Port River. I am hopeful that this committee will help usher in some real answers and solutions for these dolphins, and that we can act on those answers before more dolphins lose their life.

I note that there was some confusion with regard to the amendment that has been put to the motion before us. The amendment that was originally tabled in the name of the Hon. Robert Simms, but then moved—and I thank the Hon. Nicola Centofanti for her assistance there—simply changes this committee from a referral to the ERD Committee to a select committee of this Legislative Council. It does not change any of the wording of the terms of reference and it provides that that select committee be of four members of this place, and I thank all members who have put their hands up to be on this committee. With that, I commend the motion and the amendment.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

That the select committee consist of the Hon. S.L. Game, the Hon. J.M.A. Lensink, the Hon. R.B. Martin and the mover.

Motion carried.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

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

Motion carried.

REGIONAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:05): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that the Marshall Liberal government put an end to the neglect of regional health care;
2. Recognises that during its four-year term the Marshall Liberal government invested in upgrading facilities and expanding services at regional hospitals including Murray Bridge, Victor Harbor and Yorketown;
3. Recognises that the Marshall Liberal government invested in a new emergency department at Mount Barker Hospital, expanded the Gawler Hospital emergency department, and initiated work on a new Barossa hospital;
4. Recognises that the Marshall Liberal government expanded renal dialysis services and country chemotherapy units; and
5. Recognises that the Marshall Liberal government invested heavily to clear the capital works backlog at country hospitals left by years of Labor neglect.

The Marshall Liberal government committed to delivering better health services closer to home for regional South Australians, and that is exactly what we delivered. More than \$70 million was invested in our first three years of government, and more than \$200 million was committed to regional health infrastructure.

In 2008, Labor tried to downgrade, even close, dozens of hospitals in country South Australia. After 16 long years of Labor, in the Marshall Liberal government South Australia's regional communities finally had a government that listened and took action to deliver better health care closer to home. In Labor's last term of government they spent a mere \$14 million in regional health infrastructure, or just \$3.5 million per year. That equates to the Marshall Liberal government outspending Labor on regional health capital projects by more than five to one.

The Marshall Liberal government was delivering a \$140 million 10-year plan to address the country health maintenance backlog, a backlog created through the appalling neglect of successive Labor governments. We also decentralised decision-making from Hindmarsh Square, creating six country local health network boards so that more decisions about country health could be made in the country by those who live and work in the country.

We invested in mental health services to ensure regional South Australians could access intensive support more quickly and with improved continuity of care. When the Marshall Liberal government came to government in 2018 we did so with a commitment to rebalance the health system back towards mental health. Our landmark investment of \$163.5 million in mental health in the 2021-22 state budget demonstrated our dedication to improving community access to mental health supports.

In addition to annual spending of \$530 million statewide on mental health, the budget investment included \$12 million for eight extra psychiatric intensive care beds focused on country patients. A further \$5 million investment over two years to support the needs of the mental health workforce was particularly targeted at regional areas to support attraction and retention of nursing and allied health mental health clinicians. Mount Gambier hospital's six-bed mental health inpatient unit, with up to six beds overflow capacity, increased oversight and psychiatric input to support current demand for mental health services in the region.

We upgraded facilities and expanded services at regional hospitals. Works funded under the former Marshall Liberal government are underway, works that include a new emergency department at Mount Barker, works that include a massive expansion of the Gawler hospital emergency department, works that include progressing a new Barossa hospital.

We invested \$15.75 million to expand hospital care and dialysis services in South Australia's rapidly growing region of Victor Harbor, a commitment made in partnership with the former federal Coalition government. This project adds a new 12-bay emergency department. A new six-chair renal dialysis unit will also be built at the Southern Fleurieu Health Service, increasing the number of dialysis chairs in the region from four to six and reducing the waiting time for critical dialysis services.

As part of the \$140 million regional assets sustainment program, the Yorketown Hospital was to benefit from a new decontamination unit and procedure room. The Marshall Liberal government recognised the importance of boosting regional health services throughout all of South Australia. We recognised that regional health services do not start and stop in the Limestone Coast.

The state and federal Liberals partnered for an investment of \$13.2 million to build a new emergency department at Mount Barker hospital in South Australia, improving important services for people throughout the Adelaide Hills region. Admissions to the Mount Barker hospital emergency department have almost tripled since 2015. The funding will deliver the new emergency department that will cater for up to 22,000 presentations per year over the next decade. Thousands of locals will benefit from the Marshall Liberal government's \$15-million expansion of the Gawler hospital emergency department, which includes increasing the capacity of the department from four treatment spaces to 16, as well as an interface with the recently completed short-stay unit.

After years of neglect under Labor, the Marshall Liberal government delivered world-class health care to South Australia. We delivered world-class health care for all South Australians: South Australians living in our metropolitan area, South Australians living in our peri-urban centres and South Australians living in our regions.

The Marshall Liberal government committed to delivering a new Barossa hospital, a project cancelled by Labor two decades ago. In February, clinical service planners were appointed for the

new Barossa hospital. I want to congratulate the member for Schubert and the shadow minister for health, who have secured a commitment from the Labor government that it will continue with the Marshall Liberal government's plan to purchase land for the Barossa hospital.

We expanded renal dialysis services and country chemotherapy. The Marshall Liberal government doubled the number of medium complexity country chemotherapy units, with expanded units in Victor Harbor, the Riverland and Port Lincoln. We expanded renal dialysis services at the Mount Gambier and Ceduna hospitals. We introduced more flexible arrangements through the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme for people who need to travel long distances for specialised medical treatment. We invested \$20 million in the Rural Health Workforce Strategy to strengthen our rural health workforce.

In February this year, we signed off on a once-in-a-generation deal with South Australia's regional GPs. The landmark agreement will invest an estimated \$188 million over two years to help attract and retain GP services in regional South Australia and address the pay gap that opened up between what our rural GPs receive and what GPs earn in other places.

The Marshall Liberal government put an end to the neglect of regional health care. The Marshall Liberal government listened, took action and delivered better health care closer to home for all South Australians. I would like to acknowledge my colleague, the Hon. Stephen Wade, for the outstanding job that he did as minister for health during the Marshall Liberal government's reign.

Every South Australian is hoping that the Malinauskas Labor government can continue the excellent work of its predecessor and capitalise on the strong foundation it has inherited. Every South Australian is hoping that the Malinauskas Labor government can deliver on the more than \$3 billion in election commitments it made, without saddling the state with crippling debt, surging power prices, increased water and ESL bills and without those nasty hidden fees and charges skyrocketing. I suggest we do not hold our breath.

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

COMMUNITY CENTRE WEEK

The Hon. J.S. LEE (17:13): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes that Community Centre Week was celebrated in South Australia from Monday 9 May to Sunday 15 May 2022, coinciding with national Neighbourhood House Week;
2. Recognises the vital role that local community centres play in providing welcoming and inclusive spaces for social activities, support services, and personal development for people from all walks of life;
3. Acknowledges the contributions of all the staff and volunteers who are the heart of the 165 community centres located across South Australia;
4. Notes that this year's theme is 'Building resilience by bringing people together', highlighting the importance of rebuilding strong social connections as we re-emerge from the isolation caused by the COVID-19 pandemic; and
5. Commends the Marshall Liberal government on implementing the new Community Connections Program to support socially isolated people to increase their independence and to build strong, sustainable social and community connections.

It is a great honour today to rise to move this motion to acknowledge the importance of Community Centre Week 2022. Community Centre Week is also known as National Neighbourhood House Week. As the shadow minister for communities and multicultural South Australia, I would like to recognise the significant contributions that local community centres and community organisations make in South Australia. Community Centre Week is part of a nationwide initiative to celebrate and recognise community centres and the role they play in building social connection and community resilience.

For those of us who have visited a community centre, we know that such a centre is a friendly, informal place for community members from all walks of life and all cultural backgrounds to meet to participate in a variety of activities for free or at a minimal cost.

These community hubs are often called neighbourhood houses or neighbourhood centres because they are located where people can easily get to them, in close proximity to their homes. Each community centre reflects the needs and aspirations of their local community. Volunteers are at the heart of every community centre across South Australia. Without these passionate volunteers who generously donate their time and skills, many of the vast range of community centre programs simply would not be possible.

Community centres, families and children, including refugees and new arrivals, can meet new people, learn new skills, pick up a hobby, build their computing or financial literacy, or learn how to cook lasagne or fried rice. The community centres are as diverse as the communities they serve and are spaces that are flexible and responsive to local needs. They have a particular focus on intervention and prevention and improving outcomes for children and families and those experiencing disadvantage.

In South Australia, we are fortunate to have over 170 community centres, neighbourhood houses and community organisations across our state, from Adelaide metropolitan areas to country regions, including Mount Gambier, Port Lincoln and Roxby Downs, to name a few. According to Community Centres South Australia's 2021 member survey, on average each community centre employs 1.5 FTEs and involves over 40 volunteers, with over 20,000 hours of volunteering taking place each week across our state's community centres. With around 35,000 visitors each week and approximately 2.15 million contacts each year, Deloitte has estimated that for every dollar spent in the community centre sector, \$2.78 is returned to the economy. This is an incredible contribution to support our community.

I would like to take this opportunity to particularly acknowledge and thank Community Centres SA for their advocacy and support around South Australia. As the peak body for community centres in SA, Community Centres SA strives to build the community and organisational capacity of its members and build business sustainability to ensure that our community centres can continue to provide invaluable services and support to our local communities.

During the global COVID pandemic, we saw that lockdowns and isolation had a detrimental impact on the mental health and wellbeing of people across South Australia. One in four Australians report being lonely, and in 2021 a quarter of community centres in South Australia reported an increase of 300 per cent in the number of people presenting with mental health challenges. This year's theme for Community Centre Week was building resilience by bringing people together, highlighting the importance of rebuilding strong social connections as we recover from the isolation caused by the COVID pandemic.

Community centres focus on social scaffolding, working to nurture positive in-person relationships that are meaningful and contribute to our social identity and sense of belonging. By creating a strong foundation to help support individuals, we can help build their resilience, foster healthy family relationships and improve mental health, wellbeing and cohesive outcomes for families and communities.

This motion also seeks to commend the Marshall Liberal government for implementing the new Community Connections program in 2021 to support socially isolated people to increase their independence and to build strong sustainable social and community connections. Community Connections was designed following the Home and Community Care Reform Consultation undertaken by the former Liberal government in response to a large number of HACC clients transferring to national care, such as through the NDIS and My Aged Care.

The independent review involved consultation with sector providers and peak organisations to develop options for a new South Australian program. The review presented a range of key considerations for the development of a new program, including a service gap for people who are not eligible for federal disability programs, as well as the greatest common risk factors, including social isolation and disconnection from services and communities.

Key themes raised during the review included the need for flexibility and collaboration, the importance of culturally appropriate services for the multicultural sector and the challenge of addressing the emerging needs of younger people. The findings of the review informed the

development of the Community Connections program, which better matches services for greater needs by connecting people with community social networks and services.

I would like to particularly commend the Hon. Michelle Lensink for driving the important reform when she was the Minister for Human Services and thank her for her ongoing commitment to supporting our community sector to best meet the needs of vulnerable community members as we navigate our way out of the pandemic. As the new shadow minister for communities I am proud to take on this important portfolio and ensure that the Marshall Liberal government's legacy continues.

It is vital that we continue to support community partners such as community centres to deliver community programs, services and activities and help participants gain independence and make strong, sustainable connections with families, communities and other networks. I look forward to working with everyone in the community services sector to help build resilience in our community and create a more inclusive and stronger South Australia. Once again, I wish to congratulate everybody who has celebrated Community Centre Week 2022.

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

SA YOUTH WEEK

The Hon. J.S. LEE (17:22): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes that SA Youth Week 2022 will be held over 10 days from Friday 13 May to Sunday 22 May 2022;
2. Recognises that there are over 266,000 young people between the ages of 12 and 24 years who live in South Australia;
3. Acknowledges the significant social, cultural and economic contributions that young people make to our state; and
4. Commends the Marshall Liberal government for developing the Strong Futures SA Youth Action Plan 2020-2022 to ensure that young people are engaged, active contributors, as well as creating opportunities for learning and growth so that they can reach their full potential.

It is a great honour to rise today to move this motion in my name to acknowledge the importance of SA Youth Week. As the shadow minister for communities and multicultural South Australia I am passionate about supporting the hard work and dedication of our amazing youth. I wish to put on the public record the Liberal Party's commitment to support young people and youth organisations throughout South Australia.

During SA Youth Week 2022, which is South Australia's annual celebration of young people, South Australians from all walks of life come together to show our support for young people and help to nurture a generation of people who are quickly becoming our future. It is time to recognise the wonderful and brilliant ideas, talents and other contributions that our youth bring to our state. It is great to observe all the successful events that have been held and workshops that provide opportunities for young people throughout Youth Week.

As of 2019, statistics have shown that more than 266,000 young people aged between 12 and 24 years live in South Australia. These 266,000 people are either studying, entering into the workforce or are searching for a way to forge their career paths and future. These young people are ambitious and determined and they have their own unique talents and skills. I speak for all the young trainees that we have taken on board in Parliament House and thank all the young people who have chosen to pursue an interest in working here.

These young people are definitely already making significant contributions to our state, and they do it in all aspects of society to enrich our social, cultural and economic life and no doubt will continue to do so into the future. I thank the Hon. Laura Curran, one of our members of the Legislative Council who was elected this year, the first within that age group of young people between 14 and 25 years. I think we ought to congratulate her on her achievement.

Some in this group of young people have gone through many challenges during the pandemic. They were anxious, they were deeply concerned about their future and what they can accomplish. It is really important to recognise that these young people can live in our state because

we are considered a centre of innovation and a national leader on climate smart policy. We want our youth to consider some of the options as they take up opportunities for the future. We want our young South Australians to be confident that we are making the best investment today for their future and that their ideas are part of the shaping and development of our state.

In order to build that future, it is important to recognise that our young people are given every opportunity to strive. We would also like to use this motion to commend the Marshall Liberal government for developing the Strong Futures SA Youth Action Plan 2020-2022. It was under the former Marshall Liberal government that a plan was developed in collaboration with young people to ensure that we create a South Australia that is safe, energetic, inclusive and sustainable for all young people, now and into the future.

As I mentioned, this plan was made with the involvement of young people so that their voices are heard. Together with the Youth Panel Forum, the Marshall Liberal government has delivered a plan that listens to young people's needs and aspirations and positively involves them in decisions that impact on them and their communities. The foundation of the SA Youth Action Plan has four pillars that represent priority areas that the former Liberal government invested in. These pillars are:

1. Earn and Learn: making South Australia a state that provides young people with the necessary life skills and supports to complete school and transition confidently to further education and training or to meaningful employment;
2. Fair and Inclusive: developing a South Australia that makes young people feel confident to explore their personal potential and to access opportunities regardless of race, age, gender identity, location or ability;
3. Wellbeing and Environment: creating a future where young South Australians can be safe, healthy and resilient; and
4. Connect and Grow: forming a South Australia where young people are able to easily and confidently interact with the services and systems they need to live active and engaged lives.

It is vital that this plan continues to be implemented. The Liberal Party calls on the Malinauskas Labor government to continue the great initiatives that were set forth by the Youth Action Plan. It is critical that we continue to support our young people and create a future South Australia which better serves them and allows them opportunities to make South Australia better.

We have seen before with prior Labor governments that they have failed in taking action to create a better future for young people. We saw a massive brain drain, with much of our talented and ambitious young people choosing to leave South Australia because they felt that the opportunities here were insufficient. We should not make that same mistake again. I commend this motion and look forward to working with everyone towards a stronger, inclusive and fairer future for the young people of South Australia.

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

REFUGEE WEEK

The Hon. J.S. LEE (17:29): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes that Refugee Week will be celebrated across Australia from Sunday 19 June to Saturday 25 June 2022 and provides a platform to celebrate the positive social and economic contributions made by refugees to Australian society and create a culture of welcome;
2. Notes this year's theme of 'healing' raises awareness of the experience of refugees and encourages mainstream and refugee communities to learn from each other to heal wounds and grow stronger as a connected society;
3. Congratulates the Australian Migrant Resource Centre for being the successful convener of SA Refugee Week since 2001 and for hosting the annual Youth Poster Awards Exhibition which features posters from primary, secondary and tertiary students that celebrate the courage, resilience and contributions of people of refugee backgrounds; and
4. Commends the Marshall Liberal government for standing in solidarity with the Afghan and Ukrainian communities in view of the humanitarian tragedies unfolding overseas, funding the Afghan

Community Service Hub to support the South Australian Afghan community throughout the Afghanistan crisis and establishing the Eastern European Conflict Mental Health Support Line to address the urgent mental health needs of Ukrainian community members deeply affected by the invasion of Ukraine.

It is a great honour today to move this motion in my name to acknowledge the importance of Refugee Week in South Australia. As the shadow minister for multicultural South Australian communities, I am passionate about supporting the hard work and contributions that refugees make to our state. Australia is a proud multicultural country and a signatory to the refugees convention—the key international instrument that regulates the obligations of states to protect refugees fleeing from persecution.

Australia has been involved in the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees resettlement program since 1977 and has consistently ranked as one of the top three resettlement countries in the world. Australia has a long and proud tradition of resettling refugees and vulnerable people in the humanitarian need areas. Refugees are seeking protection from conflict and trauma, the likes of which are hard to imagine.

With the right support refugees can make extraordinary contributions and become outstanding members of society. There are lots of ways in which we can help our newest arrivals build their lives in Australia, and I want to place on the record my sincere gratitude to peak refugee organisations and service providers as well as not-for-profit multicultural organisations that are doing exceptional work to help refugees reconnect with their families, give them hope and help them rebuild their lives here in Australia.

It is great to be able to recognise all the positive social and economic contributions that refugees bring to Australian society through celebrating Refugee Week. Each year, Refugee Week has a theme to raise awareness and bring together individuals, communities and organisations from many different backgrounds behind a common theme and cohesive message.

Every refugee who comes to Australia has a story to tell. This year we celebrate the theme of healing, to encourage refugees and other communities to learn from each other, to heal wounds and grow together, stronger as a connected society. The common theme is a reminder that, regardless of our differences, we all share a common humanity.

The importance of human connections has been underscored by the pandemic and recent conflicts abroad and the lessons they teach us can help us in so many ways. Mainstream and refugee communities alike can draw upon shared hardship to heal wounds, to learn from each other and to move forward. Early community support can make a real and meaningful difference to refugees. There have been many wonderful offers of support for people who have resettled in Australia. It is all a part of the healing process.

Healing can occur through shared personal stories and experiences through being together at community gatherings. I want to take this opportunity to express my special thanks to all the volunteers who are helping and supporting refugees and humanitarian entrants in Australia to build their new lives and feel at home.

Fostering a sense of belonging for refugees in a foreign land and building a blanket of warmth and services around them provide the intrinsic value of interconnectedness for individuals who may have lost everything to feel, once again, a bit normal. Healing is an important step for refugees and an important step for us all in building a more inclusive multicultural and intercultural society. I would like to acknowledge the important work of the Australian Migrant Resource Centre as the convener of SA Refugee Week since 2001.

Every year, and again this year, the AMRC hosts the annual Youth Poster Awards Exhibition that celebrates the themes surrounding the United Nations international refugee convention. These themes include multiculturalism, human rights, cultural diversity, antiracism and the welcoming of refugees into Australia, as well as this year's theme of healing. This wonderful initiative provides an opportunity for children and young people to educate themselves about human rights and for children who are refugees and their families to share their experiences and cultural identity.

I look forward to meeting the inspiring young artists at the event next week and seeing this year's award-winning posters. I know it is very difficult to choose winners out of many because there

are so many fantastic submissions. I want to thank and congratulate AMRC for hosting the exhibition once again. A special acknowledgement must go to Eugenia Tsoulis OAM, CEO of AMRC and board member of the South Australian Multicultural Commission, for her longstanding service to multicultural communities in our state and for her advocacy for refugees in South Australia.

I would like to provide a recent example of the work by AMRC. Last year, 2021, following the devastating fall of Afghanistan to Taliban forces, Eugenia worked closely with Hussain Razaiat, a fellow member of the South Australian Multicultural Commission and President of the Afghan United Association of South Australia, to come up with a proposal to instigate the Afghan Community Service Hub. The Afghan community recognised the efforts by the Marshall Liberal government for standing in solidarity with their community and acting quickly to fund this important Afghan Community Service Hub when our Afghan community members needed urgent support and assistance at a terrible and challenging time.

The Afghan Community Service Hub is based at the Australian Migrant Resource Centre to help members of the Afghan community easily find updated and reliable information on the current crisis in Afghanistan. Through funding support by the former Marshall Liberal government, bilingual staff were employed, proficient in various languages and dialects to help all the Afghan community to apply for visas and address urgent needs in their languages. The Marshall Liberal government was acknowledged as the first state in Australia to provide such intensive support for those most affected by the tragic events in Afghanistan.

Similarly, following Russia's shocking invasion of Ukraine early this year, the Marshall Liberal government quickly established the Eastern European Conflict Mental Health Support Line in collaboration with Uniting Communities. The former Liberal government understood the significant impact that the invasion and ongoing war in Ukraine has had on our community and how deeply it has affected the mental health and wellbeing of Ukrainian community members. The support line brings together the skills and experience of mental health and counselling staff at Uniting Communities and provides in-language counselling over the phone and referrals to a range of vital services to help the Ukrainian community.

Both of these initiatives show how important and necessary support for our refugee communities is. It has been heartening to see the flood of support and donations from the wider community for the newly arrived migrants and refugees from both Afghanistan and Ukraine in recent months. It is vital that these and other such initiatives continue and that South Australia provide support to our refugee communities.

In the spirit of healing, the Liberal Party is calling on the Malinauskas Labor government to continue supporting the refugee communities in South Australia. We hope that the government takes the opportunity during Refugee Week to learn from the hardships and experiences of our refugee communities so that we can work together to create a better and more inclusive society for our refugees. I commend the motion.

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

Bills

CANNABIS LEGALISATION BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:38): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise to speak to the Cannabis Legalisation Bill. It is high time that cannabis was legalised in this state. The time has come to legalise cannabis for adult use in our state. It is clear that the so-called government wars on drugs have failed wherever they have been waged. In fact they have always been a war on our very own people. Millions of Australians use cannabis every year, and many of those people actually use it because they are sick, they have a disability, and they are simply trying to manage their pain. We here in South Australia have an opportunity, and an opportunity I believe this parliament must seize and act upon, otherwise we may well be left behind. We must take a step now and show that we can lead on this issue.

Internationally, there have been so many developments that I actually will not have time to cover the movements happening around the world, but just this week Germany has announced that it will be moving ahead with legalising adult cannabis sales this year. They will, with the leadership of their health ministry there, hold expert sessions with over 200 medical, legal and other expert representatives taking part that will then inform a bill to be put to their parliament by the end of this year.

In Thailand, the recognition of the potential of a cannabis industry has been realised there. In Thailand they have recently, in this past month, expanded their legalisation of medicinal cannabis, and a group can now form a social enterprise and grow an unlimited number of plants. In Thailand.

In New York, they have announced their 'Seedling Opportunity Initiative', which actually requires that the very first 100 dispensary licences will go to people who actually have cannabis-related convictions in their past; a real restorative approach to justice. The recognition of the impacts that the US war on drugs has had on the people in the community of New York is being seized here in that very first step of creating a new socially equitable cannabis industry in that jurisdiction.

I was very heartened last year that the parliament of South Australia's Crime and Public Integrity Committee, and their work on organised crime, has identified what many of us already know; that the legalisation of cannabis does actually need to be addressed if we are to tackle organised crime. The committee there recommended, and I quote 'the establishment of a parliamentary committee to inquire into and report on potential benefits and issues associated with the legalisation of recreational use of cannabis in South Australia'.

That committee also recognised the potential revenue to the state and the 'potential to significantly disrupt the activities of organisers involved in serious crime'. By ending this war it is a win-win. We take away the business model of organised crime and we help people, particularly sick people, to have a better quality of life. The benefits of legalising cannabis are clear, starting with the real, tangible benefits of medicinal cannabis, which allows people to live free of pain and more in control of their symptoms.

It takes money from the pockets of organised crime and it puts it in the hands of government. That money then of course can be put to good use. Rather than spending money chasing down users of cannabis we can actually put that money towards healing our sick health system. We can prevent health issues arising by putting that money into health prevention and education. We can also, as I say, drive people away from the criminal justice system.

The bill here that we have before us in this council to legalise cannabis, takes this once demonised plant and it puts it at the forefront of generating wealth for our state of South Australia. Our climate, which allows us already to make world-class wine, is also ideal for growing world-class weed, and, just quietly, already does. Our state can in fact not just become the home of fine food and wine from our clean, green environment, but indeed fine food, wine and weed from our clean, green environment.

There are countries, such as the US, that has now seen the benefits of cannabis legalisation for some years. In 2021, the US saw the highest tax revenue from cannabis sales yet; \$US3.7 billion. That is \$3.7 billion that can be reinvested into their economy. As of March 2022 in Colorado, the first US state to legalise cannabis, they had generated \$538 million in tax revenue, which has been dedicated to directly improving Colorado's public education system. Each US state that benefits from tax revenues from cannabis distributes it in the way that most benefits their communities.

From education in Colorado, to reducing recidivism in Alaska, or helping those who have been suffering from the punitive drug laws in California, these benefits to communities are in no small part why other US states and other jurisdictions right around the world are now lining up to legalise cannabis. This is a growing industry, an industry that nations such as Thailand are acting to capitalise on. From community enterprises and small local dispensaries to large venture capitalists, the market recognises this burgeoning industry. I hope our parliament will too.

We should consider the harm that our current cannabis laws have been inflicting and the fact that those effects have been disproportionately felt on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. For every non-Aboriginal person in custody for drug use, four Aboriginal people are in custody for

that very same drug use. This is extraordinary, given that cannabis is the most used illicit drug in South Australia, that we have people in custody for using a drug that most people in the community actually believe should be legal. Again, I note that one in three people have tried cannabis. It is high time that our laws caught up with the reality of our community.

Our current laws create a black market, which means big business for organised crime. It puts cannabis users at risk by forcing them to engage with this unregulated and dangerous market, and makes people fear seeking help when they need it. We need a way forward, and we must establish a legal market with protections in place for cannabis consumers. Make no mistake, cannabis is a drug. What I am arguing for here is a model where we treat that drug as a health concern and regulate it the way we have with other substances such as alcohol, which was also once prohibited.

This proposed bill will create a South Australian licensing agency to regulate the cannabis market with the aim of harm minimisation and ensuring compliance with conditions that could come with the granting of commercial licences. It ensures that the many users of cannabis have access to safe and regulated products, and means that cannabis products must be labelled with health warnings that also give information about strains. That will give cannabis users the information about levels of THC or CBD, or a number of other components, meaning they can make informed choices that keep them safe when using cannabis products—something that is not possible in the current illicit market.

The bill prohibits retailers who would participate in this industry from publicly promoting or advertising cannabis. This, with restrictions on retailers opening within 200 metres of a school or childcare centre, means that cannabis is kept away from the hands of minors. It is, indeed, an adult use bill. The bill will end the cannabis black market and break the organised crime business model. It will free people from the war on drugs that is, of course, a war on people.

As part of this new green industry, the home growing of up to six plants, or more on compassionate grounds, would be allowed. This addresses the issues we are currently facing around access to medicinal cannabis. While we have made it legal, distribution issues, red tape and price means that those who should be benefiting from the lawful provision of medicinal cannabis are not necessarily able to access it, especially those who live in poverty.

Some of these patients—and they are patients—are resorting to the black market. We are criminalising people who are sick, with all the risks they face that come with that. Allowing people to grow a small number of plants at home will also allow those people to heal. South Australians have been contacting me seeking help when they face criminal convictions for growing cannabis in their own home for their own personal medical use. Under the current laws they are committing a crime, yet these people should be able to live pain free without the threat of arrest.

I have previously spoken here of Jenny Hallam, who wanted to give relief to those who suffered chronic pain and other conditions. Jenny spent years in our South Australian courts after being charged with procuring and making cannabis oils. Let us be clear: she never grew a single plant, she never made a single cent. She made the oils for those who were sick and suffering. She did not make money out of those oils, and the court took that into account.

Jenny serves as an example of someone who has been harmed by the criminalisation of cannabis. We watched in shock as her house was raided the very same month that medicinal cannabis was made legal in this state, Jenny having been an advocate for making medicinal cannabis legal. We watched as she then spent years in our courts, defending herself against what are outdated and unfair laws. Nobody else should ever have to go through what Jenny did just because they want to heal themselves or heal others.

We all have compassion for those suffering through cancer, and we all want to see easy access to cannabis to help with a range of issues that come with those treatments. Surely we should not be criminalising patients or those who seek to help patients. At a federal level and here in South Australia we have already taken the substantial step of legalising medicinal cannabis. It is a significant step but it is actually a step in changing how we think about cannabis more broadly. It is a plant that governments around the world are finally recognising for the potential that it has and that it should no longer be prohibited.

This bill proposes something that would be a massive financial boon for the state, with hundreds of millions of pent-up investment dollars sure to flow to the very first Australian jurisdiction that allows the cultivation and sale of cannabis, with jobs and tax revenues not far behind. If we fail to act we are missing an opportunity. There is social acceptance of cannabis, demonstrated by its high rate of use within our community. What we are missing is the opportunity to get a significant, lucrative revenue stream, all while taking money out of the pockets of organised crime. Surely this should be a no-brainer.

Other states and territories are considering this issue. The ACT's progressive but minimal reforms have been in place for well over a year now. Despite the fears and the fear campaign there, the sky has not fallen in, traffic accidents have not increased and the people of the ACT are continuing as they always did. But what we have seen in that jurisdiction is people no longer being criminalised for accessing a plant.

In the past, there has been scepticism that this parliament would seize this opportunity, but I believe that is not the case. The Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee gives me that hope. I believe this Malinauskas government could make the most of being the first state to legalise cannabis for adult use.

As I said, that committee and its recognition of the link between organised crime and the punitive nature of our current laws on patients is a glimmer of hope. This is not an intractable issue; it is an opportunity. It is an opportunity to be compassionate and to support those who will benefit from medicinal cannabis, but it is also an opportunity to grow a new green industry and provide revenue to our state. It is an opportunity to stop this stupid war on drugs, which is of course a war on our very own people.

Many members of this place and the other place have had quiet words to me about this piece of legislation. There is great community interest in it, and I would hope that there will be a willingness to have a mature discussion, in the way that Germany is now doing, led by their health ministry, informed by experts, informed by evidence and done in a cross-party, collegial matter. I would hope that this bill would be the start of something big, but the start of that cross-party work would most appropriately, I believe, be done by a joint house committee—not to make a pun.

I know that there are Labor, Liberal, Independent and crossbench members who have all expressed to me in their interest in populating such a committee and, I believe, being part of a shared journey of driving this conversation forward. Whether they have had personal experience in a number of ways, whether they have had somebody who is sick and suffering and who has not been able to lawfully access medicinal cannabis, or whether they simply have their eyes on the investment we could be making in our health and education systems as a result of this industry, I welcome their interest and support and look forward to working with all members.

I will be holding some briefings on this bill and look forward to members participating in those and progressing this debate in a timely manner—indeed, in not quite as quick a time as Germany is about to do but not too much longer. We are in a new parliament, and I think there is new hope and new common sense entering the debate on cannabis, right around the globe. I hope South Australia takes its rightful place in leading in this matter. With that, I commend the bill.

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

ANIMAL WELFARE (JUMPS RACING) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 May 2022.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:55): I rise to indicate that the opposition will not be supporting this bill. I acknowledge the history of debate on this topic in this chamber now spanning more than a decade. I believe the Hon. Tammy Franks previously introduced a bill on this topic back in 2011 and again in 2015. The House of Assembly also passed a resolution in 2015 on the motion of the then minister for agriculture, food and fisheries, forestry, tourism,

recreation and sport, and racing, the member for Mawson, for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into and report on jumps racing in South Australia.

The select committee was chaired by the now Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, the member for Reynell. It was an exhaustive inquiry, which included many witnesses appearing before the committee, numerous site visits and more than 1,800 submissions. The outcome was a 120-page report. The committee heard from a wide range of individuals and organisations, from veterinarians and animal welfare organisations to regional racing clubs, owners, breeders and trainers of racehorses and jumps racehorses.

It is fair to say that there was a strong and passionate response from a broad section of the community to that committee inquiry, and that passion has not waned. Opponents and supporters of jumps racing continue their passionate advocacy, which is why I think it is important to return to the findings of that committee. I quote the executive summary of the committee's finding:

The committee found that jumps racing in SA should not be banned but that its continuation should be conditional on the industry meeting the broad areas for improvement outlined in the recommendations, over the next three years.

It is clear to the committee that jumps racing presents a greater risk of injury or fatality to horses and jockeys than flat racing, with steeplechase races presenting the greatest risk. It is, however, also evident that the implementation of several measures since 2010 has made the sport safer, as evidenced by a reduction in horse fatalities in our state in recent seasons.

The recommendations on the future direction of jumps racing, and the conditions upon which it may continue, aim to address gaps in research and data collection, matters concerning transparency and accountability in industry practices, the need for safety planning and risk mitigation to direct continuous improvement objectives, and for additional duty of care measures to safeguard animal welfare.

I want to reiterate the key aspects of these findings, that there was no case to ban jumps racing and that the industry should be given time to demonstrate improvements of its own accord. The industry has demonstrated improvements of its own accord since that time.

An example is the introduction of One Fit hurdles. The One Fit design is a modified hurdle frame with a custom fitting closed-cell foam pad replacing the traditional birch. The hurdle was developed by the British Horseracing Authority's senior inspector of courses, Richard Linley, in consultation with relevant industry bodies. It has contributed to a considerable reduction in fall rates and superficial injuries in horses across the UK. Since initial trials began in the UK in June 2013, the fall rate has reduced to 1.59 per cent (which is 56 falls from 3,525 runners), which represents a reduction of 0.5 per cent compared to the 10-year average number of fallers across all hurdle designs.

The owners, breeders, trainers and riders of these horses are committed to the welfare of these horses. They are passionate about their horses and their industry and they are committed to ongoing improvements to equine health and safety. I have received correspondence from owners detailing the care that their horses receive. Indeed, as one owner noted, their horses receive more care than many other animals, with regular vet services, chiropractor, dental, farrier and rehabilitation clinic attendance to use a water treadmill to strengthen their muscles.

Those involved in jumps racing invest heavily in their horses, both emotionally and financially. They are not dismissive, ignorant or cavalier about the risks of jumps racing, but they are invested in promoting a safe and healthy sport. It is clear from the submissions to the select committee inquiry that widespread public sentiment existed for a greater duty of care to animals, particularly those involved in sports. Community attitudes and values have continued to reflect the need for adequate protections and appropriate whole-of-life animal welfare and safety standards.

Those of us on this side of the chamber, as Liberals, believe in the fundamental right to freedom of choice and freedom of the individual. We also believe in a government that minimises interference in our daily lives, and we believe in free enterprise. With that comes the ability for anyone to compete in the marketplace where it is the market that determines prices, products and services rather than government.

If the market is such that the peak industry controlling body, Racing SA, has taken steps to phase out jumps racing due to declining participation levels and horse numbers, then so be it. But

the decision to hold jumps racing or not is the prerogative of that body and not one of government or this chamber. It is a decision of the industry, it is a decision of breeders, owners, trainers, riders and spectators as to whether to support, invest and promote this industry. It is the responsibility of industry to satisfy the public that it has a continuing commitment to mitigating risk and implementing best practice in all aspects of this sport.

It is the responsibility of industry to instil confidence that safety measures are prioritised and promoted. It is the responsibility of industry to create a product that attracts participants and spectators alike. It is the right and responsibility of individuals to make their choices: the choice to be a participant or the choice to be a spectator, or not. Those of us on this side of the chamber believe that whether jumps racing continues in South Australia remains a matter for the racing industry rather than legislators.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (18:02): I rise to speak on behalf of my colleague the Hon. Frank Pangallo who has carriage of this bill and who was prepared to speak on behalf of SA-Best today but unfortunately is unable to be here with us today. In October last year, Racing SA, the controlling body for racing in South Australia, announced that it would not be scheduling jumps racing in the upcoming racing calendar. It signalled the end of an era. At the time, there were fewer than 10 jumps horses in the state and whilst Racing SA acknowledged the 150-year history of jumps racing in South Australia, it also acknowledged that it was no longer a sustainable industry.

In the 2020-21 racing session, 12 jumps races were held with less than five horses per race. Trainer Richard Jolly said:

I did have jumpers but because we have no riders here it just became cost prohibitive to have to fly jockeys in to do the training and race riding.

On 12 October, trainer Tony McEvoy told the Barossa's *The Leader* that he supported the decision to end jumps in SA and added:

It was quite different back in the day but when all the rules changed and they lowered the jumps and started to modify them, attempting to make it safer, it made it worse in my view because horses can go faster.

These are just some of the overwhelming majority of trainers who have conceded the end of jumps in South Australia. As Tony McEvoy pointed out, there are no registered jumps jockeys in South Australia. Despite the writing on the wall, there is a very small fraternity in South Australia who continue to believe jumps racing should continue.

They will have you believe that jobs will be lost, and seek a return to the good old days—those nostalgic days when the poets Banjo Patterson and Adam Lindsay Gordon (a member of the House of Assembly in South Australia in 1865) romanticised steeplechases, the days when tens of thousands of people attended Oakbank.

I was one of them—I am talking as though I am Frank, by the way; I was not one of them—both a racegoer-cum-camper and a journalist covering the event for *The News* and the *Sunday Mail*. Such was the fascination with the race described as Australia's favourite picnic meeting that families would continue the generations-long tradition of making camp in the same spot. Even the pre-meeting trials would attract a sizeable gathering of observers. It was a time before Crows footy, dedicated racing channels and the internet—way before my time.

Those were also the days before social media images of fallen horses, the lethal green tarp being rolled out and greater animal welfare awareness. We saw some horrific race falls on live television. They are images that do not sit well with the broader community. It certainly does not make for a family-friendly spectacle. Just because it was, does not mean it always should be.

Society, including sport, has actually moved on in so many ways and areas that would not have been contemplated in years gone by. Attitudes to animal cruelty do and have changed over time due to public perceptions and more informed debate. What were once considered acceptable practices in society have been replaced by changing values and virtues. Greyhounds chasing live lures is one that comes to mind.

There was a time, while working for the afternoon paper, *The News*, that I recall Frances Nelson QC and John Glatz, the strongest voices to keep jumps racing, were once featured promoting live fox hunts on horseback involving hounds on private land in the Adelaide Hills, through

the venerable Adelaide Hunt Club. This club, founded in 1840, would use hounds to hunt down kangaroo, emu and deer in its early days before the introduction of foxes, which are now regarded as feral pests. The British banned this so-called sport in 2005 and there was pressure put on these types of clubs elsewhere in the world to follow suit.

In an interview in 2006 with *The Advertiser* journalist Rex Jory, Mr Glatz revealed to him that he believed there were probably 20 hunts a year still happening. He said at the time the hunt club still had hounds and often went onto his Hills property, where many foxes abounded. This is not to suggest there were pursuits or deliberate acts of live fox hunting occurring, however. Following outcries from animal welfare groups, the Adelaide Hunt Club made a wise and humane decision to stop this barbaric practice some years ago. The welfare of animals is very much in the minds of most Australians these days.

There are only two jumps trainers in South Australia and despite the significant majority of their work being on flats racing, we have moved an amendment—for the avoidance of doubt—to ensure they can continue to train horses here in South Australia, should they wish. It is to ensure a legislated ban on jumps racing will not prevent a trainer from schooling a racehorse—waking up a flats horse before race day by putting them over a few jumps in the week prior—or apply to show jumping or equestrian events and the like.

It is to ensure the passing of this bill does not prevent racing.com or Sky or TAB radio from broadcasting a jumps race held in Victoria or the UK or France or race books being printed with interstate fields. We do this out of an abundance of caution. We have further clarified and support the bill on the understanding a South Australian could legally own a Victorian jumps horse.

The Hon. Tammy Franks has made a good case for a ban on jumps racing by highlighting animal welfare concerns over many years in this place, which I do not propose to replay in great detail. Since 2009, there have been 19 reported deaths as a result of jumps racing in South Australia. In more recent times, at Oakbank's replacement meeting at Pakenham in April, where not one South Australian trainer was represented at the meeting, three horses fell and an additional four had to be retired from the race, meaning seven out of 50, or 14 per cent, of horses failed to finish. Superstar jumps horse Zed Em was quietly retired after a fall at that meeting. He is one of the lucky ones.

At the recent Warrnambool May Racing Carnival, the biggest jumps carnival in Australia where, again, not one South Australian trainer was represented in jumps events, four horses fell and an additional three had to be retired from the race, meaning seven out of 70, or 10 per cent, of horses failed to finish.

At Casterton, also in May, over four races there were 33 starters and nine, or 27 per cent, failed to finish, with one horse dangerously losing its rider and crossing the track as the remaining horses jumped a hurdle in the final stages of the race. Then there is the issue of workplace safety for jockeys. At Warrnambool, jockey Will Gordon was seriously injured by a jumps fall and was airlifted to Royal Melbourne Hospital with a fractured shoulder, punctured lung, lacerated liver and concussion.

I will just pause here to clarify that SA-Best supports the horse racing industry in South Australia. Clearly, we do not support the gambling industry. I can categorically say we do not support the gambling industry, but we support the stablehands, the trainers, the event staff and we understand it is a passion for many.

While I am no longer a punter, as an aficionado of sport I still follow major racing carnivals here and interstate and I marvel at the deeds of great racehorses like Black Caviar, Winx and the mighty Makybe Diva, and the delicate skills of jockeys, male and female. In my younger years, I co-raced and bred standardbred horses, pacers and trotters. This is not the thin edge of the wedge for us. We will not be supporting a ban on racing next.

Maybe greyhound racing is also in the sights of the Greens. They want to kill racing altogether. It is one of their policies, but it will never be allowed to happen anywhere. Horse racing is of course a global sport and we are active participants. I, for one, would be quite vocal about any

moves in this direction. We all recognise the importance of this industry and the thousands of jobs it creates. It also provides enjoyment.

People who own or work with animals used in racing do love them and do care immensely for them. Can you ever imagine banning the Melbourne Cup, the Everest, the Doomben 10,000, the Blue Diamond Stakes or the Cox Plate? There would be a revolt. Do you ban motor racing just because drivers can and have been killed? No, because we have seen enormous improvements in the safety of cars and racetracks.

In the meantime, racing in this state does have its challenges and remains at the crossroads compared with racing in states like Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland and WA. I hope the new Malinauskas government reviews the support for the industry here and gives it the leg up they have been crying out for, especially since Labor introduced its gambling tax where very little of the revenue that is generated finds its way back into the industry here. The sell-off of the TAB was another blow and poor privatisation decision. The industry here needs to be able to compete with interstate racing prize money and promotion and also retain jockeys, trainers and good horses to make racing a spectacle once more.

Finally, I would just like to add, if this bill does not enjoy the support of this place, I will not bring jumps racing back to South Australia. The industry itself has already spoken on jumps racing. There is a vocal minority who just will not let this rest and it is time for the parliament to put the issue to bed once and for all. With those words, SA-Best indicates its support for the bill.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (18:13): The government will finalise its position on this bill when it goes to the other place, if it passes this chamber. The government will not object to the bill passing the Legislative Council. The government notes that the racing industry has already taken the decision to remove jumps racing from its schedule, and the government will continue to consult with stakeholders in the industry and the community on the proposal.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (18:13): I remain constantly surprised by this place. I thank all members who contributed to this debate. I think it has been an unnecessarily protracted and frustrating one over many years. We are seeing the last vestiges of jumps racing supporters put up an increasingly shameful and dishonest campaign to try to stop what I think is actually inevitable.

Indeed, as I have just noted to a journalist on ABC radio, Victoria and South Australia are the only places that still run jumps racing in this nation, I have to say, simply because people want their so-called entertainment. We really must get real and recognise that the Law Society has recognised this for the cruelty that it is.

The data from this jumps season in Victoria is a sobering reminder of just how much more dangerous jumps races are compared with flat racing, even when measures are taken and introduced to make them supposedly safer. This season alone up to 8 June, there have been 11 race meetings with 39 jumps races and 56 flat races in those meetings in Victoria. While there were more flat than jumps races, 11 horses fell in jumps races while not a single one fell in the flat races.

Those safety measures certainly have not proved to be effective in Victoria. At least two jumps horses have died in jumps racing in Victoria this season, and there have been no deaths from flat races in Victoria this season. That is 11 race meetings with jumps racing and, on average, 11 falls—one fall per race per meeting, despite their safety measures being introduced.

At least 76 horses in South Australia and Victoria have died as a result of jumps race injuries between 2009 and 2021, and I say 'at least' because the death toll is believed to be much higher because the industry has not been compelled to publicly report all associated injuries and deaths. Of course, this does not even touch on how many horses fail to finish races or knuckle and stumble during jumps races. We know that these figures are not complete. Frankly, the industry does not seem that interested in true accountability and transparency.

The 2016 South Australian parliamentary Select Committee on Jumps Racing found that jumps racing is significantly more dangerous for horses and riders than flat racing. That is what it found. It produced 28 recommendations in a report that gave the sector three years—that is, until 2019, and it is now 2022—to fix the key animal welfare and transparency issues. The

recommendations also found that jumps racing is significantly more dangerous for horses and riders than flat racing.

The transparency recommendations focused on increasing the data captured and ensuring that it was accessible and reported in a way that enabled further analysis, for instance, showing the link between races, injuries, deaths and final outcomes for horses after becoming what is called 'non-viable' for racing and being listed as retired. Currently, there is little information published to identify whether jumps horses that are retired are retrained, euthanised or sent to slaughter.

The recommendations also encouraged the sector to increase investment in injury prevention and treatment, horse retraining and rehoming. Unfortunately, again, there is little evidence to suggest that these recommendations have been implemented. The sector does not publish lifetime information for each horse. Injuries and deaths in training and trials are not always reported. The impact of non-fatal injuries from colliding, knuckling, etc., is rarely reported.

Horse deaths after race day are rarely counted as having resulted from a race, although they often have. There is little evidence of research into the factors that contribute to horses failing to finish races or the publication of safety action plans. There is still no requirement for injured horses that mask their injuries on race day, which is normal for prey animals, to receive follow-up vet assessments following race day.

I see no space for this industry in modern South Australia. It is well past time we joined with almost the entirety of the rest of Australia, other than Victoria, and provided certainty with regard to ending animal cruelty in this state and, for that matter, certainty to the racing industry itself. I have long said that jumps racing forms something around 1 per cent of the industry, but it certainly provides about 99 per cent of not only the bad publicity but the harm to the industry in so many ways other than just the horses. With that, I commend the bill.

The council divided on the second reading:

Ayes 9
Noes 3
Majority 6

AYES

Bonaros, C.	Bourke, E.S.	Franks, T.A. (teller)
Hanson, J.E.	Maher, K.J.	Martin, R.B.
Ngo, T.T.	Scriven, C.M.	Wortley, R.P.

NOES

Centofanti, N.J. (teller)	Lee, J.S.	Wade, S.G.
---------------------------	-----------	------------

PAIRS

Hunter, I.K.	Curran, L.A.	Pangallo, F.
Lensink, J.M.A.	Pnevmatikos, I.	Girolamo, H.M.
Simms, R.A.	Hood, D.G.E.	

Second reading thus carried; bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: On behalf of the Hon. Mr Pangallo, I move:

Amendment No 1 [Pangallo–1]—

Page 2, after line 14 [clause 3, inserted section 14AA]—Insert:

- (1a) However, nothing in subsection (1) prevents a person from—
- (a) organising, promoting or participating in, or participating in organising or promoting, equestrian eventing, show jumping or a cross-country event; or
 - (b) jumping a horse, or requiring a person to jump a horse, over an obstacle other than in the course of a horse race; or
- Example—
- Training or preparation of a horse that includes jumping an obstacle.
- (c) publishing the field of horses competing in jumps racing held in another state or territory, or overseas; or
 - (d) advertising jumps racing held in another state or territory, or allowing images or audio of such racing to be shown or heard.

I have already explained what this amendment does. I commend it to the chamber.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: For the record, I will not be moving amendments Nos 2 and 3 on behalf of the Hon. Mr Pangallo.

Clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (18:27): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

The council divided on the third reading:

Ayes 9
 Noes 3
 Majority 6

AYES

Bonaros, C.
 Hanson, J.E.
 Ngo, T.T.

Bourke, E.S.
 Maher, K.J.
 Scriven, C.M.

Franks, T.A. (teller)
 Martin, R.B.
 Wortley, R.P.

NOES

Centofanti, N.J. (teller)

Lee, J.S.

Wade, S.G.

PAIRS

Hunter, I.K.
 Girolamo, H.M.
 Simms, R.A.

Curran, L.A.
 Pnevmatikos, I.
 Hood, D.G.E.

Pangallo, F.
 Lensink, J.M.A.

Third reading thus carried; bill passed.

At 18:32 the council adjourned until Thursday 16 June 2022 at 14:15.