

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, 7 July 2022

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (11:01): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable petitions, the tabling of papers and questions without notice to be taken into consideration at 2.15pm.

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: I note the absolute majority.

Bills

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MOTOR SPORT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 June 2022.)

The Hon. J.S. LEE (11:02): I rise today to speak on the South Australian Motor Sport (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2022 and indicate that I am the lead speaker for the Liberal Party in the Legislative Council for this bill. This bill aims to re-establish the SA Motorsport Board to undertake promotion and management of motorsport events in South Australia and for the board to enter into agreements on behalf of the state. I have a specific interest in this bill, because it will have direct and indirect impact across all my shadow ministerial portfolios, including tourism and hospitality, multicultural South Australia and communities.

With the national economy looking to rebuild after a difficult two years, a study by Ernst and Young revealed motorsport has a significant contribution to the Australian economy, with a total gross annual output of \$8.6 billion. The study found that the motorsport industry provides \$3.1 billion in direct output while providing \$5.5 billion of indirect output based on the pre-COVID figures. The motorsport industry also supported 16,900 direct jobs and a further 29,900 indirect jobs in 2019, the year the study was based on. The sport also enjoys support from approximately 18,900 unpaid officials and volunteers, creating a total workforce of 65,700.

Locally, in South Australia, it was reported that the Adelaide 500 in 2019 injected \$45 million into the South Australian economy and created 435 jobs and some 250,000 people came into the CBD, consisting of South Australians and visitors from interstate and overseas. Activities associated with motorsport generated enormous tourism, hospitality and economic benefits for our state.

With these social, cultural and economic benefits, which I have outlined, in mind, I will echo the contribution made by our shadow minister for sport, recreation and racing, Mr Vincent Tarzia, the member for Hartley in the other place, which showed our bipartisan support for this bill in the House of Assembly. I will indicate to the state government today that it will also have a clear passage in the upper house.

While the opposition will be supporting this bill to establish the South Australian Motorsport Board, I would like to take this opportunity to remind South Australians how the Malinauskas Labor government is desperately trying to rebrand themselves as the 'new Labor'. Through their rebranding, they are dissociating themselves further from the Weatherill Labor government.

Let me remind honourable members that it was the former Labor government that abolished the motorsports board in 2015. Between 2015 and the lead-up to the last election in 2022, the Labor Party obviously had a change of heart because they saw a political opportunity. They are now admitting that they were wrong to abolish the board in 2015.

Those who were around in 2014 may recall that there was a review of government boards and committees in 2014. The SA Motorsport Board was one of the many abolished by the Weatherill Labor government. It will be no surprise to many that the jurisdictional arguments they used to abolish the board include that it contributed to duplication, unnecessary complexity and inefficiency within government, and they also said it was creating unnecessary work for the Public Service.

At the time, in 2015, the national body, the Confederation of Australian Motor Sport, lobbied for the board to remain. Concerns about scrapping the board raised included the detrimental impacts on the economy, risks to governance and safety of the Clipsal 500—which is what it was called then—and World Solar Challenge events and a hit to grassroots participation. The national body warned that the board disbandment would hurt the state economy and unquestionably damage the SA motorsports sector, which generates hundreds of millions of dollars each year.

The former tourism minister, the Hon. Leon Bignell, the member for Mawson, stated at the time in parliament:

...we decided to get rid of this Liberal invention of a Motor Sport Board so that we had more control over what was going on.

The member for Mawson further went on to say:

Of course, the people involved in the Motor Sport Board kept telling me that it would be a disaster, that the Clipsal 500 would be a disaster.

Mr Bignell in the other place argued at the time that if the state could run the biggest bike race, outside the Tour de France then we could probably do a pretty good job of running the Clipsal 500 motorsport race without the SA Motorsport Board.

It is really interesting, however, that a few years later the tone of Labor's seemingly compelling or, some would say, convenient argument back then has now lost its purpose, because the current Labor Party is detaching themselves from the past, separating their policy settings from the old Labor. It is like watching the movie *Back to the Future*, as if we are travelling in a time machine. What we see here is the new Labor government winding back the clock and re-establishing the board which they axed seven years ago. Ironically, this bill comes to the debate at the same time as the new Malinauskas Labor government has announced another review into state government boards and committees, looking once again—once again—to slash the number of boards to find savings.

Another interesting observation to puzzle over is why the Premier, the Hon. Peter Malinauskas, the member for Croydon, has taken motorsport out of the tourism portfolio and taken it for himself. On 14 April 2022, it was printed in the *Government Gazette* that the Minister for Tourism, the Hon. Zoe Bettison, delegated all her functions and powers under the South Australian Tourism Commission Act 1994 with respect to the Adelaide 500 motor racing event to the Hon. Peter Malinauskas, the Premier.

Those who are paying close attention may notice that the current Premier of South Australia does not have any ministerial portfolio responsibility. Unlike the former Premier, the Hon. Steven Marshall—who had about six portfolios, including Minister for Tourism—Premier Malinauskas has not given himself any portfolios other than being the Premier of South Australia.

My curiosity prompted me to make an inquiry to the Parliament Research Library to look at what ministries were held by former premiers. I am very grateful to the research library for producing the historical data table for me. The table shows a fascinating comparison of all the ministries held by every single premier of this state since 1938, dated back to the Playford era. It highlighted that every single premier we have had in South Australia has held many ministerial portfolios in the history

of this parliament and in successive governments, whether Labor or Liberal—with the exception of the current Premier, the Hon. Peter Malinauskas.

The current Premier does not have any specific ministries attached to him. Historically, the motorsport act and the Motorsport Board have been the responsibility of the Minister for Tourism. One cannot help but wonder why the current Premier chose not to demonstrate his full commitment to motorsport by simply making himself the Minister for Tourism, but instead he is cherry-picking his favourite projects or areas of interest.

Another interesting observation is the way the key appointments for SA Motorsport were announced. Today is Thursday 7 July 2022. The SA motorsport bill is still being debated. It has not yet passed the upper house, yet the announcement of some of the SA Motorsport appointments was already made on 1 May 2022 by the Malinauskas Labor government. Do we not think that this whole process is undermining the work and proper process of parliament? Where are the consultations with elected members like us? Where is the transparency and accountability of the Malinauskas Labor government?

It seems that the decisions have already been made. The Labor government is making decisions ahead of the legislation being properly considered by elected members. The government is calling for tenders and procurement of contracts when the bill has not even passed the Legislative Council yet. It is very astounding how Labor is taking things for granted. It shows a disrespect for the due process of parliament, and it demonstrates the high level of pure arrogance of the Malinauskas Labor government.

Nevertheless, we accept that the appointments have been made, and we are glad the appointees are widely accepted as the most suitable candidates. I would like to congratulate Mr Mark Warren as chief executive for the new South Australian Motorsport Board and also convey my congratulations to Mr Andrew Daniels, the chair of the board. I want to put on the public record that the Liberal Party welcome their appointments because both of them are highly regarded by the industry and have extensive experience and passionate expertise to deliver motorsport events. I understand that Motorsport Australia supports their appointments as well.

The Liberal opposition look forward to working with them and wish them every success in their roles to deliver the anticipated outcomes for South Australia. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Mr Eugene Arocca, Chief Executive of Motorsport Australia, and Mr Mike Smith, director of motorsport, and their team for taking the time to meet with myself and Mr Vincent Tarzia to give their feedback on the bill and to provide their valuable insights into the motorsport industry more broadly.

During our conversations, they highlighted one very important development in South Australia, which is the establishment of The Bend Motorsport Park by the Shahin family. During the visit to The Bend, former Premier Marshall commended Dr Shahin's bold vision and obsession for motorsport as a driving force for bringing the world-class facility to Tailem Bend and injecting economic activities into the region.

Motorsport Australia reported a 30 per cent increase in motorsport permits issued in the period immediately after The Bend started hosting events. Without any doubt, Motorsport Australia absolutely supports the re-establishment of the board, and they are very pleased that the bill will have bipartisan support. The opposition took the liberty to invite them for comments, and they provided valuable input regarding the composition of the board and skill set required. They believe that the bill should mandate that a representative of Motorsport Australia be appointed to the board.

I would like to take this opportunity to incorporate some key and valid suggestions by Motorsport Australia for honourable members' consideration. Motorsport Australia is calling for the parliament to mandate that a representative of Motorsport Australia be appointed to the board. The previous board had such an appointment. An appointment is seen to be advantageous for the board to ensure proper advice on everything from circuit design to safety related matters can receive due consideration and to pursue new events. Another critical suggestion is to bring a board member that understands the culture and trends of motorsport, who is fully committed to seeing the sport grow in a safe and sustainable manner.

One other valid recommendation by Motorsport Australia is relating to the term of appointment. They suggest that the term should be for three years, with eligibility of reappointment. However, there ought to be a provision that no-one should serve more than three terms. Having a time limit allows for fresh ideas and renewal. This is in keeping with good governance and to ensure that adequate succession is in place.

While the Liberal Party is not seeking to make amendments to the bill in the current form, I encourage the Malinauskas Labor government to consider providing a spot at the table for Motorsport Australia, because I think there is great value to have a representative from Motorsport Australia, who can provide advice to support the popularity, growth and long-term sustainability of motorsport in South Australia.

More importantly, as the shared shadow minister for tourism, hospitality as well as multicultural South Australian communities, I strongly concur with the view that a representative from Motorsport Australia will provide direct access and act as a conduit to ensure better cooperation and more collaboration at a national and international level.

I see enormous opportunity for a representative from Motorsport Australia working with the SA Motorsport Board to ensure events are conducted to include activities that promote youth and junior participation, diversity and inclusion, including multiculturalism and volunteerism in motorsport. This is an area that is very close to my heart. If you want major events in South Australia to succeed, we must bring all our committee members along on this journey.

From the many independent reports and information presented to us for consideration, motorsport is an exciting industry that holds many social and economic opportunities for South Australia. It has flow-on effects to a variety of industries outside of supercar racing, which includes tourism, hospitality, retail and entertainment. Accommodation venues at local, state and national levels all benefit from their motorsport presence, providing a significant impact on a large number of communities.

With the motorsport market growing rapidly in Asia and other parts of the world, there are many opportunities for South Australia to leverage on attracting other international events to the state and providing world-class training for international delegates and race officials. It will be helpful if the Labor government can explain during the committee stage how SA Tourism Commission and SA Motorsport Board will work together in practice.

In order for the new Motorsport Board to achieve what it sets out to do, it has to be an efficient and effective organisation that has the expertise and skills to carry out its vision and objectives. We want to see motorsport grow and have long-term sustainability in South Australia beyond the Adelaide 500 race. As indicated, we do not intend to hold up the passage of this bill. With those comments, I conclude my remarks and look forward to raising some questions in the committee stage.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (11:19): I rise to speak as one of two Greens speakers on this bill. The Greens recognise, no matter how we might feel about it, that Adelaide has long had a car race. The Formula One car race—which we know, according to my adviser, was 'stolen' by the Victorians—was last held in 1995. The then state government struck a deal to stage a supercar race in 1999, and indeed in 1999 the Sensational Adelaide 500 was held.

We also recognise that the SATC having responsibility for our races after the board was disbanded was the wrong move. Members who have been in this chamber for some time would be quite familiar with my ongoing concerns about the lack of transparency with regard to the SATC's management of what was previously the Clipsal 500 in many years gone by, but in the time I was asking the questions about it it was the Superloop—although for one of those years it did not have a sponsor at all. We are hoping to see better transparency with the passage of this particular legislation.

Surprising no-one, the Greens are not actually fans of those motorsports that are still using vehicles powered by fossil fuels. We do recognise, however, the opportunity here is presented by bringing back the motorsports board in seeing South Australia become more involved and invested in things such as Formula E and, of course, the World Solar Challenge. We are truly looking forward to the future of motorsports coming to our state. I do recognise that the Adelaide 500 could still take place with or without this legislation, so that is somewhat of a moot point. But while this particular

race is an important part of the debate on this bill, it is not actually necessarily materially affected by it, and note that with regard to our position on this bill.

However, we do want to put on record our concerns and the concerns particularly of many city residents about racing coming back to the city in this particular capacity. In fact, through our campaigning in the recent state election and discussions with the residents, many of them sure as hell do not want it back. The noise and disruption caused to them by the race has been a longstanding issue, not to mention the traffic delays, the restrictions on trade—there are frustrations not just for those within the city. Minister Bettison's own FOIs could tell her and the Labor Party this, because those documents do reveal that the south-east city residents have long lobbied for this car race to be removed from the City of Adelaide.

When I came to this place back in 2010, in 2009 I campaigned on a Greens platform of moving the car race down to Gillman and we had done so with the local motorsports community. I note that that was before we saw The Bend, but indeed I have to say that a Port Adelaide 500, a Port Adelaide street race, would create far fewer traffic hassles in the city and place less disadvantage on the other events that we currently have.

I do also welcome, though, the removal of this race from March. The impact on the third week of the Fringe was never calculated in the economic impact of this race. We know that those sales in the third week of the Adelaide Fringe always went down, as people either had their events impeded by the noise or indeed had those particular patrons choose not to go into the city on that particular weekend.

Importantly as well, that measure would leave the Parklands alone. To that end, one of the amendments I will be moving today will remove references to the parkland from this bill and the act so that the Parklands will be off-limits for motorsports racing in South Australia. There have been ongoing concerns about the impact of motorsports on the Parklands, and in 2020 we saw the creation of a campaign group, Reimagining Victoria Park, which was forced to raise concerns about the park becoming a bitumen heatsink. In their response to the prospect of the Adelaide 500 returning to the city, they have stated:

...the present and future amenity of Victoria Park—one of Adelaide's most heavily used and best-loved parks for general community recreation and sports—is in jeopardy because, firstly, there is inadequate tree canopy to counter the impacts of global warming and provide shade for walkers, runners, cyclists and spectators; and secondly, based on past experience, the Adelaide 500 race excludes the public from a large swathe of the park for five months each year.

That is an extraordinary impact that, again, is never accounted for in the figures or the statements. There has been regular criticism from many groups. The idea that public parklands—our public parklands, open green space that belongs to everyone—is being blocked off for months at a time for a polluting race that much of the public have little interest in and only goes for a few days. Is this striking the right balance? I have to say that we are seeing public green land being used for a private event, and I am not sure that we are getting a return for our investment that is an appropriate one. But who would know? We do not have transparency in the figures.

It is not just the noise and pollution, not to mention the congestion that city residents and others are concerned about. Again, as some members would be aware, I have previously raised these concerns in this place and in the media. Having worked as the Young Women's Program Manager at the YWCA, which is based on Hutt Street, it is being directly impacted in that premises by the car race, and then my following Young Women's Program Manager is doing work on the level particularly of sexual harassment and harassment that women, and particularly young women, face in the city in the wake of these races over the many years.

There is statistical and survey data that has been taken on that, as well as the actual police stats that bear some of that out as well. I would hope that these concerns that have been raised are something that the board will take into consideration moving forward, and work to provide a safe, and a safer, environment for everyone while these races are taking place in the future.

Greater transparency and accountability is also something I hope we will see from this new board. I do have some confidence, and I hope that confidence is well-founded. In the past, despite

significant effort, however, and repeated questions, we have not been able to obtain information on even how many tickets are actually sold to the race. This is extraordinary.

I can go to the Adelaide Fringe impact document released just over a week ago and I can tell you not only how many tickets were sold at the past Adelaide Fringe event but what category they were on and what age the people were in those age cohorts that they were sold to. It is extraordinary that with the amount of public money that goes to this event we do not even get the ticket sales given to us, the South Australia public, who are the ones who give the social licence for this race to continue.

I will be putting forward that amendment, and I take it as a sign of goodwill for greater transparency about reporting on these events into the future. This reporting which would simply include the number and type of tickets that are sold, and also given away as gifts—I know that this is a goodwill gesture but given away to volunteers such as those who are in our CFS or emergency services, and these are very good things and you would think that in fact they would want to be trumpeting these good initiatives, but apparently, no, it is all too much for us to find out these figures in the current regime. I am hoping the new regime will be more transparent and accountable.

In summary, the Greens have not been the biggest fans of the return of the Adelaide 500. We campaigned against it at the state election. We campaigned against it at the Bragg by-election. We say it is the wrong race in the wrong place. We hope the Motorsport Board, with their more discrete attention to all motorsports, but in particular that car race, will bring a level of nuance to the debate that has not been here in the parliament currently, and certainty has not been forthcoming from the SATC.

On that note, we do welcome bringing back the Motorsport Board. We welcome them taking the management of this. I note there has been commentary made about the Premier taking on this role. I understand that with the mechanics of a new government it was appropriate that this sit within Premier and Cabinet to get the job done.

It was an election commitment with a December deadline and it seems that this government, the Malinauskas government will get this job done and will honour the election commitment. I have no quarrel with that. What I do ask, though, and I would like the government to respond to is: could they outline how the decision was made to discontinue the Adelaide 500, what bodies were involved in that decision and on what date was it made, and how was it communicated to the South Australia public? I cannot quite hear what the Hon. Tung Ngo is interjecting because he has a mask on.

The Hon. T.T. Ngo interjecting:

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The Hon. Tung Ngo believes that it was a personal decision. I am interested to know whether the government would concur with that. My understanding was that it was a formal decision made by a formally constituted body. So I look forward to that being placed on the record. Many in this council would probably like to pretend that it was a personal decision; it was not a personal decision. But I look forward to the record providing that detail and transparency in the second reading response, if not in the committee stage.

For those who are new to this place, I have been asking questions about the Adelaide 500, no matter who the sponsor was, or when they lost their sponsor, about things like ticket sales and about how much money we get in return for the amount of money that we spend on it, for over a decade. I am sick to death of having those questions never answered and being told it is all commercial-in-confidence and that it is all too hard.

I do thank the former minister, Leon Bignell, for his honesty when he told us at one point that Robbie Williams actually saved the race that year and, had they not had a big headliner that year, it would have been somewhat of a disaster. He told us that after the event and after that year's race had been done and in retrospect, but that is on the public record. So I ask members to reflect on that when we continue to back events that perhaps may have had their day. I also welcome that this motorsport board may have more of an eye to the future than the SATC has had. With that, I welcome the debate.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (11:31): I rise to speak in support of the South Australian Motor Sport (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill. It is designed to return the planning and implementation of

motorsport events, like the Adelaide 500, to a dedicated motorsport board, made up of individuals with the know-how to stage these events successfully, and therefore be of benefit to the business community, tourism and job creation, as well as making them entertaining and enjoyable for South Australians and Australian motorsport fans.

I will not delve into the financial benefits of having an event like the Adelaide 500 back on our city streets, because that has been well canvassed by the government and others, but we know it will drive enormous economic activity, particularly in the CBD, which has been gutted by the pandemic. I know so many people with businesses in the city—cafe and restaurant owners, particularly my mates across the road, Ralph and Danny at Parlamento—who are looking forward to seeing the streets come alive, so to speak, if I can borrow the slogan from our very first Formula One Grand Prix back in 1985, which I attended as a journalist, and the subsequent ones that followed, along with the supercar events.

These events do generate genuine excitement in our community. They also put the city and the state on the international map of motorsport events. I point out that the motorsport board, which had been so effective in selling and staging these great events, was dismantled by Labor and put into the hands of the South Australian Tourism Commission, which did not have the expertise nor, I suspect, the zeal to maintain the standards that had been set over those preceding years.

That is not to say I am being critical of the South Australian Tourism Commission. Quite frankly, they have done a fantastic job with the Tour Down Under and other tourism campaigns, particularly in the past two years of the pandemic. I just do not think it was a good fit with them running a motorsport event without the appropriate expertise being in there, and that is what this bill will address.

I remember when the former Liberal minister, the Hon. David Ridgway, came to me in my office and broke the news that they were axing the Adelaide 500. At first I thought he was having a lend of me. I then described it as the dumbest decision I have seen the government make.

The Hon. R.A. Simms: That's a big call.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Simms! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: At the time it was. They were relatively new, but it was a dopey decision, nonetheless, as we now know and one that they regret because it has been so costly for them, particularly losing the seat of Adelaide. Only a few months earlier, the then Premier, Steven Marshall, in a live television cross and beaming like the happy quokka the Prime Minister described him as, was magnanimously praising the event and the benefits it brought our city. Like the Hon. Tammy Franks, I would like to one day know why there was a sudden about-face on this event. However, as we have seen, it did cost the Liberals dearly, as I have pointed out.

I must say, they attempted to take away a genuine family event enjoyed across the state. We were told that families had saved up for tickets and looked forward to going there with their children and soaking up the atmosphere. I was a revhead myself and a lover of motorsport for so many years. I have not only attended the V8 events but also the Grand Prix, both here and overseas, as a reporter. There is nothing like the smell of burning rubber and brakes, the sounds of throaty V8 engines and turbocharged engines and the cut and thrust of racing itself. It was also an accessible event, with drivers ready to mingle with the public.

I would like to point out that perhaps one of the most cynical acts of the previous government was, when it looked like there was a strong movement to save the event and bring it back if there was to be a change of government, when they decided to flog off the infrastructure. It was shameful. It was shameful to do that without waiting a few months to see what would happen. It was just an attempt to destroy that race coming back onto the streets of Adelaide.

Labor and the crossbench—us in particular—rallied together to make sure that that event would come back. The thing that galls me is that governments will spend hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money in branding and putting on these events and then establishing the city as a motorsport hub, not just in this country but internationally, and then it is just pulled away on a whim by an inexplicable decision of government. You are throwing away hundreds of millions of

dollars that had already been spent in putting the event on, just throwing that down the drain without any proper explanation. I still shake my head at some of the decisions that are made like that.

The PRESIDENT: Just before you continue, the Hon. Mr Pangallo. Conversations in the chamber—perhaps members could go elsewhere. Excuse me, the Hon. Ms Bonaros, you and the advisers perhaps might like to go to a meeting room so that the Hon. Mr Pangallo can be heard in silence. Thank you.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Thank you, Mr President. As we know, the Adelaide 500 was not quite the glamour event that the Formula One was and still is, but it was enough to satisfy our love for having a major motorsport event here, was an event that was popular with teams and drivers and was, as I have pointed out, on an international level.

Serious aficionados of motorsport around the globe knew about Adelaide, its motorsport traditions and its DNA, with the Australian Grand Prix being staged here as far back as 1939, going through the challenging and dangerous roads of Lobethal in the Adelaide Hills. I think at the time it was, and probably still is, Australia's longest Grand Prix track. It ran something like 14 kilometres and was raced over 17 laps. It was Australia's first all-bitumen circuit and was active between 1937 and 1948, hosting a number of events, some of which attracted up to 60,000 spectators at a time.

I endorse Premier Malinauskas's commitment to returning this great event. It started in opposition, and we supported it at various protest rallies, including the first one here on the steps of Parliament House. Just a few hundred turned up to that first one. I would like to also thank and congratulate motorsport fan Sam Henderson, who flagged off the movement to bring the race back. Sam and his parents met with both the Premier and myself, and I must say I was most impressed by Sam's passion to win the event back.

As his dad pointed out, the race—the 500—changed Sam's life. When he was just a five year old, with autism, he went to the race and met driver Mark Skaife, sat on Mark's lap and spoke for the first time. He has been a committed motorsport fan since then. I gather he is also now taking part in carting events. I hope we reward Sam in some sort of way at the first event this year, perhaps giving him—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Waving the flag at the finish line to mark the event, because Sam was a catalyst in the movement to bring back the race and an important one. So well done, mate.

Another one I would like to also acknowledge is Cheryl Lee Vangelis. Cheryl Lee was another who whipped up support for the event through many motorsport clubs and organisations. It was great fun taking part in a rally last year from Vili's cafe in Mile End along the South Eastern Freeway with vehicles that were involved in it.

There was also a poignant side trip that we took, travelling past the Calvary Hospital where Cheryl Lee, who could not take part in the rally that she had helped to organise, was undergoing serious cancer treatment. It was a great gesture from all those taking part in the rally to go past so that Cheryl Lee could see the cars—they were all V8s that took part that day—and to be able to wave to her and for her to be acknowledged.

I would also like to acknowledge drivers Tim Slade and Nic Percat. These are two great, patriotic South Australians. They also came over to Adelaide and helped promote the cause to bring the race back. I am sure they will be beaming once the event starts off in November.

Another one I would like to acknowledge is Murray Walker, who was an old colleague of mine in days gone by, the legendary Formula One broadcaster. Murray loved Adelaide. He loved the street circuit. He loved the Formula One when it was here. Of course, later he became an ambassador for the 500 and would often come back here—in fact, he came here for several events—to be part of the atmosphere.

Murray absolutely love the event. He often used to remark to me, when I would bump into him on the Formula One circuit or whatever and when I was co-writing Formula One columns with him, how much he really enjoyed coming to Adelaide for that last race of the year each year. He loved the atmosphere, soaking in the passion of fans on the street circuit.

One thing Murray would always do when he went to a city, whether it was for a Formula One event or maybe if he happened to go to Bathurst or whatever, was he would always take the time to walk the circuit. He would take a day out and walk the circuit and have a look at it. He often told me how he enjoyed leaving his hotel room—he used to stay at the Hilton Hotel—and being able to wander through the city streets and then go onto the circuit and enjoy the ambience of that.

I remember I had the pleasure of interviewing George Harrison in 1995 at our last Formula One Grand Prix. One remark that George made to me was how he loved walking from his hotel room to the circuit. He did not mind that people would come up to him seeking his autograph and trying to take selfies with him. He just loved the fact that you could do that from a hotel or a place of residence somewhere in the city, to be able to take that stroll onto a racetrack and then afterwards be able to stroll back through the city and see people enjoying themselves and the hospitality that was generated to them.

The Formula One drivers and, as I have mentioned, the 500 drivers were absolutely thrilled to come here at the end of a gruelling season, and the teams were as well. They were often able to let their hair down and enjoy the hospitality that South Australians provided to them during that period. It was a fantastic atmosphere.

As I mentioned the other day, the Premier is quite mischievous—and good luck to him—if he is trying to get the race back to South Australia. It is going to be a huge battle, but at least he has had a go at it. I am just wondering whether we would ever be successful in seeing it. I do not think it is going to happen in my lifetime, but I certainly hope it does, that we rekindle those wonderful memories of having that glamorous event here.

It was such an important event too, because most of the time in the 10 years it was here there was always something hinging on that race. We have had world champions who were hinging on it. There were controversial moments in those races. We had downpours, where the events were cut short. I think we may still have the record for the shortest Grand Prix after the, I think, 1989 downpour.

Again, the world's press would flood here and we would be on the front pages, or the back pages, of sports newspapers and magazines everywhere. That showed you the importance of what Adelaide stood for and the branding of Adelaide as an international centre for motorsport. It says something that you have a government that is committed, as I mentioned the other day, to unscrambling the egg. I would say to the Premier, the Hon. Peter Malinauskas, contrary to what he said on radio that you cannot unscramble eggs like taxes, he certainly has unscrambled this one.

Back to Murray: as I mentioned, sadly he passed away last year. One of the last posts that Murray made before he passed away was to express his strong support for the Adelaide event and condemn the fact that it had been axed. We all thank Murray for doing that. With that, I look forward to the return of the event later this year. I hope it will be a huge success and I await more announcements from the government.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (11:49): I rise to speak in relation to the South Australian Motor Sport (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill. Before doing so, I want to put on the public record for members' benefit the fact that I am a city resident; however, I do not consider that to be a conflict of interest. After all, the part of the city that I live in is not directly impacted by the sports race. It is also a large class of persons. I note that the race can proceed irrespective of what happens with this particular bill, given this is establishing the Motorsport Board, but the government already has the authority to press ahead with an Adelaide 500 race. I did think it was worthwhile putting that on the record.

The Greens' concerns around car racing are well known and have been well documented, as stated by my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks and my predecessor Mark Parnell. I have been on the public record many times over the years as an Adelaide city councillor, expressing concern around car racing. I do question whether this is the best use of public money, to spend millions of dollars of taxpayer money—I think it is about \$20 million over four years—on car racing, given the significant crises we face at the moment, the crisis in terms of the cost of living and the lack of affordable housing.

I also question whether this is really in keeping with the new government's priorities. Given we are in the midst of a climate emergency and this parliament has declared that, is now really the time to be bringing gas guzzlers and all those emissions back onto our city streets and celebrating car racing, a sport that does have such a significant impact on emissions? I do not think it is, but this is a view that the government has taken. It has long been the view of the Greens that it is better for these matters to be dealt with by the Motorsport Board in terms of transparency rather than the Tourism Commission.

I also want to flag the impact that this race could have on the Parklands, this public green space. There is an impact potentially on the natural flora and fauna in that area. One thing that is quite unique about the Adelaide 500 race in particular is that it is a race that runs through the CBD. In other places around the world, particularly Melbourne in Albert Park, it is a little removed from the city and so it has a slightly different impact.

I am concerned about the impacts of motor racing. I do question whether this is the correct priority for the government at this present time, at a time of climate crisis and growing inequality. I also do have some concerns around the impact this might have on city businesses. I heard media reports during the week that the Adelaide City Council has considered some of these issues and raised concerns around the impact on city businesses. I will be very interested in hearing some responses from the government in relation to those concerns as part of the committee stage.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (11:53): I rise to briefly speak on this bill. I will not be speaking from the same perspective as my colleague in terms of enthusiasm for these events because I do not know enough about them, frankly, but I know that this is something that he has pushed for very hard in terms of having it in South Australia.

We, too, were disappointed with the decision of the previous government, so I commend this government for its election commitment and seeing that through with the introduction of this bill and all the advocacy that went into that. Obviously, for the revheads in South Australia—and I have to say, I have been to some motorsport events and I do enjoy them—I think this is a good outcome.

I will be speaking to it from a slightly more potentially boring aspect, and that is one around gambling. If there is one thing that we do know, it is absolutely impossible these days to attend a sporting event and not be bombarded by gambling advertising, gambling promotion, betting odds. You cannot watch a game of footy or soccer or anything else without relying on betting odds to know where we are at with the game. It has become part of the conversation.

I have, for some unknown reason to me, tuned into a few of these shows, and the commentators are constantly referring to betting odds when they are talking about the game that is in play. Kids are referring to betting odds. It has become a normalised behaviour and embedded in our discussions as a community, in commentators' discussions and in sporting events more generally.

I do not think any of this is coincidental. I do not think these agencies advertise to the extent that they do with their little ribbons on the TV screens and at that these things out of any goodwill or just to keep us abreast of how a game or an event is going. They do it, though, because, as we know, this is all very carefully crafted to hook people to gambling products. That is something that I, as you should know, and SA-Best are extremely concerned about.

I would hasten to say that, if these agencies could bet on our kids' sporting events on weekends, they probably would, because there is nothing really that is immune from this sort of gambling advertising or these betting odds these days. Even elections now are not immune from betting odds. You can go and place a bet on just about anything, and I find that really disappointing.

Again, this is all very carefully crafted messaging to ensure that people become hooked to gambling products, to gambling as an activity and to normalise it as much as possible in the community. That is not a good outcome for gambling addiction. I do not think the 'gamble responsibly' messaging has much effect when you turn up to these events and you see huge promotions of gambling advertising across the place.

The discussions that I focused on with the government have been around restrictions of certain types of advertising and sponsorship at these events. I will say for the record, to that extent,

that I did have an amendment drafted but obviously wanted to engage with the government about what its intentions were around gambling advertising and promotion of gambling services at events that will be held under the scope of this legislation and, indeed, continue those discussions when it comes to other forms of state administered advertising and promotions and the sorts of agreements that they are entering into.

I think the state has a genuine responsibility to enter into responsible gambling agreements, and the advertising and promotion that they do should absolutely take into account the harms and impacts of the agencies that they enter those agreements into. To that end, from the discussions that I have had with the government—and I will make it clear for the record I am not intending to hold this bill up in any way, shape or form—it is my understanding now that the government is willing to place on the record some undertakings so as not to result in provisions that we cannot overcome or that would render some of the provisions of this bill impractical.

Insofar as the board is responsible for making decisions around its advertising or promotions at these events, there are some undertakings that they are willing to make in terms of the agreements that they will enter into with gambling providers and agencies. I am satisfied that the minister has indicated his willingness to have these discussions. Insofar as it is possible, we will not be interfering in any commercial arrangements—and I think we called them the sanctioning body for the various categories—because there will be commercial arrangements which we do not want to interfere in, when there is a team who has a particular sponsor; it might be Repco or it might be SkyCity Adelaide that is sponsoring a particular team.

We are certainly not suggesting that we interfere in those commercial arrangements that come along with the event, but as far as the board is responsible for advertising or promotion at an event then those undertakings will apply to the event itself—so basically, on-track gambling advertising and whether that will be allowed or restricted at the events that are hosted under the scope of this legislation.

I understand that there is a GCAC (Government Communications Advisory Committee), which is a communications and advertising committee, and they actually assess all the various campaigns and ultimately influence the policies that are put in place when it comes to the decisions that the board makes around the sort of advertising and arrangements that are agreed to by the government at various events.

My understanding—and I am sure that the minister or the Attorney will confirm this for the record—is that the government have now indicated their willingness to make various undertakings around restricting gambling advertising where those decisions are being made by the board, and there are specific provisions in the bill that deal with the board's ability to advertise or promote various things. I think it is in 'Functions of the board' and allows it to 'carry on any advertising and promotional activities' and restrict and control any of those sorts of advertising and promotional activities.

Those undertakings will relate specifically to those areas of the bill that deal with what will be and what will not be allowed. Perhaps if I can put it another way, I think it was when Minister Gago was here there was a decision made that there would no longer be grid girls at some of these events. I think it was Minister Gago, was it not?

The Hon. K.J. Maher: It was Biggles.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Oh, Minister Bignell at the time. I suppose that is the equivalent thing that springs to mind in terms of what we have said is acceptable and is not acceptable at this. I will be holding the government to those undertakings that they have made and working with them to limit, as much as possible, the arrangements around the promotion and advertising that occurs at these events—which inevitably becomes by the board.

I am hoping that the minister will soon confirm what I have just said, but effectively what we are saying is that the government have given undertakings that would tend to indicate that as far as is practicable they will restrict the promotion of gambling agencies, products and services on the track. That is the short way of describing it. I look forward to those undertakings from the minister and indicate again, as my colleague has, our support for the bill.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (12:03): I thank all honourable members for their contribution. I know there have been a few questions asked and things to make sure are read on to *Hansard*. I inform honourable members I intend to do that at clause 1, to be able to put those things that members have asked for on the record. With that, I commend the bill to the chamber.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The CHAIR: The bill has 25 clauses and a schedule. There are a number of amendments beginning at clause 6. Are there any contributions at clause 1?

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Chair, the minister has undertaken to provide answers at clause 1 from questions raised in the second reading debate and there may well be further questions.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I might first respond to the last thing because that is still in my head and I find that easier to do, and then I am sure the Hon. Tammy Franks will remind me of the things that the honourable member requires answers to. The Hon. Connie Bonaros raised the issue of gambling. I am able to put on the record, because I have been advised, that the government can make an undertaking that it will seek to restrict and minimise gambling advertising in relation to events being promoted by the South Australian Motorsport Board. This will be supported by using the guidelines and processes of the Government Communications Advisory Committee.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I will remind the minister of my question asked in the second reading. It was for specifics as to who decided to discontinue the Adelaide 500, when and where that decision was made and who were the individuals or organisations involved?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the member for her question. With the advice I have to hand at the moment, we do not have the details of exactly what processes were undertaken in the last term of government for the race being discontinued. However, I am assuming, and I am reasonably certain that at the end of the day if the race was desired to be kept going it would have been within the powers of the previous government and the Premier to do so.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: So the government does not know how the decision was made, and they have not bothered to go and find out how the decision was made to discontinue what they have committed to bring back—is that what the minister is telling me?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I reiterate to the honourable member that, based on the advice that I have to hand at the moment, I do not have the advice about the exact date and time and the exact processes that the former government went through when this race was discontinued. However, I would be reasonably certain that at the end of the day if there was a desire to continue with the race that would have been within the power of the former government, particularly the former Premier.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: With regard to the Adelaide Motorsport Festival, which the Motorsport Board will also have carriage of, what is the status of that particular event? While I am here I will ask: what is the status of Formula E? I understand from a recent Budget and Finance that no approach has been made as yet to the chief executive from Formula E. For the council's benefit, what is intended in the space of Formula E?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can inform the honourable member that in relation to the Adelaide Motorsport Festival, I am advised that South Australian Motorsport has been handed a major boost with the return of the highly popular Adelaide Motorsport Festival for the first time since 2018. The festival will take place in and around the streets of Adelaide, including parts of the original track where the Grand Prix was run between 1985 and 1995.

I am advised that throughout the festival attendees will be able to see motorsport action, with the focus on the event being Formula One cars from the Adelaide era. There will also be model demonstrations and parades, the most notable of which is the return of Peak Hour of Power, a parade of rare and exotic vehicles that ends in a party in the city.

The government is supporting this event and an agreement is in place to financially support this year's event and provide in-kind support to the organisation running the event. I am also informed in relation to Formula E that no formal approach has been made at this stage, but if any such approach was being made it certainly would be considered.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 4 passed.

Clause 5.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: I refer to new section 5(1), membership of the nine members appointed by the Governor. Can the minister explain why there is no consideration for Motorsport Australia to have a representative from the peak body to be on the board of the nine members?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. I reiterate a response that I understand was provided to the member for Hartley in another place, Vincent Tarzia, and also to the honourable member in relation to this issue. I can reiterate the previously provided response.

First, in relation to the suggestion of some prescriptive elements in relation to skills being added to the selection on appointment of board members, the government understands the intent of this suggestion and has existing guidelines in place to ensure a balance of skills established on the board under the government's boards and committee guidelines for agencies and board members, published by cabinet office.

The extensive guidance is provided to ensure balanced and effective boards are appointed by government agencies. This is a keystone election commitment of the new Labor government, and we will be appointing a dynamic, effective and well-balanced board that will set up this race for success in 2022 and into the future.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: I refer to new section 5(3), 'The Governor may appoint 1 member of the board'. Obviously, Mr Andrew Daniels has already been appointed as the chair, assuming the chair means the presiding member in this instance. Can the minister explain when the appointment of the presiding member—I think the chair has been announced publicly—took place? There was mention in new subsection (3) about the deputy presiding member. Has that presiding member been selected and can a person's name be provided to this chamber? Can the minister indicate the timing of the appointment of the other members?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that the individual mentioned would be the nominee, should this bill pass, and that will go through the normal processes of Executive Council in due course and there will be consideration, but a decision has not been reached in relation to a deputy.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Can I ask whether members to be appointed by the Governor to the board have already been notified? Has the government designated who these members will be and, if they have not, when do they anticipate they will be announced, assuming the bill passes, of course?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is there have not been any further appointments made or notifications to anyone of potential appointments. My further advice is that will happen as soon as possible, once the passage of this has concluded.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Further to the points that were raised by the Hon. Jing Lee in her address about the composition of the board, can the minister give us an indication of the qualifications and the skills that are going to be applicable to the membership of this board?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for his question. My advice is that the Government Boards and Committees Guidelines for Agencies and Board Members, published by the Cabinet Office, will provide a guide to that. It is the intention that those with the skills most suitable to ensure the best success of this event will be ones that are envisaged.

Clause passed.

Clause 6.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I move:

Amendment No 1 [AboriginalAff-1]—

Page 4, line 4 [heading to clause 6]—Delete 'Insertion of sections 4 to 9B' and substitute:

Substitution of section 10

Amendment No 2 [AboriginalAff-1]—

Page 4, line 5—Delete 'Before section 10 insert:' and substitute:

Section 10—delete section 10 and substitute:

These amendments go to very much the same thing. They are drafting amendments, referring to particular sections, that have been picked up between the chambers. My advice is that these are technical drafting errors and nothing else.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I rise to say that SA-Best will support the amendments.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: At new section 6—Term and conditions of office, subsections (1) and (2) stipulate that there will be a term, but the term is not specific. How long is each term? Is it three years? Who sets the term? Is it the Governor or the minister, because the appointment is by the Governor? Can the minister explain, thereafter, what is the reappointment after the expiration of the term?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that appointments will be made as appointments are usually made by the Governor on the recommendation of the Executive Council through a cabinet process. My further advice is that it is likely the appointments will be made at staggered lengths to allow for consistency of reappointment, so that they do not all come up at once and you can have consistency while also being able to renew the board over time. I am further advised that it is not envisaged that there is an impediment to reappointing someone who is already a board member at the conclusion of their term.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Is the minister saying that there is really no set term, as such? If a particular board member is appointed for, say, three years, they can keep going for a long period of time until they wish not to continue, or for whatever reason the government terminates their appointment.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that a term needs to be set—that it is required that the appointment is for a term, so there would have to be a term of a certain number of years. But there is nothing that precludes a board member, at the conclusion of that term, from making themselves available and through the cabinet and Executive Council and Governor process being reappointed.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Currently, the appointment for the presiding member, the chair, of the board has already been made. What is the term? How many years of that term has been determined per the current appointment?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. My advice is there has not been a formal appointment made yet. There has been an indication about who would be nominated for that position, and should this bill pass then it will be the process I have described—a cabinet process to Executive Council and then recommendation to the Governor about the appointment of the person who has been identified, and at that time there will be a term set down.

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

Amendment No 1 [Franks-1]—

Page 5, line 37 [clause 6, inserted section 8(2)(b)]—Delete 'and parklands'

I move this amendment because under the functions of the board the bill includes, in 8(2)(b):

as provided by this Act, assume the care, control, management and use of public roads and parklands on a temporary basis;

We question why the extraordinary powers to control the Parklands are required under this act and wish to draw the council's and the parliament's attention to that. We have not touched the public

roads aspect, but we certainly wanted to test the government's rationale for including the Parklands in this legislation.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for bringing this amendment to this chamber; however, the government will be opposing this and the series of amendments that follow it in relation to the Parklands. My advice is that removing the Parklands from the scope of the powers of the Motorsport Board could limit where the event can be held and would defeat at least part of the point of re-establishing the board; namely, delivering on the election commitment to bring the Adelaide 500 as a race back in a very similar fashion to how it has been in the past.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I rise on behalf of SA-Best to indicate that we will not be supporting this amendment from the Greens. In fact, it appears to me like almost a backdoor attempt to stop the event from being staged in the Parklands of Adelaide by carving them out. I note that the Adelaide Park Lands Act 2005, part 3—Designation of Adelaide Park Lands, section 14—Definition of Park Lands by plan provides:

- (3) The following principles or requirements are to be taken into account (and, as appropriate, applied) in relation to the plan:
 - (a) the Adelaide Park Lands are to include—
 - (i) the land commonly known as the Adelaide Park Lands; and
 - (ii) Victoria Square, Light Square, Hindmarsh Square, Hurtle Square, Whitmore Square and Wellington Square; and
 - (iii) Brougham Gardens and Palmer Gardens,
 (as determined and defined by the Minister taking into account the principles set out in section 4 (but not to include any road (or part of a road) unless the Minister is acting under paragraph (b) or another provision of this Act));

Further:

- (c) the Adelaide Park Lands will not include—
 - (i) Parliament House, the premises known as Old Parliament House, or the land appurtenant to Parliament House or Old Parliament House; or
 - (ii) Government House, or the land appurtenant to Government House;

In summary, I guess if this was to be passed, Victoria Park would be considered under GRO planning as being Parklands and which would threaten the event. So we will not be supporting it.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: The Liberal Party took on the considerations and explanation made by the minister and will be opposing this amendment.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I note that the Greens will be standing by this amendment and that there is a series of amendments that are consequential. We will divide on this one; we will not divide on the consequential. We will take that as a test for the series of Parklands protection amendments we have made to this bill.

The council divided on the amendment:

Ayes 2
 Noes 17
 Majority 15

AYES

Franks, T.A. (teller) Simms, R.A.

NOES

Bonaros, C.	Bourke, E.S.	Centofanti, N.J.
Curran, L.A.	Game, S.L.	Girolamo, H.M.
Hanson, J.E.	Hunter, I.K.	Lee, J.S.
Lensink, J.M.A.	Maher, K.J. (teller)	Martin, R.B.

NOES

Ngo, T.T.
Wade, S.G.

Pangallo, F.
Wortley, R.P.

Scriven, C.M.

Amendment thus negatived; clause as amended passed.

Clause 7.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: A member of the board is entitled to remuneration, allowances and expenses determined by the Governor. Can I ask the minister whether that has been decided? Do we know what the remuneration, allowances and expenses are going to be?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for his question. My advice is that that is in the process of being decided. There is no final decision as of yet. I am happy to see if there is a way we can bring back an answer for the member once that is done. I suspect it will be pretty quickly announced.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Inflation and everything taken into account, would it be commensurate with what the payments were previously to other members of the Motorsport Board?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that it will be commensurate with what was paid in the past to the board.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Will there be any full-time positions on this board at all?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that the board itself will not have any further full-time employees, but the organisation that puts on the event will have full-time employees and, I suspect, employees that ramp up and down as the race is staged, as such.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Has it been determined where the board will be based, where it will be working from?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that yes, that has been determined. It will be working out of 182 Victoria Square.

Clause passed.

Clause 8.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: In relation to the functions of the board, the board is to conduct all things necessary to make sure that the event is successful. With flight cancellations at the moment and the impact of COVID waves coming back into our community, what COVID management measures has the government put in place, and what are the unforeseen financial implications that may cause the success of the race to fall over? Can the minister give us some reassurance?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. In terms of any COVID plans for when the race is on, which I think was the question, that will have to be determined for the situation as it occurs at the time. The second part of the question was: what would be the unforeseen costs? They would be unforeseen.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: A question to the minister in relation to budgets: is there a breakdown of spending for the board in terms of where money is going to be allocated for promotion, advertising, television advertising and other associated costs of the event? Is there a budget breakdown that the minister can provide to us?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for his question. My advice is that once the board is established and running, the budgets for the board will be established then.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Following on from the Hon. Frank Pangallo's question, which budget line within the current budget is set forth for the SA Motorsport Board?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We have copies of some extracts of budget papers here, but I might need to take that on notice. I am happy to provide the honourable member with that at a later date, the exact budget paper volume and line that this comes from.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: We know that the Premier has promised a big-ticket item in relation to entertainment at this year's event. Has that been finalised? What amount of money has been set aside?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for his question. My advice is that that has not yet been finalised and the amount will depend on who it is. If it is a Robbie Williams, I suspect that might be a different amount compared to someone else. I have to say a few years ago when Hilltop Hoods, Illy and G Flip all played in a concert together, it was probably the best concert I have ever seen. To the extent that I get any say in it, I would ask for a recreation of those three onstage.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Will there be preference to an Australian act, or will it be whatever is available or overseas?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that it is anticipated there will be a line-up over three different nights. It is anticipated there will be Australian acts as part of that. It is my further advice it will be the most appropriate and the most attractive for the audience that we are able to attract, which I hope will be Hilltop Hoods, Illy and G Flip.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: We are now almost four months away from the event, 16 weeks or whatever. Can the minister give us an indication if ticket prices have already been set, and what are they for the event?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that is in the final stages of appointing a ticketing agency. It is hoped that tickets will be able to be on sale in August, but that final price is still being finalised ahead of that.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Is the minister saying that the ticket agency is going to come up with a price, or is it the government or the Motorsport Board or whoever? Surely they would have been discussing that now, because you would have to book time for advertising for this event, and it is only 16 weeks away. Is there an approximate value?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for his question. I do apologise if I have given the wrong impression. It will not be the ticketing agency that sets the price. I was just trying to give as full an explanation and full information about ticketing as I could. I am advised that it is in the final stages, but the ticketing pricing has not been set but it will be very soon.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: I refer to clause 8(1)(d) regarding functions of the board. Is there any concern that the functions of the board duplicates those of the Tourism Commission? How will the SA Tourism Commission and SA Motorsport Board actually work alongside each other? Can the minister just explain how does that work in practice?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that the board will work very closely with the Tourism Commission, as they have in the past. For quite some time there was the board and the Tourism Commission. I have been previously advised that the reason it is seen as desirable to have a board is that we are recreating an event that was abolished. Having its own standalone board that works closely with the Tourism Commission, as it has in the past, is seen as the most effective and best way to give the event the best possible chance of success.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Is there a likelihood that a board member from the South Australian Tourism Commission will also be appointed on the SA Motorsport Board to ensure that there is a conduit?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that it is envisaged that it will be someone on the Motorsport Board who has experience of tourism directly.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I have another question on ticket prices. Will the final ticket price be influenced by the entertainment that is signed to the event?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that the primary determination for ticket prices is the infrastructure costing and what needs to be recovered to make the event as commercially viable as possible.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: On infrastructure, as we know, the previous government flogged off various items. The main pit stand was also sold off. Can the minister update us on what infrastructure will now have to be either purchased or rebuilt? What is happening to that pit structure and the two overpasses that were sold off at peppercorn rates to the Tailem Bend race?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for his question. I remember some time during the last term of parliament the honourable member and I were both on the Budget and Finance Committee when questions were asked about the infrastructure and what was happening to it. If I recall correctly, the answers we were given at the time were that some infrastructure was being sold off and some was actually being given away. I am advised that the sale of the pit building fell through, so that is able to be retained. Those overpasses are having to be manufactured new for use for this year's race.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Does the minister have the amount that will need to be spent on resurfacing the circuit, and have there been other problems that have arisen in relation to getting the circuit up to scratch and meeting the required standards of the relevant motorsport authority?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can inform the member that my advice in relation to that particular question is that the surfacing of the track is currently out to tender, so there is not a cost yet but it will be known once the tender process has finished.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Could we have an update of when that resurfacing will happen and what impact it will have on traffic flow leading up to the event?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My information is that the main resurfacing is intended to happen in late August, and we will look at whatever is necessary to make that happen.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: The previous government had offered an incentive to contractors for dismantling the infrastructure within a specified period of time. Will that also be applicable here in this instance?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: In relation to the proposition the honourable member has put forward, my advice is that having had a look for those we have not been able to find any evidence of such incentives. We are still looking to see if there were, to see if that is something that could be considered in the future, but no evidence or documents have been found to suggest that those incentives were actually in place.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: With regard to the functions of the board, I have a question which is about both the current workings and the workings going forward with regard specifically to the Adelaide 500. My question is: who has the work health and safety obligations as the PCBU for the Adelaide 500? Obviously, we have not had a race for a few years but previously, and then going forward.

With a bit of indulgence I will explain why I am particularly interested. I note that there was a volunteer who took an industrial issue of work health and safety to the Ombudsman because he was denied access from the SATC to the documents he required for his complaint with regard to work health and safety in an incident that occurred to him in what was his volunteer workplace. He was denied access to those documents by the SATC claiming commercial-in-confidence.

The Ombudsman, of course, called this out. Going forward, who will be responsible as the PCBU for work health and safety, and who was responsible as the PCBU for work health and safety in previous years?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. In relation to the second part—who was responsible—that is something I will have to take away, and I am happy to do so, to try to find an answer. My understanding, from advice, is that ultimately it is the board that has the responsibility. But, again, I will have that double-checked and if it is not the case I am happy to bring something back to the honourable member.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I could not quite see it here but I was hoping you would say going forward it would be the board, and I would appreciate that clarity. I am not proposing to hold up this clause but I would appreciate that clarity in terms of receiving some of that information.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: It was also announced by the Premier that following the event this year Adelaide will host a gala awards night. Does the board have an involvement in the organisation of that post-event gala?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that no, the board does not. That is a Supercars Australia organised event.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I understand the government has entered into a several-years deal, has the government or will the government be contributing towards staging that event and, if so, how much?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that is a commitment from Supercars Australia to stage it at their cost.

Clause passed.

Clauses 9 and 10 passed.

Clause 11.

The CHAIR: There are amendments at clause 11 in the name of the Hon. Ms Franks.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Seeking your guidance, I note that first test case on the Parklands—I am not proposing to proceed with any of those amendments.

The CHAIR: Amendment No. 2 [Franks-1], amendment No. 3 [Franks-1] and amendment No. 4 [Franks-1].

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I am not proceeding with any of those.

The CHAIR: Thank you.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Sorry, I thought I had made that clear previously.

Clause passed.

Clauses 12 to 19 passed.

New clause 19A.

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

Amendment No 5 [Franks-1]—

Page 13, after line 2—Insert:

19A—Insertion of Part 3B

After section 27C insert:

Part 3B—Reporting

27D—Board to report on ticket sales etc for motor sport events

- (1) The Board must, in relation to each motor sport event promoted by the Board, or in relation to which the Board performs functions under this Act, prepare and provide to the Minister a report setting out—
 - (a) the total number of tickets sold or given away in relation to the motor sport event; and
 - (b) a breakdown of the different types of ticket available in relation to the motor sport event, and the number of tickets actually sold or given away of each type; and
 - (c) the total attendance at the motor sport event; and
 - (d) any other information required by the regulations.
- (2) The report must be completed and provided to the Minister within 3 months after the completion of the motor sport event.
- (3) The Minister must cause a copy of the report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament within 6 sitting days after receiving the report.

Noting the time, I will keep this very brief. I covered off on this in my second reading speech. This requires the board to report on ticket sales for their events, and that would include the total number of tickets sold or given away in relation to the motorsport event, a breakdown of the different types of ticket available in relation to the motorsport event and the number of tickets actually sold or given away of each type, the total attendance at the motorsport event and any other information required by the regulations. I would imagine this would reasonably be part of the annual report, but it goes on to specify how it would be tabled in parliament.

I am looking for more transparency. I am sure the public of South Australia, particularly those most impacted by these events, would appreciate that level of transparency going forward, given that we have had such a lack of detail of why particularly the Adelaide 500 was abandoned, no detail on the years as to why it could not secure sponsorship, claims of a \$45 million economic benefit the last time the race was run, but a lack of detail being able to be provided in Budget and Finance about what was the breakdown of that. It is a reasonable expectation for the public to know how many tickets we sell, at what price point and how many we are seeing given away each year.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: In its current form we will not support the amendment. However, sir, I would seek your advice about the best way for me to amend the honourable member's amendment. I wish in subsection (1) of her new clause to strike out paragraphs (a) and (b), but with the rest remaining. I assume that would mean renumbering (c) and (d) to (a) and (b). I will seek the support of the chamber to do that, and in that form I indicate that the government will support the new clause as amended as I have suggested. The reason for this is that, whilst the government is very keen on increasing transparency, it must do so in a way that does not lead to breaching any commercial-in-confidence parts of any contract entered into.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: With the explanation by the minister, the Liberal opposition believes that the new clause proposed to be inserted by the Hon. Tammy Franks in principle is very fair and reasonable to ensure transparency and accountability of government, but we agree with the minister for paragraphs (a) and (b) to be struck out or removed in order for the rest of the amendment to be accepted by the Liberal opposition.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I rise to indicate that SA-Best will support the recommendation from the minister for the amendment to the new clause.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I can do numbers and I can see that it is only the Greens who would insist that the total number of tickets sold or given away in relation to the motorsport event and the breakdown of the different types of those tickets be published in the annual report or similar. This is pretty basic information that I find is available in other major event reports, and it is a level of transparency that I would think the public would expect.

I am not sure how it really can be a breach of commercial-in-confidence to let people know how many tickets you sell and at what price point those tickets were sold, and how many tickets you give away for free to perhaps make your event look better patronised than it might otherwise have been. I feel the South Australian public does need to know how many freebies are given out to major events that they are heavily subsidising, not in the hundreds of thousands of dollars but in the millions of dollars.

I will not insist on a division. I am happy that the government has at least come part way to support part of the amendment. It is a step forward, and I am hoping that there will be further steps forward on this. I find the argument that this might actually impact on other events in practice and that it might scare off investment in events in South Australia if people had to actually publish their ticket sales and types to be somewhat ludicrous.

I think if all South Australians were able to know exactly what bang for their buck they were getting from the events we would be in a far better place, and I am sure that those across the border would appreciate that level of information, too, and it does indeed occur in quite a few events across the country.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I move an amendment to the Hon. Tammy Franks' amendment as follows:

To strike out paragraphs (a) and (b) under subsection (1) of proposed section 27D, and re-order as necessary the remaining two paragraphs (c) and (d).

Amendment carried; new clause as amended inserted.

Remaining clauses (20 to 25) passed.

Schedule 1.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: In relation to the vesting of assets and liabilities of the commission and the board—and we saw under the previous government the rapid divesting of various items of infrastructure—does this government and the new board have any plans to protect any assets being sold off without consultation?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am advised that it is a good suggestion and that it is something we will turn our mind to.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: But will the decision be made by either the government of the day or the board, or will it be a decision that perhaps parliament could consider about the divesting of state-owned assets, much like privatisation and our pursuit of that.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for his suggestion and contribution. I can assure him that this government has no intention of following the path of the last government in cancelling the event and doing a rapid fire sale or divestment of assets that are used for the event. I am happy to explore with the honourable member what possibilities there are for further protections.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: As a supplementary to that: does the Motorsport Board, if this bill now passes, have the ability to cancel any event they may deem fit to cancel—noting that there is not just one event here—and do they have the ability to initiate events without the government's say-so, or will they always require the government to sign off on that?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. My advice is that there is the possibility for new events to be contemplated. In relation to cancellation of events my advice is it is envisaged that the board would work with the government of the day in relation to decisions about discontinuing any event.

Schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (13:01): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CROSS BORDER COMMISSIONER BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the House of Assembly desires the concurrence of the Legislative Council:

No 1 Clause 3, page 2, line 13 to page 3, line 32 [clause 3, definitions of *government agency*, *responsible Minister* and *State authority*—Delete the definitions

No 2 Clause 5 Delete this clause

No 3 Clause 8, page 5, line 13 [clause 8(g)]—Delete 'in accordance with section 9' and substitute:

in consultation with the Minister

No 4 Clause 9 Delete this clause

No 5 Clause 10 Delete this clause

No 6 Clause 15, page 7, line 19 [clause 15(1)]—Delete 'Act' and substitute:

Section

Sitting suspended from 13:02 to 14:15.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Department for Education: Report, 2021

Fee Notices under Acts—

Bills of Sale Act 1886

South Australian–Victorian Border Groundwaters Agreement Review Committee—dated to 30 June 2021

By the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development (Hon. C.M. Scriven)—

Report of the Guardian for Children and Young People on Dual Involved Project

Report on Actions taken by the Department for Correctional Services—Coronial Inquest into the Death in Custody of Anthony Lanzafame

Ministerial Statement

BIOSECURITY RESPONSE TO VARROA DESTRUCTOR

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:16): I make a ministerial statement in regard to the South Australian biosecurity response to *Varroa destructor*. *Varroa mite (Varroa destructor)* was detected in sentinel beehives at the port of Newcastle, New South Wales, on Wednesday 22 June 2022 as part of routine surveillance. Multiple further detections in New South Wales have since been made. *Varroa mite* is not established in Australia and is considered the greatest threat to Australia's honey and honey bee pollination industries. Australia remains the only major beekeeping country in the world to remain free of *varroa mite*.

The South Australian apiary industry pollinates agricultural and horticultural crops valued at an estimated \$1.7 billion and produces more than \$11 million worth of honey bee products. *Varroa* parasitises European honey bee (EHB) and potentially transmits several serious viruses also not currently known to be present in Australia, including deformed wing virus. Collectively, the mites and viruses can lead to colony collapse if left unmanaged.

Once hives become infected with *varroa*, without treatment the hives will weaken and typically die out. This can take anywhere between a couple of months and three years, depending on mite numbers. During that time, hives infested with mites can also infect surrounding managed hives and feral colonies.

Effective biosecurity response to exotic pests such as *varroa mite* relies on swift action from both government and industry, as well as the public. Movement restrictions are critical to successful containment and eradication. I can advise that the New South Wales government is implementing an emergency response and has issued an order restricting all movement of honey bees within New South Wales.

The Department of Primary Industries and Regions South Australia (PIRSA) is working with the Consultative Committee on Emergency Plant Pests (CCEPP) and liaising with industry on South Australia's response to the detection. I can advise that PIRSA has set up an incident management team to stop the spread of *varroa mite* into South Australia.

A prohibition on the import of risk items into South Australia was put in place on 28 June 2022. Restrictions have been introduced on bees, hives and associated beekeeping products and beekeeping property. These items cannot be brought into South Australia without written permission

of the Chief Inspector of Stock. This prohibition also applies to any of these items that have been in New South Wales since 1 January 2022.

I can further advise that, following a risk assessment, the movement of commercially processed honey and new apiary appliances and hive components is allowed. PIRSA has brought forward scheduled surveillance at sentinel hives in Port Adelaide. This was conducted on 2 July 2022 and no varroa mites have been found. Furthermore, PIRSA is asking all beekeepers to inform PIRSA of any movement of risk items into South Australia since 1 January 2022. Beekeepers are also being urged to check their hives for varroa and send the results to PIRSA. This information will be used to inform tracing and surveillance to provide assurance that South Australia remains varroa free.

There are nearly 3,000 beekeepers registered with Biosecurity SA and approximately 61,000 hives in South Australia. South Australian registered beekeepers and the industry network have been issued an SMS alert and email providing detailed information and advice on what beekeepers and apiarists in this state need to do in response to the detection. All South Australian beekeepers are advised to be alert for signs of varroa mite in their bees and if varroa mite is suspected beekeepers must contact the Exotic Plant Pest Hotline on 1800 084 881 or email pirsa.beebiosecurity@sa.gov.au.

Beekeepers can apply for permission to move bees or bee components by visiting the PIRSA website www.pir.sa.gov.au/varroa. I have spoken with leaders from both industry and hobby beekeeping associations over the past week about the situation and to hear the concerns of beekeepers. The New South Wales incursion is a rapidly evolving situation that the South Australian government will continue to closely monitor and respond to for the protection of the South Australian apiary and honey bee pollination-dependent industries.

EASTERN STATES DEPLOYMENT, EMERGENCY STORM RESPONSE

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:21): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to Eastern States deployment, emergency storm response made in the other place by the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

The PRESIDENT: I direct that the written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

Question Time

VARROA MITE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development a question regarding biosecurity.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: On 24 June, the varroa mite (*Varroa destructor*) was found in two beehives in Newcastle, New South Wales. Until now, Australia has been lucky to be the last remaining beekeeping continent free of this destructive pest. The outbreak of varroa mite in New South Wales threatens not only South Australia's beekeepers but also our agricultural sector more broadly, because bees also provide essential pollination services. My questions to the minister are:

1. Has the minister met with key stakeholder groups within the horticultural and agricultural sectors since the outbreak was announced?
2. If so, which key stakeholders has the minister met with to discuss the varroa mite outbreak?
3. What resources in FTEs have been allocated within PIRSA to prepare, mitigate and respond to the risk of varroa mite outbreak in South Australia?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:25): I thank the honourable member for her question. I think I did respond to several of those questions within the ministerial statement that I tabled just prior to question time. My department is meeting with all affected stakeholders. Of course, the pressing issue is in regard to pollination for the almond industry. Normally, pollination and movement of bees and hives for that purpose would commence in August. It is certainly a big concern to people in that industry as well as, I am sure, South Australians more broadly.

There is work in progress as we speak, which has been in progress since 22 June when the first outbreaks were detected in New South Wales, for all jurisdictions to be working together. Biosecurity, of course, is a shared concern for all of us. In terms of the risks, for example, for the almond industry, if we are unable to move beehives in the time that they need to have the pollination occur, that is certainly a big risk and it will be of concern to all. The biosecurity team is working very hard. We are having daily conversations, as they are with the various affected stakeholders, of which there are many.

VARROA MITE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): Supplementary: is the minister confident that PIRSA is sufficiently resourced to mitigate and respond to any varroa mite incursions?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:27): I have outlined all of the steps that are being taken, and I look forward to being continually updated about the varroa mite. Currently, as we know, it is contained to New South Wales. The provisions that have been put in place to prevent beehives and bee equipment, as I outlined in my ministerial statement, are important steps towards keeping varroa mite out of South Australia.

VARROA MITE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): Supplementary: can the minister give us an indication as to how many unregistered beekeepers there could be in South Australia and how PIRSA is keeping them informed of any developments?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:28): It is a requirement under the legislation—from memory, it is the Livestock Act—that keepers of hives must be registered. This is incredibly important because this is how we communicate with people about things such as varroa mite and other biosecurity concerns. There is certainly a large number of beekeepers, both hobby and professional, and it is a requirement that they are registered.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding biosecurity.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: In relation to the threat of foot-and-mouth disease, the minister advised the council on 2 June that, and I quote, 'An industry task force has been established to work on preparedness activities.' My questions to the minister are:

1. When did the industry task force last meet?
2. How frequently is the task force meeting?
3. Is the minister on, or represented on, the task force?
4. Has the minister attended any of the industry task force meetings?
5. When will the task force report on preparedness activities?
6. Will the task force make recommendations to the government?

7. Will those recommendations be made public?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:28): I thank the honourable member for her question. In response to the detection of foot-and-mouth disease in Indonesia, the Australian government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry is engaged with Indonesia on a constant basis to assist with their response and minimise risk posed by this risk, with pre-border and border activities.

In the event that foot-and-mouth occurs in Australia, the response is centrally coordinated through the Consultative Committee on Emergency Animal Disease and the cost-sharing arrangements for the response are pre-agreed in the Emergency Animal Disease Response Agreement signed by all the states and territories, the commonwealth and peak industry bodies. We continue to work closely with the Australian government, our colleagues interstate and our local livestock industry, remaining alert to the developments.

I am advised that PIRSA, in response to the significance of the foot-and-mouth disease—as indeed, the lumpy skin disease also—outbreaks in Indonesia, is prioritising staff resources to focus on preparedness activities on these diseases. PIRSA is working closely with state peak industry bodies, and nationally through working groups, to contribute to both national and state preparedness activities.

I am also advised that PIRSA's key areas of activity for preparedness will be enhanced surveillance to ensure early detection of disease and planning to ensure a rapid and effective response, should detection of this disease occur in Australia. This will include a communications strategy to complement the national efforts being undertaken. Foot-and-mouth disease is one of Australia's greatest livestock biosecurity risks. Australia is currently free of foot-and-mouth disease and, as we know, an outbreak would have devastating impacts.

I have been updated in terms of the processes being undertaken at airports, particularly in regard to travellers returning from Bali. As members may be aware, there have now been detections of foot-and-mouth disease in Bali. I remain in contact with my department, which is working with all stakeholders. Any other questions that the member has put forward I can take on notice and come back with a reply.

COASTAL MANAGEMENT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions of the Attorney-General regarding coastal management.

Leave granted.

Labor's election policy document entitled 'Adelaide's Coastline' included a commitment to:

Establish a scientific review of all options for sand management which will include full community input and transparency and analysis of climate change impact...

In parliament on Tuesday 5 July, the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, in a response to a question in the other place regarding the government's commitment to establishing a scientific review, stated:

The minister who will be taking the responsibility for the review of the question of whether the pipeline is the best way to manage sand along the coastline has now been identified. By virtue of having a conflict of interest, I don't know what discussion has happened between the department and Minister Maher, who is the minister in the other place who has that responsibility. I don't know what discussions have happened in terms of setting up the review.

My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Have the terms of the review been set?
2. Will the terms of the review be publicly available?
3. Who will conduct the review?
4. Will the review include the option for groynes?
5. Will the review include the option for a sand recycling pipeline?

6. When will the review commence?
7. When is the review expected to be completed?
8. Will the Attorney commit to the review being made public?
9. Will the Attorney commit to the government's response to the review being made public?

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 questions. The Deputy Premier, as Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, has portfolio responsibility for Adelaide beach management review. As has been outlined, the Deputy Premier has declared a conflict of interest on this matter and the Premier has appointed me as the responsible minister in relation to this review. The Premier has also directed the Chief Executive of the Department for Environment and Water to take direction from, and report to, me in relation to this matter.

In the coming weeks, I expect to be briefed on further detail about this matter, having just had that instrument to appoint me. Where decisions are required on this matter, I will seek advice from the Department for Environment and Water and make decisions in line with the delegation I have received from the Premier. In relation to the specific questions about a review yet, they will be announced in due course in the coming weeks.

AGRICULTURAL TOWN OF THE YEAR AWARD

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about the Ag Town of the Year Award for 2022, and how the South Australian public can be involved?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:34): I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in our regional areas. Regional communities are, of course, the economic backbone of South Australia, contributing \$29 billion to the state's economy each year—but their importance cannot be measured just by dollars and cents.

The communities that make up our regions provide so much of the social, environmental and cultural fabric of our state. I think it is fair to say that almost every South Australian would have some connection to regional South Australia, whether it is a particular region you live in, you holiday there, you work there or you have family there. I would like to think that regional South Australia is part of all of us.

The Agricultural Town of the Year Award, now in its fourth year, highlights the vital role that agriculture plays in the regional landscape. It recognises the synergy that exists between agriculture and the benefits that flow from it for communities in so many parts of our state, and that is why I was so pleased recently to be able to offer my congratulations to all 54 regional towns which were nominated for this year's Agricultural Town of the Year Award.

Each of the towns which were nominated can now showcase themselves and vie for the support of the public through the online voting system at agtown.com.au. Voting closes on Monday, 25 July, after which five finalists will be announced in early August to move through to the next round, and an independent judging process to determine who will be crowned this year's winner will follow.

The overall winner will be announced in November at the regional showcase celebration and they will receive not only the esteemed title of Ag Town of the Year but also a community event and a sign unveiling recognising their achievement, a certificate and trophy to be presented, a double-page feature spread in *SALIFE* magazine, and promotional stories and videos produced by Solstice Media.

Last year's winner, Kimba, won the award for its fantastic community spirit and its sense of pride in its role as an agricultural town that is willing to invest in developing skills in younger generations so that agriculture remains at its core for generations to come. Kimba also has a wonderful sense of community. The Kimba Mayor, Dean Johnson, said at the recent award ceremony celebrating their win, that more than 50 per cent of the residents in Kimba are regularly involved with volunteering and community projects that assist with the town's continued growth and development.

While Kimba took the 2021 prize, the other four finalists from last year—Mypolonga, Kapunda, Orroroo and Booleroo—all did an outstanding job, and I note that three of those, namely, Mypolonga, Kapunda and Orroroo, are in the running again this year. I pass on my best wishes to them to maybe go one better this year. I also use this opportunity to congratulate previous winners of Ag Town of the Year, Cleve and Pinnaroo. They won their respective awards in 2019 and 2020. I note that they continue to do outstanding things in their communities.

Once again, I encourage the South Australian public to get online and vote at agtown.com.au before 25 July, to recognise the outstanding contributions that each of these towns and regions make to our state.

OFFICE OF INDUSTRIAL HEMP AND MEDICINAL CANNABIS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:38): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development a question on the topic of the Office of Industrial Hemp and Medicinal Cannabis.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Earlier today I received a response to a previous question I asked about whether or not the Office of Industrial Hemp and Medicinal Cannabis exists under the Malinauskas government. The answer that I received in writing today does not confirm whether it does. Can the minister now confirm whether the office continues?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:38): I thank the honourable member for her question and her ongoing interest in the topic of industrial hemp. As outlined in the answer to which I believe she is referring, there was a four-year PIRSA/SARDI industrial hemp trials project which was completed in 2021, and an update report was published in January of this year, and that report is publicly available on the PIRSA website.

There is also AgriFutures Australia, which commenced an industrial hemp varieties trial project in July, which is a national project with trial sites across Australia, and SARDI is a participant in these trials, with trial sites at Loxton in the Riverland and Maaoupe in the Limestone Coast. Up to 17 June 2022 PIRSA has issued 25 licences to cultivate industrial hemp and two licences to process industrial hemp.

In terms of responsibilities, as Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development I am responsible for the Industrial Hemp Act 2017 and the Industrial Hemp Regulations 2017, which provides a licencing framework to authorise and regulate the possession, cultivation, processing and supply of industrial hemp in South Australia.

I am advised that medicinal cannabis is regulated by SA Health and the commonwealth, and of course the Department for Trade and Investment supports commercial investor and export interests in South Australia. That is typically predicated on stakeholders meeting regulatory requirements. So in terms of the official responsibilities for this matter, that is where the responsibilities lie.

OFFICE OF INDUSTRIAL HEMP AND MEDICINAL CANNABIS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:40): Supplementary question, and I will say it very slowly: does the Office of Industrial Hemp and Medicinal Cannabis still exist?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:40): I have just answered a question about where the various offices and responsibilities lie.

COASTAL MANAGEMENT

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:41): My questions are to the Attorney-General regarding coastal management:

1. When can the Attorney provide some indication as to the expected time frame for a government decision following completion of a scientific review of all options for sand management?

2. As he has indicated that this is his new responsibility, can he commit to this review as a priority?

3. When can the community expect to see tangible action to deliver on the options for sand management?

4. What has happened to the funding that was allocated for the West Beach pipeline?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:41): I thank the honourable member for her questions—which I think were her leader's questions. Be that as it may, I can answer that, having just less than a week ago been given my instrument of appointment in relation to this decision-making power and the very busy time we have all spent in this chamber this week, I have not been briefed, but as soon as I am briefed I will turn my mind to the review.

COASTAL MANAGEMENT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): Supplementary: when will the Attorney be briefed?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I will call the Attorney-General when he gets some quiet.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:42): Soon.

COASTAL MANAGEMENT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): Supplementary: how soon?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:42): Very soon.

COASTAL MANAGEMENT

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN (14:42): Supplementary: can the minister advise if he or anyone acting on his behalf in his office have requested a briefing as of yet?

The PRESIDENT: Sorry, it does not come from the original answer. You can answer it, if you would like, Attorney.

The Hon. L.A. Curran: I take that as a no.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Conversations across the chamber are out of order. I call the Hon. Mr Ngo.

NAIDOC WEEK

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister inform the council about tomorrow's NAIDOC family fun day?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:43): I certainly can inform the member about the NAIDOC Family Fun Day in responding to his very original question broaching a new subject, sir. As the council is aware, and as I have been talking about, this week is NAIDOC Week and many events have been held right around South Australia, as I have outlined. Each provide the community with a range of activities to participate in the spirit of NAIDOC Week.

The NAIDOC SA march and Family Fun Day are two of the biggest annual events on the NAIDOC calendar. Although the march I will be participating in tomorrow is based on Kaurna country here in Adelaide, there are many marches right across our state.

Both events in Adelaide tomorrow—the Family Fun Day and the march—are free events and provide another opportunity for the South Australian community to get together to celebrate

Aboriginal heritage and culture and the contributions that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people have made, and continue to make, to our state and our nation.

The march begins at Tarntanyangga (Victoria Square) at 11am; however, if people are interested in attending I would encourage them very much to be there bright and early, perhaps around 10.30 or 10.45 for an 11am prompt start. The march will proceed down King William Street and finish on the steps of Parliament House, where there are usually informative, and occasionally feisty, speeches that occur as part of the NAIDOC celebrations.

This event has been immensely popular in previous years, with hundreds and possibly even thousands of people each year attending. I have been very fortunate, for most of the last decade at least, to attend the NAIDOC marches. It is a good opportunity to catch up with people and also to hear about things that are important to Aboriginal people in this state.

For those who are unable to attend the March but would still like to participate in events before the end of the week, the march will be followed by celebrations at the Family Fun Day back at Victoria Square from 11.30am to 3.30pm. In addition to many activities for children and young people, the Family Fun Day will have over 40 stallholders from government and non-government organisations, a men's zone, a women's zone, an elders' zone, a be active zone, a small business zone and a children's zone. There will be food stalls and plenty for families to enjoy while a free concert is on display. I would implore people to get around to it and get involved.

NAIDOC WEEK

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): Supplementary: will there be any family fun days held in regional South Australia?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:46): It's a very good question. As I outlined I think on Tuesday, there are 30-something events, for instance, occurring in Port Augusta, including days for children and for elders, a ball and other events. I know that, in my home town of Mount Gambier, there are regularly a march and stalls back at Pangula Mannamurna, which I talked about yesterday. I have been involved in NAIDOC events and celebrations, for all ages, in places like Whyalla in the past, and Port Lincoln.

There certainly are events, and on websites there are details of events that are held right around regional South Australia. I think I mentioned, either yesterday or the day before, that I will be making representations to my colleagues to see if it is at all possible to not be sitting during NAIDOC week next year, so I can once again attend NAIDOC events right around the state, rather than just a few of them outside of parliamentary sitting hours in Adelaide.

VARROA MITE

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:47): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development a question about bees.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I acknowledge the minister's statement today. The state government earlier this year imposed indefinite restrictions on a range of bees and products arriving from New South Wales after the outbreak of the varroa mite, which as we know can cause serious damage to beehive colonies. Many New South Wales producers are also having to face euthanising their colonies, and special permission must now be given by the state government for any bees from New South Wales to come here. Bans are also applying to apiary products and appliances and beekeeping plants or components. There are also issues with restrictions being placed on pig herds from parts of Queensland and New South Wales.

My question to the minister is: given there are many almond growers in the Riverland as well as stone fruit producers, which we know need bees to help pollinate their orchards, does she know how many of these growers have relied on hives being brought in across the border? What assurances can she give them that they will be able to pollinate their crops? In the event of losses, will the government be in a position to provide compensation? Has she consulted with the pig industry about the impacts that it could have on them?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:49): I thank the honourable member for his question. It certainly is an incredibly important question. The varroa mite is an incredibly destructive pest, which is certainly causing a great deal of concern in terms of both beekeepers but also industries such as the member has referred to in the almond industry.

The South Australian almond industry relies on commercially managed and supplied European honey bees, which is the one that is affected by the varroa mite. These are the most efficient and effective pollinator of almond flowers. Almond pollination by bees takes place usually around late July or in August, and many hives are sourced from within South Australia but large numbers of hives are also brought into the state to meet the pollination needs.

I am advised that 70,000 hives are needed to pollinate the two major regions, being the Riverland, which has over 11,000 hectares, and the Adelaide Plains, approximately 669 hectares. Almonds are one of the largest fruit crops produced in South Australia in farmgate production value, which in 2021 was estimated to be \$150 million. In that same year, South Australia produced just over 21,000 tonnes of almonds.

In terms of compensation in the event that those bees are not going to be able to be brought into South Australia, I am certainly aware that there are compensation provisions in place for those who need to destroy their bees or hives. I will check in regard to the flow-on industries and bring that back to the member.

In terms of his questions in regard to pigs and the notice that was in the *Gazette* this week, there has actually been no change for the entry conditions for pigs. The reason it appears in the *Gazette* is a technical operational one in regard to what must be gazetted, withdrawn and then regazetted. So the 4 July 2022 *South Australian Government Gazette* revokes all previous gazettes for section 33 of the Livestock Act 1997, which relates to conditions of entry for livestock, livestock products and other property into South Australia or a specified part of the state.

That is why the conditions for entry of pigs is republished, along with all other new and existing entry conditions, so that the *Gazette* always remains complete for this section of the act.

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

VARROA MITE

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:52): What would this place be without a question about Kangaroo Island in regard to their precious Ligurian bees? Considering travel is quite easy between the mainland and Kangaroo Island—there are restrictions, as we all know, in taking over products like that—will there be any additional safeguards, for instance a checkpoint at Cape Jarvis, for travellers and also freight going across to the island to ensure that the Ligurian bee population isn't threatened?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:53): I thank the honourable member for his question. I certainly agree with him: what would a week of question time be without a question about Kangaroo Island? As the member I think is probably aware, there are already restrictions that are ongoing in place in terms of protecting the Ligurian bees on Kangaroo Island.

The approach at the moment is in regard to preventing movement of any bees or bee products from New South Wales, which is the infected area, as I outlined in my ministerial statement. At the moment, to our knowledge, we do not have the varroa mite here. The approach for Kangaroo Island is consistent with what we are doing for the rest of the state, because of course all of our beekeepers and apiarists are very keen to ensure that this mite does not take hold in South Australia.

VARROA MITE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:54): Supplementary: in terms of restriction of movement of bees and bee products from New South Wales, can the minister explain how this will affect the cross-border community of Lindsay Point in the Riverland?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:54): The regulations prevent any movement into South

Australia of bees or bee products, and I would encourage members to go to the PIRSA website for a very specific explanation of the individual items that can and cannot be brought into South Australia without having the approval, as I outlined in the ministerial statement.

The New South Wales government has, almost immediately following the detection of varroa mite in New South Wales, or very soon after, put in place restrictions on the movement of hives within that state and therefore the cross-border communities will similarly be in the situation, sadly, that many areas within South Australia will be. We are hoping that it will be contained and eradicated. From my discussions with those within the industry this week, there is still some confidence that that can occur, and certainly my department and I will be working to ensure that that can happen, if it is at all possible.

TEA TREE GULLY COMMUNITY WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:55): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing questions to the Attorney-General representing the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water on the subject of the Tea Tree Gully CWMS.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: As part of Labor's election policy document, 'Taking control of the CWMS', from 1 July 2022 all previous Tea Tree Gully council community wastewater management system customers were transferred to SA Water for billing purposes. The 2022 budget lists the cost of this as being \$3.3 million over two years. My questions for the minister are:

1. Are there any asset writedown costs, liabilities or any other accounting implications that will transfer to SA Water as a result of Labor's election commitment to transfer all customers by 1 July 2022?
2. If so, what are the details of these, including any estimated and/or actual costs and a breakdown of how much, and what will be the impact on customer bills as a result?
3. What are the details of the arrangement with the council to allow the transfer, and did the council provide any financial contribution?
4. Will the time line of the physical transfer of customers continue as planned under the SA Water sustainable sewers program?
5. What is the breakdown of the \$3.3 million? What are the components and costings for each of those?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:57): I think the honourable member for her questions. I am happy to refer those to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

SCIENCE BURSARY FOR WOMEN

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about the recent announcement of the 2022 SARDI Science Bursary for Women recipient?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:57): I thank the honourable member for his very important question. I was pleased to announce recently that the recipient of the 2022 SARDI Science Bursary for Women is marine biologist Elise Tuuri. The bursary, which was established in 1994 to celebrate the South Australian Women's Suffrage Centenary, is awarded each year to a female graduate studying in South Australia in the agriculture, fisheries, natural resource management or forestry science fields.

Ms Tuuri is halfway through a PhD in biological oceanography at Flinders University. Her research focuses on how much microplastic is in the ocean, how much is eaten by zooplankton and how microplastic moves in the currents. Of her research, she says:

By understanding how much microplastic zooplankton eats, it could help us understand how microplastics move through the food web and where any hotspots are. Understanding microplastic distributions in Australian oceans could help with targeting clean up efforts and waste management efforts.

Microplastic in oceans is an issue that is becoming more widely understood as researchers such as Ms Tuuri continue their important work discovering the scale of the issue and how it impacts upon all marine life. Research released by the CSIRO in 2020 suggested there could be up to 14 million tonnes of microplastics on the sea floor around the globe, and other research indicates that much of it gets there by way of products such as vehicle tyres, textiles, building debris, cosmetics and packing materials.

Ms Tuuri's research will be the first to review how microplastics enter the marine food web through zooplankton in Australia. It will also focus on possible impacts of microplastic consumption on marine organisms and ecosystems. Ms Tuuri also went on to say:

I was born in Finland but I grew up in Victor Harbor, so I spent a lot of time by the ocean...Once I've completed the PhD, I hope to stay in South Australia, although it will depend on job opportunities, as I love this state.

We certainly do hope that Ms Tuuri does stay and continues her promising research and career here in South Australia. It will be her generation of young researchers and scientists that leads the way, not least on the important issue of microplastic in the ocean, how this problem can be managed and understanding the impact on all marine life and humans into the future. I do commend Ms Tuuri and also acknowledge that the Science Bursary for Women is an important way of encouraging young people, particularly young girls and women, into the study of these important sciences.

COST OF LIVING CONCESSION

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:00): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Minister for Regional Development on the topic of renting in the regions and the Cost of Living Concession.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: This morning, Premier Malinauskas and Minister Cook held a press conference announcing the state government's commitment to bring forward the Cost of Living Concession payments to August this year. Previously, some recipients were due to receive their payment in March 2023. In August, home owner-occupiers who are eligible to receive the Cost of Living Concession will receive \$449 to assist with their cost-of-living expenses while eligible renters will receive just half of that, \$224.60.

We know that more South Australians than ever before are experiencing rental stress. This is particularly acute in regional areas, where prices have surged by almost 70 per cent over the last two years. My question to the minister is: is the minister concerned that renters in regional areas are being short-changed by the Cost of Living Concession, and will she be advocating for renters to receive the same payment as home owners as part of the government's review of these concessions?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:01): I thank the honourable member for his question. I was also delighted to be able to hear the announcement today that effectively the Cost of Living Concession will be doubled as we go forward in this period of time. I think there is an important need to be constantly looking at the concessions that we have in our state. They are a very important part of supporting those who need that assistance at various times throughout their lives. I will be happy to refer the substance of his question to the Minister for Human Services in the other place.

COST OF LIVING CONCESSION

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:02): Supplementary: will the minister be advocating for renters in the regions to get the same concession as home owners, given the crisis gripping regional South Australia?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:02): I am constantly in discussions with the Minister for Human

Services, as are most members, I am sure, on this side of the chamber, about how we can best address the cost-of-living concerns and issues being faced by people across our state.

COST OF LIVING CONCESSION

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:02): Supplementary: what is the minister's view on those challenges? How does she consider we can best address this?

The PRESIDENT: I am not sure that comes from the original answer. You are looking for an opinion, I believe.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

The Hon. S.G. WADE (15:02): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions without notice to the Leader of the Government in relation to government accountability.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The government is accountable to parliament and to each house of the parliament, yet the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council persistently refers questions to ministers in the other place, even when the questions are broad questions about stated government priorities and their delivery. For example, in question time this week, the Hon. Robert Simms MLC asked a series of questions about rental affordability and housing—questions that related to broad government policy, not portfolio detail—yet the leader referred all these questions to ministers in the other place.

Given that the government claimed in the election that we were in a housing crisis, why does the government now refuse to account to the people of South Australia through this chamber for its actions on housing and rental affordability? My second question is—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —given that this chamber only—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Wade, just wait until we get some silence, please.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Wade, please continue.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Given that this chamber only has two ministers out of 15 ministers, is it the Malinauskas government's lack of respect for its obligations to this chamber that it only accounts for one-seventh of the full range of government responsibilities?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:04): I thank the honourable member for his questions. Where questions are sensibly answered in other portfolios, I will continue to refer them to other members for the very precise reason of being as accountable as we properly can be to get full and proper answers for the honourable member.

If I gave glib, short answers to questions, the Hon. Stephen Wade would be the first person complaining about not answering properly and not being accountable. Just to satisfy the Hon. Stephen Wade, I will refer questions that are better answered in other portfolio areas to those other portfolio areas. In relation to his second question, I couldn't properly hear what was being asked.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN (15:05): Supplementary question: can the minister advise how many questions he has taken on notice and how many responses he has provided thus far?

The PRESIDENT: That is not a supplementary question from the original answer. The Hon. Ms Lensink, you have a supplementary question?

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:05): I do indeed, arising from the original answer. Is it not correct that the Residential Tenancies Act is committed to him as Attorney-General?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:06): I will double-check that. I think I have 188 pieces of legislation that are committed to me. I suspect, but I will double-check, the Residential Tenancies Act is committed to the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs. I am pretty sure, but I will double-check on that to see if it is one of my 188 or, as I actually suspect, it is committed to Minister Michaels. I am almost certain of that. If I am wrong, because there is an outside chance I could be wrong, I am happy to bring back a reply to the minister.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:06): Supplementary arising from the original answer: as the Leader of the Government in this house, can the leader articulate what his government is doing to deal with rental affordability?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:06): I thank the honourable member for his question and his many questions on this. As I outlined to the Hon. Stephen Wade, there are other ministers who have appropriate responsibility for these. I am happy to bring back a reply from the ministers in the other place who are responsible.

NAIDOC WEEK

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister inform the council about the winner of the 2022 NAIDOC SA Person of the Year Award?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:07): I am very happy to answer that question, and I am happy to have received a number of questions from my colleagues in this chamber about NAIDOC Week. It is certainly that one special week of the year where we get to celebrate Aboriginal people's achievements in South Australia, so it gives me great pleasure to inform the council about the winner of this year's 2022 NAIDOC Week SA Person of the Year Award.

Every year, the NAIDOC committee awards a number of awards to the remarkable contribution of Aboriginal South Australians. There are many categories. They include Male and Female Elder of the Year, Person of the Year, Scholar of the Year, Sportsman and Sportswoman of the Year, Artist of the Year, Lifetime Achievement Award, Young Person of the Year, LGBTIQ Person of the Year, Trainee of the Year, Caring for Country, and Business of the Year.

This year, I wish to take some time to talk about the award for this year's Person of the Year, who is an incredible community leader, Corey McLennan, who won the award. Corey McLennan has dedicated many years of service; he has dedicated pretty much all of his life to his community and his region. He started his career at the Far West Coast Aboriginal Association, later becoming an Aboriginal education manager at Ceduna public school.

Corey is currently the chief executive officer of the Koonibba Community Aboriginal Corporation. In this role, Corey has worked tirelessly to improve the social, cultural and economic status of Aboriginal people and their families in Koonibba and surrounding communities. Corey is currently the chairperson of the Far West Coast Aboriginal Leaders community group that comprises the chief executives of the five main Aboriginal communities in the Far West Coast of South Australia.

Corey has been instrumental in advocating for major state and federal government reform initiatives within his region, including the Stronger Places, Stronger People and Empowered Communities initiatives.

He has shown strong leadership in embracing Australia's space race and was instrumental in implementing the Koonibba test range which was Australia's first fully licensed space launch facility, in partnership with Southern Launch. I know some members of this chamber have attended the community when activities have occurred there previously in relation to the space industry.

Corey is dedicated to creating opportunities for his local Aboriginal communities and consistently displays excellence in leadership, which was very apparent during the recent COVID-19 outbreak within the region. He did this while also being genuine, empathetic and compassionate as well as adopting a rational position on the pandemic to protect and ensure the health and safety of his community. It has often been commented that, amongst others, Corey's leadership and resilience helped guide the community through the devastation of COVID-19 on the Far West Coast.

Corey is also a former player, current coach and longstanding supporter of the Koonibba Football Club, which is the oldest running Aboriginal football club anywhere in Australia, founded in 1906—the Roosters, in fact. I'm reliably informed that Corey McLennan was an excellent player on the half-back for the Koonibba Roosters, earning his place in the club's team of the century. Corey was a Triple Mail Medal winner, one of only two at the club to achieve this, and achieved captaincy of the Roosters at just 23 years old. Corey retired at the ripe old age of 29 from the Koonibba Football Club after playing 147 games.

Corey intends to continue his work to improve the lives of Aboriginal people in his community on the Far West Coast, with a focus on empowering the next generation of leaders, including his son, Wayne Miller, who will be known to many in this chamber who have visited the Far West Coast. Corey stands as a shining example of leadership in that area.

On a personal note, I would like to thank Corey and his family for, over many years, meeting with me and providing insights into the challenges faced by Aboriginal people in Far West communities.

PAEDIATRIC HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. S.L. GAME (15:12): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, on the lack of paediatricians in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: The government has stated time and again that they are prioritising the health of South Australians, yet there are still significant wait times for paediatric allergists/immunologists, paediatric audiologists, paediatric dietitians, paediatric exercise physiologists, paediatric gastroenterologists, paediatric occupational therapists, paediatric orthopaedic surgeons, paediatric physiotherapists, paediatric podiatrists, paediatric psychologists, paediatric respiratory physicians, paediatric rheumatologists, paediatric social workers and paediatric speech pathologists. The wait times are even longer if you live in a regional area. The possibility of being seen before 18 months if you are going through the public system is next to impossible.

Early intervention, diagnosis and therapies are crucial. Time is of the essence when diagnosing disabilities, disorders and chronic conditions in young children. There are not enough paediatricians and childhood health specialists in South Australia to deal with the current needs of families. Even after diagnosis, everyone knows about the chronic delays with the NDIS funding plans and, of course, cumulatively there are obvious delays and shortages in treatment and therapy because, as previously mentioned, there are simply not enough paediatric specialists.

I cannot find anything in the budget estimates to address the chronic shortage of paediatricians in training in South Australia—nothing. My question is: what is the government doing to address this?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:13): I thank the honourable member for her question. As it relates to the health portfolio, I will be referring that to my colleague in another place and bringing back a reply.

SEXUAL ASSAULT

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN (15:14): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General in relation to his portfolio.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN: In light of the concerns raised in this place earlier today by the Hon. Tammy Franks in relation to sexual assault that women face in the city surrounding events, can the minister advise if the crime rates and complaints increase throughout the events period?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:14): I thank the honourable member for her question. I don't have current up-to-date crime statistics. I am happy to take that on notice and bring back a reply. I suspect when there are more people and increased activity a whole lot of statistics increase, but I wouldn't want to have a guess without knowing for sure, so I am very happy to take that on notice and, if there are statistics that can be ascertained for that, bring the honourable member a reply in relation to it.

SEXUAL ASSAULT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:15): Supplementary: will the Attorney also undertake to look at the work of the YWCA about young women's safety in the city as part of that analysis?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:15): Certainly. I will take that on notice and bring back a reply. I think in relation to the Hon. Laura Curran's question, it would be the police I think who would probably keep the statistics, but between the Attorney-General's and police I am happy to see if they have statistics that are readily available to bring them back.

SEXUAL ASSAULT

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN (15:15): Supplementary question: what is the government doing to ensure that all state government sponsored events are fulfilling their community obligations to ensure that these events are safe and inclusive for all people who attend, not only at the event but on their way home, and to get there as well?

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 for her question. This goes well outside my portfolio area so I will see if there is further information I can add from across government. There will be areas to do with major events and to do with transport that I think will influence these but I do know, as I think a lot of members know, that during very major events there is increased public transport and occasionally there is free public transport offered and there is increased security, but as it ranges across government I will see if there is further information I can bring back for the honourable member.

FRUIT FLY

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:16): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister update the council on the latest strategy in tackling fruit fly in the Riverland?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:16): I thank the honourable member for his question and ongoing interest in our regional areas. The state government is constantly looking at different ways to tackle the ongoing fruit fly outbreaks that we are experiencing in the Riverland. As members would be aware, some of those are large approaches such as the additional \$13 million as part of the recent state budget for fruit fly eradication programs.

The government continues to look at other ways in which we can increase the awareness of fruit fly and the need to maintain fruit trees appropriately. On Monday, I had the opportunity to meet with Janelle from Waikerie Wills & Co Mitre 10 to deliver 1,000 fruit tree tags, which will be attached to fruit trees in the nursery and will educate consumers about the fruit fly pest and what steps can be taken to ensure fruit trees are appropriately maintained. As a backyard grower herself, Janelle was

very pleased to see the tree tag initiative and welcomed the educational support for Riverland residents.

The Department of Primary Industries and Regions started rolling out these tags in metropolitan Adelaide last year and have now started adding these tree tags, the 'Look after me' tree tags, in several locations in the Riverland. These tags remind backyard producers to pick their fruit as soon as it is ripe, to collect and dispose of any fruit on the ground under trees, and to check their produce for blemishes and maggots.

The tags were initially rolled out to independent nurseries and garden centres with assistance from the Nursery and Garden Industry South Australia. I would like to thank that industry association for their assistance in this. It is wonderful to now see stores such as Mitre 10 and Bunnings, along with other nurseries in the Riverland, get involved in providing a simple but crucial piece of information to customers and residents of the Riverland.

It is critical that there is continued collaboration between government, industry and our community to educate people about the importance of maintaining their backyards. The horticulture industry in South Australia is worth \$1.3 billion and provides thousands of jobs in South Australia, and we cannot leave any stone unturned in the continued fight against fruit fly and towards our goal of complete fruit fly eradication.

We know that Riverland residents who have fruit trees in their backyards need to pick the ripe fruit and vegetables promptly. They need to collect fallen fruit and ensure that it is not buried or composted. They need to check the fruit for blemishes and maggots, and then call the fruit fly hotline if they suspect they have the pest on their property. The South Australian government remains committed to maintaining South Australia's status as the only mainland state free of fruit fly and continues to apply significant efforts to eradicate the pest from multiple outbreaks in the Riverland.

I look forward to continuing to update the council on the government's continued efforts to eradicate this pest from South Australia, and I also look forward to continuing the positive relationship where everyone accepts that biosecurity is a shared responsibility, whether it be those of us who grow fruit in our backyards, whether it be commercial growers or travellers into and out of appropriate areas. I look forward to being able to provide more updates as we go forward.

FRUIT FLY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:20): Supplementary question: what is the minister and her department doing to communicate the important message regarding restrictions and fruit tree management to those in the community who have existing fruit trees?

The Hon. C.M. Scriven interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I think it does, because you gave a reasonably broad-ranging answer with regard to that, so answer it how you see fit.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:20): Certainly. I thank the honourable member for her supplementary question. It comes down to the wide range of responses that are needed. As I mentioned, there has been a large effort from the commercial growers in terms of addressing the fruit fly issue and looking at different opportunities that exist to eradicate fruit fly from the Riverland. There have also been a number of communications activities.

As I mentioned, I was in the Riverland earlier this week on Monday and I met with a number of our local councils. It was a very useful conversation to have, to have their on-the-ground perspective on how the existing educational and informational brochures and other mechanisms had been received, what could be done differently and what more needed to be done. A wideranging communications plan is administered by PIRSA, and my staff met recently with them about that plan to get an update on where the different opportunities are and what some other opportunities might be going forward.

It is really important that issues such as fruit fly, biosecurity in general but in this case fruit fly, is addressed with a bipartisan approach. Often it will be different ideas coming from different

parts of the community, and I am very happy to receive any such suggestions from the honourable member or any other members of the community because we really want to make sure that the message is getting through to all parts of the community, to everyone who has trees in their backyard, who need to be aware of what is required, and potentially to look at where the gaps are, if any.

We know that fruit fly has been an issue for a long time but a more serious issue over the last 18 months to two years. There is the opportunity always to be looking at what aspects are being implemented and how we can do it differently in terms of communications. I think the former government certainly tried very hard in terms of communication activities, but no-one would expect something to be perfect, and I am sure there is still room for improvement now going forward as well.

SAFEWORK SA

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:23): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about SafeWork SA.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: In May, the Attorney announced that an independent review would have been undertaken into SafeWork SA's decision not to prosecute the employer of murdered nurse Gayle Woodforde, who we know was murdered while working in the remote community of Fregon where she lived and worked as a nurse.

Her murderer, Dudley Davey, was sentenced to a mandatory term of life imprisonment in June 2017. Following the conclusion of a coronial inquest in 2021, SafeWork SA reopened its investigation into whether her employer should be prosecuted for contraventions of the Work Health and Safety Act relating to Gayle's death.

In April 2022, after a 12-month investigation, we know that the announcement was made that there would be no prosecution in that case. That decision raised a number of concerns by a number of parties, which ultimately resulted in the Attorney announcing that an independent review by a former federal judge, the Hon. John Mansfield AM QC, was due to be completed by 15 July next week, I think, next Friday, after which it will be made publicly available.

My questions to the Attorney are: is the review on time and expected to be completed by Friday the 15th, or is any extension being envisaged? Will you make the report public before parliament resumes after the winter break in September? More broadly, how is the broader review into SafeWork SA progressing, and when can we expect a report into that inquiry?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:25): I thank the honourable member for her question. It's an important question and certainly one that she has taken a keen interest in, and I thank her for that. I had the opportunity to briefly meet with John Mansfield AM QC, I think two to three weeks ago—I can't remember exactly when. It was a brief meeting, but in the brief discussion he relayed that the review was coming along in the time frame as expected. I haven't heard anything since then.

If it is not the case I will check, but I am quite sure that it is anticipated to be completed in the time frame that was outlined, by 15 July. Certainly, two to three weeks ago, John Mansfield AM QC had conducted almost all the interviews and had read the documents that were needed from SafeWork SA to then go away and draw conclusions and put together a review.

Yes, I have committed to making that review public, and I would anticipate it would absolutely be made public during the winter break before we resume in this chamber in September. We are considering who might undertake the larger review of the practices and procedures of SafeWork SA. Certainly, I have made it clear that the Mansfield review into the Woodford case specifically will inform and be considered as part of the broader review.

Bills

CROSS BORDER COMMISSIONER BILL

Final Stages

Consideration in committee of message No. 24 from the House of Assembly.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I move:

That the amendments from the House of Assembly be agreed to.

I would like to update the chamber and summarise the amendments that were moved in the other place. In regard to the Cross Border Commissioner Bill, the bill was designed to provide the appropriate standing expertise and governance for the commissioner, with transparency around their functions, their reporting requirements and the skills needed.

There were some changes made to the bill in this place that the government could not support. While intended to set minimum standards for consultation and accountability for state authorities, in the government's view these changes would have created unnecessary layers of administrative burden and restricted the commissioner from being responsive to community needs.

The member for Mount Gambier in the other place moved the following amendments that resulted in the bill that now returns to us. The annual plan clause has been removed due to the prescriptive nature of that clause and the fact that it would have led to the creation of additional red tape, namely binding the commissioner to extensive planning and reporting processes rather than being able to move on with the job and address current and emerging issues of concern—and those emerging issues are particularly important.

As a consequence of deleting the annual plan clause, paragraph (g) of the 'Functions of Commissioner' clause was revised from 'to prepare an annual plan in accordance with section 9' to 'to prepare an annual plan in consultation with the minister'. There were also deletions of a clause such as the power to require information clause, which is a consequence of the deletion of the annual plan clause. The intent of the bill is to establish a commissioner who is focused on issues that relate to differences between South Australia and other jurisdictions, requiring an emphasis on negotiation and collaboration to find solutions rather than using powers to direct.

Subsection (1) of the delegation clause has been amended from 'subject to this act' to read 'subject to this section', as the term 'section' is more succinct given delegation of the functions are only referred to under this clause; therefore reference to the whole act is not required. Those changes to the bill also resulted in the removal of the definitions of government agency, responsible minister and state authority, as those terms no longer appear in the bill.

I would like to also note that the amendments made to the bill in this place in regard to a review of the act have been retained in the latest version of the bill. There were no changes in the other place to that aspect. In summary, I would like to stress that the bill will still require an annual replan and annual reporting against the plan but without being overly prescriptive and hence creating additional administrative burden and red tape.

The prescribed functions of the commissioner and a requirement to consult with the minister when preparing the annual plan will ensure there will be proper consultation. Also, the annual reports that will be tabled in parliament provide accountability for the commissioner and government agencies in delivering on their commitments to cross-border communities, and the retention of the review of act clause should give everyone comfort going forward.

I also reiterate and would like to again place on the record that there will be a competitive and transparent process followed regarding the appointment of the commissioner to ensure that the best candidate for the role is identified and appointed. I therefore commend the bill in its current form to the chamber.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:32): I rise to communicate my disappointment on this bill coming back to this chamber. I do so because I think it is a symbol of the difference between the two chambers. The Labor Malinauskas government do have the numbers in the House of Assembly and have used their numbers to remove some practical and sensible amendments to the Cross Border Commissioner Bill that improve transparency and accountability of the role, and no-one can give me a good reason as to why they have done so.

The member for Mount Gambier spoke in the other place about not wanting to bog the commissioner down with planning and reporting and wanting less red tape; however, the commissioner still has to develop an annual plan, and they still need to provide an annual report.

The only thing that the member for Mount Gambier has done, other than perhaps doing the Labor Party's bidding, is to remove the minimum requirement for the commissioner to undertake consultation with local community, which is the one thing that cross-border communities want the most—to be spoken to, to be engaged with and to be heard.

Cross-border issues are incredibly real and important issues in the daily lives of many cross-border communities. They were highlighted during the peak of COVID; however, they have always existed. Those of us that live in cross-border communities—and there are a number of MPs in the other place, not just the member for Mount Gambier, who live in and represent cross-border communities; we have the members for MacKillop, Chaffey, Hammond, Flinders, Stuart and Giles—are all aware of the importance of ensuring cross-border issues are recognised and worked through in a timely fashion.

Most cross-border issues are anomalies arising from practice differences, the very nature of two states doing things differently, or rule differences, such as different road rules or different business licences, but these issues are real for these communities. I am concerned that the removal of the consultation amendment and the amendment giving the commissioner powers to require information from departments and agencies will see a weaker approach to this role, and that is not what our cross-border communities want to see.

I am glad that the government has decided to support the amendment that at least legislates that the commissioner should reside in a cross-border community. We on this side would have preferred 'must', but acknowledge the possible issues surrounding this language. However, I think everyone can agree that lived experience is critical to really understanding the issues that cross-border communities face.

I am also glad that the government has agreed to the concept of an independent review of this bill. Role reviews on various pieces of legislation are not uncommon in this place, and indeed the other place, and will ensure that there is a mechanism to determine whether the cross-border commissioner's role is working as this parliament intended it to.

They say in this place you need to be able to count the numbers. I acknowledge that we no longer have those numbers in this place, and nor do we want to hold up this important piece of legislation. However, I do want to place on the record my frustration with the way that the government has used its numbers to quash what are very practical and sensible amendments.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I rise on behalf of the Greens to indicate that we will be supporting the amended version of the bill, as has been transmitted from the house. I do want to express some disappointment, though, at the way in which this matter has been handled and at perhaps a degree of recalcitrance on behalf of the government, given they were some quite modest changes that were made by this chamber.

I must say, I am not persuaded by the suggestion that the sky was going to fall in if these changes were made to the bill. However, on balance, in weighing our approach to this matter the Greens have been concerned about holding up the progress of this bill heading into the midwinter break. We recognise the desire of regional communities, cross-border communities, to see this commissioner put in place. On that basis, I do not have an appetite to go through the next stages of this process and potentially delay the commissioner.

I recognise the government has made some compromise in terms of incorporating some of the changes that this house put in place, but it is disappointing to me that they have not been willing to budge on some of the suggestions that were made by the opposition, which did seem to be, I think, fairly sensible. That said, we will be supporting the government's position and we look forward to this bill being progressed today.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I rise to say that SA-Best will also support the changes to the bill, somewhat reluctantly, because, as the Hon. Robert Simms has indicated, we thought they were quite sensible changes to the bill. I understand that the government wanted to dig its heels in and make some strong statement about what should remain and what should not be there.

I would have been extremely disappointed if they had knocked out the review of the legislation. As has been pointed out by the Hon. Nicola Centofanti, and as we did in the debate

previously, these reviews are commonplace in legislation that comes from this place and it is only sensible that there are reviews of this type of legislation to enable parliament to see how effective these changes are.

Regarding the power to require information, again I am disappointed with that being knocked out. I think it is quite important that the commissioner is able to access relevant information that may arise or be necessary because of certain issues that will definitely arise, and not just in border communities in the South-East.

Let us remember that the commissioner is not just going to be a representative for communities at the border of South Australia and Victoria in the South-East. We also have borders with New South Wales, Queensland, the Northern Territory and Western Australia. The commissioner is going to be quite a busy person. In saying that, I now recognise that it may have been a little cumbersome to expect the border commissioner to prepare annual plans when the person is going to be extremely busy attending to various matters in various border communities, and more so now.

As my colleagues have pointed out here, there is an urgency now to have this position in place, particularly with the biosecurity concerns that have arisen in the Riverland. We not only have the issues with the *Varroa destructor* and the issues with pigs but we also have fruit fly. Those challenges, which could actually turn up and become crises for our primary industries, will be reliant on not just the minister's Department of Primary Industries but also advocates who will go to the cross-border commissioner in search of some kind of support, should that arise.

Again, it is important that we get this matter dealt with today. In saying that, I will support the changes from the government. I thank the minister for making this bill happen. It has come back quickly, and we can get on with the job of assisting all those communities that need a voice. We saw that during the pandemic they became voiceless. This will certainly be beneficial to them.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I would like to very briefly thank all members who have made a contribution, both in this place and also in terms of discussions about how best to approach this very important position. This will be a role that looks after communities on all borders. The feedback I have had is that there is an expectation that this will be a very useful role, similar to the feedback I have received about the New South Wales and Victorian cross-border commissioners. I thank all members and look forward to not only this bill now progressing but us being able to progress with advertising and then appointing a cross-border commissioner for the good of all our state, particularly those living in cross-border communities.

Motion carried.

Motions

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:44): I move:

That, during the present session, members appointed to select committees and committees established pursuant to resolution of the council may participate in the proceedings of those committees, including moving motions and voting, by way of telephone or videoconference or other audiovisual means and shall be deemed to be present and counted for purposes of a quorum, subject to such means of participation remaining effective and not disadvantaging any member of the committee.

Motion carried.

Bills

APPROPRIATION BILL 2022

Second Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:45): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation and explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: No; I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT: Leave is not granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The Appropriation Bill 2022 reflects the Treasurer's budget that was tabled in this house on budget day, June 2022. By way of explanation of clauses:

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Commencement

This clause provides for the bill to operate retrospectively to 1 July 2022. Until the bill is passed, expenditure is financed from appropriation authority provided by the Supply Act.

3—Interpretation

This clause provides relevant definitions.

4—Issue and application of money

This clause provides for the issue and application of the sums shown in schedule 1 to the bill. Subclause (2) makes it clear that the appropriation authority provided by the Supply Act is superseded by this bill.

5—Application of money if functions or duties of agency are transferred

This clause is designed to ensure that where parliament has appropriated funds to an agency to enable it to carry out particular functions or duties and those functions or duties become the responsibility of another agency, the funds may be used by the responsible agency in accordance with parliament's original intentions without further appropriation.

6—Expenditure from hospitals fund

This clause provides authority for the Treasurer to issue and apply money from the hospitals fund for the provision of facilities in public hospitals.

7—Additional appropriation under other Acts

This clause makes it clear that appropriation authority provided by this bill is additional to authority provided in other acts of parliament, except, of course, in the Supply Act.

8—Overdraft limit

This sets a limit of \$150 million on the amount which the government may borrow by way of overdraft.

Schedule 1—Amounts proposed to be expended from the Consolidated Account during the financial year ending 30 June 2023

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

Motions

ASSANGE, MR J.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:48): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises Julian Assange is an Australian citizen and a journalist with WikiLeaks who aided in exposing possible war crimes and civilian casualties in the release of documents which included Afghanistan War logs in 2010 and Guantanamo Bay files in 2011, supplied to WikiLeaks by Chelsea Manning, a former U.S. Army intelligence analyst.
2. Acknowledges Mr Assange genuinely believed his actions were for the purpose of:

- (a) government accountability, transparency and integrity; and
 - (b) the broader public interest and for the interest of justice.
3. Notes that since the publication of those documents, Mr Assange has been forced into isolation or imprisoned over the course of 10 years, resulting in the serious deterioration of his health and mental wellbeing.
4. Recognises Mr Assange's impending prosecution by the United States of America constitutes a serious attack on the fundamental democratic freedoms of the press.
5. Questions the legitimacy of prosecuting Mr Assange in the United States through that country's Espionage Act of 1917, carrying a penalty of up to 175 years imprisonment, and whether the act should be applied to non-US citizens either living and/or working in other countries at the time of any alleged offending.
6. Calls on the President of the Legislative Council to write to:
 - (a) the President of the United States, Joe Biden, expressing the Legislative Council's desire that he show clemency by intervening in the extradition and prosecution of Mr Assange, and instruct the US Attorney-General and US Department of Justice to withdraw all charges on medical and humanitarian grounds; and
 - (b) the Prime Minister of Australia, the Rt Hon Anthony Albanese, and Minister for Foreign Affairs, Hon Senator Penny Wong, requesting they write to the President of the United States and the US Ambassador to Australia, Ms Caroline Kennedy, to express the concerns of the Legislative Council regarding Mr Assange's prosecution.
7. Notes a poll conducted by the *Sydney Morning Herald* in January 2022 which showed 71 per cent support for Mr Assange being returned to Australia.

I rise today to call on the federal Albanese government to intervene in the extradition of Julian Assange to the United States, where he will face prosecution for a breach of the Espionage Act. If convicted, Mr Assange faces up to 175 years in jail. It is our duty as Australians and defenders of freedom of the press and other democratic values to ensure that civil liberties and protection of state citizens is paramount.

For the US to have a claim to sovereignty over the world and seek to apply their law to anyone, anywhere, goes beyond the pale. The United States is exercising a law of universal jurisdiction that can have you charged and deported to the USA for breaking an American law. It is this application of this apparent authority to exercise US laws extraterritorially that we are witnessing in plain sight with Julian Assange. The extension of US domestic law to persons such as Julian Assange, who has no legal connection to the United States by way of citizenship, residence or by any other ties to the jurisdiction, is repugnant to the rule of law.

Since 2012, Mr Assange has been persecuted, detailed, isolated and had his human rights infringed. All the while, Australia has stood by and watched as one of its citizens is subjected to such treatment for standing up for press freedoms, integrity and government accountability. There is widespread support for Julian Assange domestically in Australia and from the global community, including a vast number of non-state actors such as the International Federation of Journalists and its 600,000 members, Reporters Without Borders, Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International, to name a few. The list, however, is extensive.

A *Sydney Morning Herald* article published on 5 January 2022 showed that 71 per cent of respondents support the call for Julian Assange to be brought back to Australia. Sixteen per cent voted no and 13 per cent were unsure. As many in this chamber would appreciate, 71 per cent is a significant number in support. In May 2022, Assange advocates tabled a Change.org petition with a 700,000-signature 'Bring Julian Assange home' campaign to present to parliament in support of bringing Mr Assange home to Australia with his brother Gabriel Shipton, stating now is the time the government can intervene and come up with a political solution to bring Julian home.

It is up to the Prime Minister now to pick up the phone and bring Julian home. I echo the words issued by Greg Barns, the Assange family's legal counsel, on the same day that it is incumbent upon not only prime ministers but also our foreign minister, now the Hon. Penny Wong, to get heavily involved in this matter, along with the Attorney-General and attorneys-general of each jurisdiction, to bring to an end what is a disgraceful case based on a person who revealed war crimes—something that, of course, Australia was currently looking at with allegations in relation to Afghanistan.

I will point out and I welcome today's announcement from the federal Attorney-General, the Hon. Mark Dreyfus QC, who announced that charges against lawyer Bernard Collaery have been dropped. As members in this chamber would know, Mr Collaery was being prosecuted for leaking classified information that had been supplied by his client, known as 'witness K', who was a spy and who in fact pleaded guilty to charges.

The information revealed an act of treachery by the Australian government in which the government bugged the government offices of Timor-Leste during talks on gas and oil reserves. I welcome today's announcement that Mr Collaery will not be prosecuted and I hope, with that, the federal government moves swiftly to try to also seek some recourse for Mr Assange.

It is time for the decade-long suffering of one of our own to come to an end. As Australians we stand proud behind Julian's courage and defence of democratic transparency and press freedom in the face of extreme deterrence and his continual fight for justice. It is time we recognised, not only in this chamber but in the state and country, that whistleblowing and the rights around protection be highlighted as a strength of our institutions. Whistleblower protection is an integral aspect of the public capacity to ensure and foster transparency of government.

Intervening in the Assange persecution will act to promote a culture in Australia of accountability and integrity in both public and private institutions by empowering the citizenry against corruption and encourages the reporting of corruption, misconduct and also fraud. Taking action to bring Julian Assange home or to resolve the matter by having the charges dropped have real implications.

It is not just about Julian, it is about civil institutions being held to a certain standard, and that citizens of democratic nation-states are aware of and have access to understand what decisions the government make in the name of the body politic. Julian's actions and subsequent treatment go to the fundamental question of media freedom, whistleblower protection and the public interest, which lies in the balance of openness in government.

I would like to read a statement entitled 'Journalists demand Assange release from UK Jail', dated 22 June 2022. It is a statement from the International Coalition of Journalists. I will read the statement from Geneva, which states:

An international coalition of journalists, editors and publishers demanded on Wednesday that WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange be immediately released from a UK jail and that all charges against him be dropped.

Fifteen representatives of journalist and publishers' unions and organisations [from six countries] gathered in Geneva for the 'call to free Julian Assange in the name of press freedom'.

The petitioners also called on Swiss authorities, who have said they have worked to protect Assange, to facilitate his release by offering him a safe haven from further prosecution in Switzerland. The call came after the British government last week approved Assange's extradition to the United States, to the dismay of his supporters and free press campaigners. Assange, 50, has said he will appeal against the decision.

He is wanted to face trial for violating the US Espionage Act by publishing military and diplomatic files in 2010 and could face up to 175 years in jail if found guilty. The Assange case has become a cause célèbre for media freedom, and his supporters accuse Washington of trying to muzzle reporting of legitimate security concerns. Wednesday's event slammed the British decision as a flagrant violation of human rights and a showing of total contempt for freedom of the press.

Pierre Ruetschi, the head of the Swiss Press Club hosting the event, warned that democracy is being taken hostage, and I quote him:

This attempt at criminalising journalism is a serious threat.

Tim Dawson of the National Union of Journalists of Britain and Ireland agreed, and I quote him:

If Julian Assange can be threatened with prosecution as a spy, what might that mean for other journalists?

Assange has been held on remand at a top security jail in South-East London since 2019 for jumping bail in a previous case, accusing him of sexual assault in Sweden. Before that, he spent seven years at Ecuador's embassy in London to avoid being removed to Sweden. The Australian was arrested

when the government changed in Quito, and his diplomatic protection was removed. I seek leave to table that document.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I would also like to point out and acknowledge an advertisement that was taken out in the national newspaper, *The Australian*, by well-known Australian businessman Dick Smith. Mr Smith told me that he had visited Julian Assange three times in the Ecuadorian embassy in London, and found him to be quite a sincere and genuine person in what he was doing. In his advertisement Mr Smith says:

A message to all Australians—

and this follows a letter that he had written to the *Sydney Morning Herald* on 15 December 2021—

For the US to claim sovereignty over the globe and seek to apply their law to anyone anywhere in the world at will is sheer arrogance.

In the ad Mr Smith says:

The United States has a law of universal jurisdiction that can have you charged and deported to the USA for breaking American law. Yes, even if you are an Australian citizen and haven't been to the United States. It is happening to scapegoat Julian Assange, and it can happen to you.

In a message to the Prime Minister, Mr Smith says, 'Prime Minister Albanese, you are a fair person, please take action.' I seek leave to table that advertisement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: And this from the conversation, and the heading is, 'A new book argues Julian Assange is being tortured—will our new PM do anything about it?' It is written by Matthew Ricketson, Professor of Communication at Deakin University. He writes:

It is easy to forget why Julian Assange has been on trial in England for, well, seemingly forever. Didn't he allegedly sexually assault two women in Sweden? Isn't that why he holed up for years in the Ecuadorian embassy in London to avoid facing charges? When the bobbies finally dragged him out of the embassy, didn't his dishevelled appearance confirm all those stories about his lousy personal hygiene? Didn't he persuade Chelsea (formerly Bradley) Manning to hack into the United States' military computers to reveal national security matters that endangered the lives of American soldiers and intelligence agents? He says he is a journalist, but hasn't *The New York Times* made it clear he's just a source and not a publisher, entitled to first amendment protection?

If you answered yes to any or all of these questions, you are not alone, but the answers are actually no. At the very least it is more complicated than that. To take one example, the reason Assange was dishevelled was that staff in the Ecuadorian embassy had confiscated his shaving gear for three months before to ensure his appearance matched his stereotype when the arrest took place.

That is one of the findings of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Torture, Nils Melzer, whose investigation of the case against Assange has been laid out in forensic detail in *The Trial of Julian Assange*. 'What is the UN's Special Rapporteur on Torture doing investigating the Assange case?' you might think. But did Melzer investigate? When Assange's lawyers first approached him in 2018, he said, 'I had more important things to do. I had to take care of real torture victims.' Melzer returned to a report he was writing about overcoming prejudice and self-deception when dealing with official corruption. He said, and I quote:

Not until a few months later would I realise the striking irony of this situation.

The 47 members of the UN Human Rights Council directly appoint special rapporteurs on torture. The position is unpaid. Melzer earns his living as a professor of international law, but they have diplomatic immunity and operate largely outside the UN hierarchies. Among the many pleas for his attention, Melzer's small office chooses between 100 and 200 cases each year to officially investigate. His conclusions and recommendations are not binding on states.

He bleakly notes that in barely 10 per cent of cases does he receive full cooperation from states and an adequate resolution. He received nothing like full cooperation in investigating Assange's case. He gathered around 10,000 pages of procedural files, but a lot of them came from leaks to journalists or from freedom of information requests. Many pages had been redacted.

Rephrasing Carl von Clausewitz's maxim, Melzer wrote his book as 'the continuation of diplomacy by other means'. What he finds is stark and disturbing, and I will quote:

The Assange case is the story of a man who has been persecuted and abused for exposing the dirty secrets of the powerful, including war crimes, torture and corruption. It's a story of deliberate judicial arbitrariness in Western democracies that are otherwise keen to present themselves as exemplary in the area of human rights. It is the story of wilful collusion by intelligence services behind the back of national parliaments and the general public. It is a story of manipulated and manipulative reporting in the mainstream media for the purpose of deliberately isolating, demonising and destroying a particular individual. It is the story of a man who has been scapegoated by all of us for our own societal failures to address government corruption and state-sanctioned crimes.

Under the heading of 'collateral murder', the article then goes on to say:

The dirty secrets of the powerful are difficult to face, which is why we—and I don't include myself—
says the author—

swallow neatly packaged slurs and diversions of the kind listed at the beginning of this article.

Melzer rightly takes us back to April 2010, four years after the Australian-born Assange had founded WikiLeaks, a small organisation set up to publish official documents that it had received encrypted so as to protect whistleblowers from official retribution. Assange released video footage showing, in horrifying detail, how US soldiers in a helicopter had shot and killed Iraqi civilians and two Reuters journalists in 2007. Apart from how the soldiers spoke—and I quote: 'Ha, ha, ha, I hit them.' 'Nice.' 'Good shot'—it looks like most of the victims were civilians and that the journalist's cameras were mistaken for rifles.

When one of the wounded men tried to crawl to safety, the helicopter crew, instead of allowing their comrades on the ground to take him prisoner, as required by the rules of war, seek permission to shoot him again. As Melzer's detailed description makes clear, the soldiers knew what they were doing. I quote:

Come on, buddy—

the gunner comments, aiming the crosshairs at his hapless target—

all you got to do is pick up a weapon.

The soldiers' request for authorisation to shoot is given. When the wounded man is carried to a nearby minibus it is shot to pieces with a helicopter's 30-millimetre gun. The driver and two other rescuers are killed instantly. The drivers' two young children inside are seriously wounded.

US Army command investigated the matter, concluding that the soldiers acted in accordance with the rules of war, even though they had not. Equally to the point, writes Melzer, the public would never have known a war crime had been committed without the release of what Assange called the collateral murder video.

The video footage was just one of hundreds of thousands of documents that WikiLeaks released last year in tranches known as the Afghan war logs, the Iraqi war logs and Cablegate. They revealed numerous alleged war crimes and provided raw material for a shadow history of the disastrous wars waged by the US and its allies, including Australia, in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Under the heading 'Punished forever' Melzer retraces what has happened to Assange since then, from the accusations of sexual assault in Sweden to Assange taking refuge in the Ecuadorian embassy in London in an attempt to avoid the possibility of extradition to the US if returned to Sweden. His refuge led him to being jailed in the United Kingdom for breaching his bail conditions.

Sweden eventually dropped the sexual assault charges, but the US government ramped up its request to extradite Assange. He faces charges under the 1917 Espionage Act which, if successful, could lead to a jail term of 175 years. Two key points became increasingly clear as Melzer methodically works through the events. The first is that there has been a carefully orchestrated plan by four countries, the United States, the United Kingdom, Sweden and, yes Australia, to ensure Assange is punished forever for revealing state secrets.

The second is that the conditions he has been subjected to and will continue to be subjected to, if the US's extradition request is granted, amount to torture. On the first point, how else are we to interpret the continual twists and turns over nearly a decade in the official positions taken by Sweden

and the UK? Contrary to the obfuscating language of official communiqués, all of these have closed down Assange's options and denied him due process.

Melzer documents the thinness of the Swedish authorities' case for charging Assange with sexual assault. That did not prevent them from keeping it open for many years. Nor was Assange as uncooperative with the police as has been suggested. Swedish police kept changing their minds about where and whether to formally interview Assange, because they knew the evidence was weak. Melzer also takes pains to show how Swedish police also overrode the interests of the two women who had made the complaints against Assange.

It is distressing to read the conditions Assange has endured over several years. A change in the political leadership of Ecuador led to a change in his living conditions in the embassy, from cramped but bearable to virtual imprisonment. Since being taken from the embassy to Belmarsh prison in 2019 Assange has spent much of his time in solitary confinement—for 22 to 23 hours a day. He has been denied all but the most limited access to his legal team, let alone family and friends. He was kept in a glass cage during his seemingly interminable extradition hearing, appeals over which could continue for several more years, according to Melzer.

Assange's physical and mental health have suffered to the point where he has been put on suicide watch again. That seems to be the point, Melzer writes:

The primary purpose of persecuting Assange is not—and never has been—to punish him personally, but to establish a generic precedent with a global deterrent effect on other journalists, publicists and activists.

The author of this article, Matthew Ricketson, asks:

So will the new Australian prime minister, Anthony Albanese, do any more than his three Coalition and two Labor predecessors to advocate for the interests of an Australian citizen?

In December 2021, Guardian Australia reported Albanese saying he did 'not see what purpose is served by the ongoing pursuit of Mr Assange' and that 'enough is enough'. Since being sworn in as prime minister, he has kept his cards close to his chest.

The actions of his predecessors suggest he won't, even though Albanese has already said on several occasions since being elected that he wants to do politics differently.

Melzer, among others, would remind him of the words of former US president Jimmy Carter, who, contrary to other presidents, said he did not deplore the WikiLeaks revelations. 'They just made public what was the truth. Most often, the revelation of truth, even if it's unpleasant, is beneficial... I think that, almost invariably, the secrecy is designed to conceal improper activities.'

More recently, another article by Daniel Hurst, under the heading 'Julian Assange: what is Australia's position on his extradition, and what options does it have?' I seek leave to table that document as well.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Mr Hurst writes:

Australia's prime minister, Anthony Albanese, has said he stands by his previous comments opposing the ongoing pursuit of WikiLeaks co-founder Julian Assange.

But when asked on Monday whether he had spoken with Joe Biden about the US push to extradite Assange from the UK, Albanese indicated he would pursue the issue out of the public glare. The US is seeking to try Assange in connection with the publication of hundreds of thousands of leaked documents about the Afghanistan and Iraq wars, as well as diplomatic cables.

Mr Hurst asks:

So what is the new Australian government's position? What options does it have? And what are the next steps in the legal process?

This is what the Prime Minister, Mr Albanese, has said in the past about Mr Assange. This was in northern Tasmania on 15 December:

'Well, I've said for some time that enough is enough. The fact is that you have the circumstances whereby the person who has actually leaked the classified information to WikiLeaks is free, is walking around, isn't incarcerated. But the person who published that information remains in jail in Britain awaiting the extradition procedures that the United States is taking place.'

That was a reference to the former army intelligence analyst Chelsea Manning, who was released in 2017 when Barack Obama commuted her 35-year military prison sentence in one of his final acts as president. Albanese went on to say that Assange had 'paid a big price for the publication of that information already':

'I do not see what purpose is served by the ongoing pursuit of Mr Assange. He is an Australian citizen as well. And with that should come an obligation of the Australian government to ensure that he receives appropriate support.'

In April, Assange's father, John Shipton, said the election of a Labor government would be a 'great opportunity' to free the WikiLeaks co-founder. Shipton said he had had several lunches with Albanese and had been assured the then opposition leader would do 'whatever he can' to free his son.

What did Mr Albanese say most recently?

Speaking to reporters in Melbourne, the prime minister reaffirmed his previously stated position, while suggesting that he would not take a more forthright public position.

'I have made clear what my position is publicly,' he said. 'I made it clear last year. I stand by my comments that I made then.'

'But I make this point as well—there are some people who think that if you put things in capital letters on Twitter and put an exclamation mark, then that somehow makes it more important. It doesn't.'

'I intend to lead a government that engages diplomatically and appropriately with our partners.'

It is an about-face when you go from Leader of the Opposition to Prime Minister and you then need to engage with your direct allies with whom you have significant arrangements, like AUKUS. Why are press freedom groups worried about this case? I quote:

Press freedom advocates and human rights groups have raised fears the prosecution of Assange under the US Espionage Act sets 'a dangerous precedent'.

Daniel Ellsberg—the whistleblower prosecuted 50 years ago for releasing the Pentagon Papers about the Vietnam war—has said: 'This extradition would mean that journalists, anywhere in the world, could be extradited to the US for exposing information classified in the US.'

Imagine that: they could just go anywhere and pluck any journalist. Just because they published some classified information that would have embarrassed the government, they could be plucked from anywhere, come to this country, because we have those relations with them, and those people could be facing jail terms of up to 175 years. What is happening with the legal process? I quote:

In April a UK court formally approved the extradition of Assange to the US on espionage charges but it was up to the home secretary, Priti Patel, to sign off.

On Friday the UK Home Office announced that Patel had approved the extradition, saying the UK courts had 'not found that it would be oppressive, unjust or an abuse of process to extradite Mr Assange'.

'Nor have they found that extradition would be incompatible with his human rights, including his right to a fair trial and to freedom of expression, and that whilst in the US he will be treated appropriately, including in relation to his health,' a Home Office spokesperson said.

WikiLeaks immediately announced that the decision would be appealed (the Home Office said Assange 'retains the normal 14-day right to appeal'). Any appeal was likely to focus on grounds such as the right to freedom of expression and whether the extradition request was politically motivated.

The author then asks: how did the government's response differ from the previous government's stance? He writes:

The foreign affairs minister, Penny Wong, and the attorney general, Mark Dreyfus, responded to Patel's decision by observing that Australia was 'not a party to Mr Assange's case, nor can the Australian government intervene in the legal matters of another country'.

But they said they planned to 'continue to convey our expectations that Mr Assange is entitled to due process, humane and fair treatment, access to proper medical care, and access to his legal team'. This is a similar position to what the former Australian government repeatedly said in public.

But there was a critical addition to the statement alluding to new overarching representations to the US and the UK: 'The Australian government has been clear in our view that Mr Assange's case has dragged on for too long and that it should be brought to a close. We will continue to express this view to the governments of the United Kingdom and United States.'

What options does the government have to intervene?

The only real option for the Australian government is to vigorously pursue this issue at a political level.

The government has not elaborated exactly what it means by bringing the matter to a close. One option would be to encourage the US to drop the charges. The Biden administration has previously said this is a matter for the Department of Justice, which it says acts independently.

Another option would be to encourage the US president to issue a pardon to Assange. If Assange were to be extradited and convicted and sentenced, Australia could also lobby for the sentence to be commuted, in a similar way to Manning's sentence.

Ultimately, this is a question of how much political capital Albanese wishes to use.

One of Assange's most vocal advocates, the independent MP Andrew Wilkie, thinks the time for quiet diplomacy is over and the government should 'call an end to this madness'.

'I think if Anthony Albanese made an unambiguous and strong public comment in support of Julian Assange I think that would be helpful at this point in time,' Wilkie told Sky News [recently]. He acknowledged the new government's changed tone as 'good' but said 'it hasn't amounted to anything' because Patel had signed off on the extradition.

The former foreign minister Bob Carr has argued that Australia has been an 'exemplary ally' to the US and this should count for something. Carr also points to the Howard government's success in 2007—after years of mounting calls to act—in securing the return of the former Guantánamo Bay inmate David Hicks to serve out the remainder of his sentence in Australia.

Could Assange serve any sentence in Australia?

The US has already offered this. It was among a number of assurances that were crucial to a successful US appeal against an earlier British court ruling blocking Assange's extradition.

These assurances included that Assange would not be subject to 'special administrative measures' or held at a maximum security 'ADX' facility and could apply, if convicted, to be transferred to a prison in Australia.

That article was by Daniel Hurst, which was published in *The Guardian* on 20 June 2022. I would like to go to another piece, which was written by prominent Canberra journalist Michelle Grattan, talking to Greg Barns on the battle to free Mr Assange.

Julian Assange, the founder of WikiLeaks, is facing extradition to the United States...

Barrister Greg Barns has worked pro bono on Assange's case for the last nine years as part of the Australian Assange campaign.

Barns argues the Assange issue 'goes to fundamental questions like freedom of the press and freedom of speech.'

The election of the Albanese government has reignited calls for Australia to do more to try to bring Assange home.

'We've certainly been heartened by the approach taken by the new government,' Barns says.

'I think Anthony Albanese himself has been committed for some time now in his public statements and certainly been supportive privately of Assange's position. He's made that clear in a number of statements with a theme really that this has gone long enough.'

'There has been a marked change in rhetoric on the part of Mr Albanese, but also I think in his very telling statement that he did not want to pursue this matter through megaphone diplomacy, which we respect, because of course you're dealing with Australia's closest ally.'

'He wants to do something, but he wants to do it in a way that respects the friendship between Australia and the United States.'

Which I guess is understandable. It continues:

On what US President Joe Biden should consider when it comes to the relationship with Australia and the issue of Assange, Barns notes Biden has 'given a number of speeches now talking about democracy and the importance of democratic values'.

This is an opportunity to assert those values by saying that freedom of speech and freedom of the press are fundamentally important in a democracy and in the democratic world. And so there are certainly plenty of avenues and plenty of reasons why President Biden might deal with this matter.

This case has gone on too long. There are fundamental principles at stake and it's time to end it.

I seek leave to table that *Conversation* article.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: The Australian federal government now have the opportunity to become a global stalwart in ensuring the actions taken to identify and call out governmental misconduct, accountability and breaches of ethical duties are elevated and celebrated. The Australian government have made it clear in their position that journalists should not be prosecuted for doing their jobs. The Attorney-General, the Hon. Mark Dreyfus QC, recently expressed his commitment to journalistic protection in an ABC Law Report interview with Kristina Kukulja, highlighting that a free press is the lifeblood of our political debate and without it there would be little room to keep citizens informed.

I could not agree more with the Attorney-General's assessment of journalist protection and free press. I call upon him and his government to act on the promises they made in opposition and throughout the election campaign in defence of Assange's treatment and commitment to intervene through any means available and necessary.

It was only last year in 2021, when in opposition, the now Prime Minister Anthony Albanese was a signatory to the 'Bring Julian Assange home' campaign and stated on the record that Julian should be freed. This sentiment was also echoed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Penny Wong, who stated:

We will continue to convey our expectations that Mr Assange is entitled to due process, humane and fair treatment, access to proper medical care, and access to his legal team.

And bring the matter to a close. It was only in January 2021 that a UK judge sided with Mr Assange's team, ruling that he could not be extradited because there was no guarantee the American authorities could or would look after him. Now Julian is facing this reality.

The government has the opportunity to ensure the safety and risk to Julian is mitigated by taking diplomatic political measures in a bona fide attempt to bring Julian home or have the charges against him dropped. It is not just the position on record that Julian Assange be freed by the now government ministers but also government backbenchers, with Julian Hill MP describing secretary Patel's decision to approve the extradition as 'appalling' and compared his plight with army intelligence analyst Chelsea Manning, who was the source of the leak. He further suggested that there is only a political solution to the matter and that 'Political cases should never be the subject of extradition.'

Many in this country voted for change at the federal election on 26 May 2022, with an expectation that a new incoming government would act promptly on the Assange matter, where inaction had become the staple for the past nine years. Attorney-General Mark Dreyfus correctly stated in an interview on ABC Radio National Law Report that Australia has no jurisdiction in interfering with either the jailing or extradition of Julian Assange, but emphasised on record that it is the Australian government's position that:

...the case of Julian Assange has gone on far too long. What is available to the Australian Government is making diplomatic representations.

In the A-G's own words, we are taking steps as they are available, when he was asked about a resolution.

Alongside many of my fellow Australians, I call on the Albanese government to turn their words in opposition into action in the government. I commend this motion to the chamber.

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

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 15 June 2022.)

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (16:35): Antisemitism has no place in our country or, indeed, anywhere. These racist and repugnant views should rightfully be condemned. I am proud that we live in a multicultural country where people of all faiths and backgrounds are celebrated and respected, and protected with strong legislative protections in place to prevent discrimination in all its forms. It is concerning that there are reports of antisemitism being on the rise in our community. On our side of the chamber we are understanding and appreciative of the sincere intent of this motion. Any measure that can help to fight against prejudice and intolerance towards anyone in our community should be carefully considered.

The motion seeks to endorse a definition of antisemitism as defined by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance. I understand that this definition has been recognised and endorsed in a number of other jurisdictions, including interstate. I agree that a definition of antisemitism will have value in governments and individuals being able to identify and respond to antisemitic behaviours in our communities. On this basis, the government will be supporting this important motion.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:36): I rise to speak in opposition to this motion and indicate at the outset that I will also be moving to amend the motion at the conclusion of my contribution. On 26 May 2016, the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) made the decision to issue what it referred to as a non-legally-binding work definition of antisemitism, the words of which are replicated in the Hon. Sarah Game's motion.

My colleague the Hon. Frank Pangallo has a contribution of his own that he will be making as well, but for the record I indicate that SA-Best will not be supporting the motion, for the following reasons. The first reason is that the definition was not and was never intended to be drafted for political purposes. It was not designed to be used as a political tool, rather a tool for data collection in response to an increase in race hate crimes in Northern Europe. In his written testimony to the United States House of Representatives on 7 November 2017, US Attorney and former lead draftsman for the American Jewish Committee Against Antisemitism, Kenneth S. Stern said:

The definition was drafted to make it easier for data collectors to know what to put in their reports and what to reject.

He went on to say that:

The definition was not drafted, and was never intended, as a tool to target or chill speech...

He likened the promotion of the definition to the opening of Pandora's box. Academics, legal experts and legal rights groups all over the globe have expressed similar concern, particularly in relation to the potential impact on freedom of expression which could restrict legitimate debate and criticism of Israel and Zionism. As world-renowned international law lawyer, Geoffrey Robertson, AO, QC, explained:

The IHRA definition of anti-Semitism is not fit for any purpose that seeks to use it as an adjudicative standard.

It is imprecise, confusing and open to misinterpretation and even manipulation.

It does not cover some insidious forms of anti-Semitism.

It was originally drafted in the absence of any other decision as a tool for collecting data and is useful for purposes of discussion, but should not be used, or be used with great caution, as a measure for discipline or in ways that have consequences for political speech.

In the conclusion of an opinion that was given by Mr Robertson, after being asked by the Palestinian Return Centre to comment on the interpretation and impact on free speech of the government's acceptance in 2016 of an extended definition of antisemitism promulgated by IHRA, he states:

...for the reasons set out above, that:

1. The IHRA definition is not fit for any purpose that seeks to use it as an adjudicative standard.

He relays the stuff that I have said about being used only as a tool for collection of data and says:

3. The UK Government was wrong to adopt it without the 'caveat' recommended with reason by the Home Affairs Committee, namely:

'It is not anti-Semitic to criticise the government of Israel, without additional evidence to suggest anti-Semitic intent.'

Any public body or other organisation (including the Labour Party) that is contemplating adoption of the IHRA definition in full should add this provision to it.
4. As a matter of internal construction, the examples appended to the IHRA core definition should be read as incorporating a) the fact that they 'could not' amount to anti-Semitism and b) in particular, unless they exhibited to reasonable people a hatred of Jewish people.
5. The Government's 'adoption' of the definition has no legal effect and does not oblige public bodies to take notice of it.
6. The definition should not be adopted, and certainly should not be applied, by public bodies unless they are clear about Article 10 of the ECHR which is binding upon them, namely that they cannot ban speech or write about Israel unless there is a real likelihood that it will lead to violence or disorder or race hatred.
7. Universities and Colleges should be particularly careful about adopting or using the definition as they have a statutory duty to protect freedom of expression.
8. A particular problem with the IHRA definition is that it is likely in practice to chill free speech by raising expectations of pro-Israeli groups that they can successfully object to legitimate criticism [of their country] and correspondingly arouse fears in NGOs and student bodies that they will have events banned or else have to incur considerable expense to protect themselves by legal action. Either way, they may not organise such events.
9. Whether under human rights law or the IHRA definition, political action against Israel is not properly characterised as anti-Semitic unless the action is intended to promote hatred or hostility against Jews in general.

For the benefit of members, Geoffrey Robertson AO, QC is founder and head of Doughty Street Chambers. He has appeared in many ground-breaking cases in criminal, constitutional and international law, and served as First President of the UN War Crimes Court in Sierra Leone and as a 'distinguished jurist member' of the UN's Justice Council. His books include a text on media law, *Crimes Against Humanity—the Struggle for Global Justice* and *An Inconvenient Genocide—Who Now Remembers the Armenians*. In December 2016, he lectured at the Hebrew University in

Jerusalem on the connection between the Armenian Genocide and the Holocaust. I seek leave to table the entire opinion of Mr Robertson.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: For the benefit of new members, and as a reminder to others, in May last year I introduced a motion in this place calling on us to recognise the right of the Palestinian people to exercise their inalienable rights, including the right to self-determination without external interference, the right to national independence and sovereignty, and the right to return to their homes and property from which they have been displaced.

As I said at the time, this is not about religion: this is about equal rights for everyone, regardless of their nationality, religion or race. I stand even firmer by those comments today. We are not defending antisemitism, and any suggestion that not supporting this motion results in that is frankly offensive, repugnant and simply untrue.

All racism is completely repugnant and unacceptable but, by the same token, we cannot support motions or actions that risk silencing the conversation about people suffering and about the suffering of Palestinian people—the Palestinian people who continue to live without basic human rights in an open-air prison with sweeping restrictions on movement.

For years, Palestinians have been living without proper sanitation. As I said at the time, the water supply in Gaza is unfit for human consumption and water pollution is the leading source of child mortality. Human Rights Watch summarised the dire situation in their report, *A Threshold Crossed: Israeli Authorities and the Crimes of Apartheid and Persecution*, that I referred to in April last year. I quote:

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

Despite any best intentions, it is, with respect, my firm position that this motion will almost inevitably result in a division. As I said, in my firm and respectful view this is not about antisemitism, and simply calling for a division and showing which side of the chamber members land on, without context, should not be the focus of this debate. The very fact that we are here discussing this means that we need context.

While on the face of it the motion appears harmless, words matter and context matters. The words of this motion and the underlying messages and how they will be used, how they have been used and how they are perceived absolutely matter. As I said, this is not about choosing sides, regardless of what causes we support, it is about equal rights for all.

It is on that basis that I seek to move the amendment, which in my view offers a more balanced position on this issue. It is not just my opinion. The alternative has been prepared by stakeholders who not only reject antisemitism and all other forms of racial and religious discrimination and vilification but also see this as a matter of freedom of speech, with the ultimate goal of equality for all.

I think most members have now had the benefit of having seen the amendment. I appreciate that, given the events of this week, we were not sure whether this motion was actually going to be dealt with, so the timing is what it is in relation to that.

I said that words do matter, and I suppose the other thing that matters is when our inboxes suddenly become flooded with correspondence from members of the public who share concerns about the optics, the perceptions and the use of words. That has certainly been the case in relation to this motion. I am sure many of you would have received emails that highlight those same concerns.

One I have received, which is effectively a pro forma email sent by individuals who have put their names to it, reads:

Dear members of the Legislative Council/Members,

A motion is to be debated on Wednesday 6 July 2022 in the South Australian Legislative Council for the House to endorse and adopt the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance...definition of antisemitism. I ask you to do all you can to oppose this motion.

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, would be to stifle legitimate debate over Israel and Palestine.

Deep concerns about how the definition is being adopted have been expressed widely, including by the key drafter Kenneth Stern—

who I referred to earlier—

who says 'I drafted the definition, right wing Jews are weaponising it.' It has also been opposed by Geoffrey Robertson AO QC—

whose work I have also referred to and tabled—

...progressive Jewish groups; Palestinian academics and human rights groups.

The reality of Israeli apartheid is clearer than ever, as evidenced in the recent detailed reports of Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, B'tselem, Harvard Law School and the UN Human Rights Council Special Rapporteur on Palestine. It is therefore immoral and simply undemocratic to restrict legitimate debate on Israeli policies and practices under the cover of fighting antisemitism.

I strongly urge you to stand for the right to freedom of speech and to oppose this motion.

I will place on the record a handwritten and signed petition that we have also received, which reads—and I think this is important, because people sign these on the understanding that they will be tabled in this place and referred to:

Re. Israeli attempt to prevent scrutiny by labelling all criticism as 'antisemitic'

We, the undersigned, request that you do all in your power to prevent the South Australian Parliament from adopting the...IHRA...definition of antisemitism. The IHRA definition has been used in other states and countries as the basis for legal action against any individuals or organisations who dared to criticise Israel's illegal, violent, unjust and punitive actions against the Palestinian people. We denounce racism and support freedom to express views opposing injustice wherever it occurs.

I also have—and I would like to place on the record—correspondence from Amnesty International, which is dated 29 June this year, and reads:

Amnesty International is the world's largest independent human rights organisation, with more than ten million supporters in over 160 countries. We promote and defend all human rights enshrined in international human rights law and standards. We are impartial and independent of any government, political persuasion or religious belief and do not receive funding from governments or political parties.

It is in this context that I write to you ahead of a motion to adopt the IHRA Definition of Antisemitism within the South Australian Parliament.

While Amnesty takes no position on the IHRA Definition of Antisemitism, we oppose Antisemitism and discrimination in all its forms. We continue to make clear that countries have an obligation to take effective steps to counteract stereotypes and societal prejudice, and exercise due diligence to protect members of the group concerned against any such abuses.

However, many have, and continue to use the wide ranging implications of the IHRA definition to label Amnesty an Antisemitic organisation, and in doing so delegitimise serious human rights violations.

Earlier this year Amnesty released its new report (attached), finding that Israel has—and continues to commit—the crime of Apartheid against Palestinians. These findings are supported by independent research conducted by Human Rights Watch and the UN Special Rapporteur.

It is imperative that legitimate and well-founded criticism of the Israeli state is not conflated with Antisemitism. I ask that you scrutinise this in your consideration on the adoption of the IHRA definition.

Amnesty goes on to note the author and so forth. That is the position that I take and that SA-Best takes on this issue. I think Amnesty has summarised the issues that we are dealing with here today very well. It is certainly my position, as I have said, that we will not be tied to something which on the

face of it suggests antisemitism when there are so many underlying implications of it and it cannot be further from the truth in terms of its depiction.

I also will place on the record, and I will seek to table these three documents, the analysis of the motion by AFOPA. Can I say that is an organisation that I am extremely proud to be involved with. This has been provided by Paul Heywood-Smith QC:

As Patron of the Australian Friends of Palestine Association and its former Chairperson, I have been asked to comment upon the Honourable S.L. Game's motion submitted to the Legislative Council on 1 June and relating to the IHRA definition of antisemitism. With respect to the Honourable member, I comment as follows:

1. The IHRA definition has been the subject of controversy worldwide for a considerable time.
2. Anything said by the former Prime Minister on the issue, and the former Leader of the Opposition, are no more than political statements made to a particular audience for a particular purpose and do not carry any official status.
3. I refer to the analysis made by me in a paper, published in October 2021, attached.
4. I refer to a similar analysis made by Associate Professor Jake Lynch of the Peace and Conflict Studies Unit, University of Sydney, also attached.
5. The proposer points to adoption elsewhere, but such statistics are of limited assistance: the fact that 19 US States have adopted the definition suggests that 31 States have rejected it; the fact that 204 local government bodies in the UK have adopted it needs to be considered against the total number of local government bodies there are in the United Kingdom and how many have rejected it, etc.
6. South Australia must make its own decision, an informed decision, and not be led by NSW or Victoria.
7. No-one is seeking to defend antisemitism, which is clearly unacceptable, as is Islamophobia, indeed, any racism. However, criticism of Israel, or Zionism, is not antisemitism. To call out Israel for suffering a member of the IDF to murder a Palestinian journalist, Shireen Abu Akleh, is not antisemitism. To call out Israel for dispossession by ever-expanding illegal settlements, the forced eviction of Palestinians, and demolition of their homes, is not antisemitism. Indeed, a failure to call out Israel, or Zionism, for such conduct, would make us complicit. The fact that the New York based Human Rights Watch, and Amnesty International, two highly regarded institutions accuse Israel of creating an apartheid state, does not mean that either organisation is guilty of antisemitism.
8. Jewish students at the University of Adelaide are entitled to be upset over pro-Nazi posters, swastikas, etc. They are not entitled to be upset over for example:
 - "claiming that the existence of the State of Israel is a racist endeavour"—definition (g), or
 - demanding that Israel comply with UN resolutions—definition (h), or
 - comparing Israel's ethnic cleansing of East Jerusalem with Nazi policies—definition (j), or
 - holding the Jewish population in Israel responsible for that State's actions—definition (k).
9. One thing is absolutely clear, Jewish students at the University of Adelaide are no more entitled to be upset over criticism of Israeli actions than are Russian students over the criticism of the invasion of Ukraine, or Chinese students over criticisms of the Chinese government's treatment of Uighurs, or American students, over the US government's war against Iraq, or Afghanistan.
10. Passage of the subject motion would be portrayed by the Zionist lobby in Australia as proof of the legitimacy and correctness of the Israeli state in its dealings with its Arab citizens and Palestinians throughout the West Bank and Gaza. Have no doubt.

I thank members of the Legislative Council for reading this note and taking it into account in their deliberations.

They are also views that I associate myself with.

Finally, the last document that I will quote from is by a former member of this place, the Hon. Sandra Kanck, who provided me with a document yesterday. I know many of you know Ms Kanck. She is someone I have a great deal of respect for not only as a very effective member of this place previously but more so because of the conviction with which she has advocated for worthy causes she believes in.

Even when we have not agreed in our political opinions, I have admired her courage, her passion and, perhaps more than anything else, the peaceful yet persuasive way she goes about championing these causes, her advocacy with the Australian Friends of Palestine included. When I read Ms Kanck's views on this motion, I was left with a view that, in many instances, we shared the

same thoughts at the outset in relation to how we consider this issue. I will quote Ms Kanck's assessment of the motion at her request to read this onto the record:

You and I are the sort of people who turn out to rallies for refugees.

You and I are the sort of people who actively support human rights. Only last week I saw many of you at a rally protesting the treatment of Julian Assange.

You and I are the sort of people that condemn racism. So an outsider might assume you and I would support a motion condemning antisemitism. To the contrary.

It's because we are these sort of people, we're here today to protest the particular motion about antisemitism currently under consideration in the SA'n parliament.

The definition proposed for adoption by the South Australian parliament is one devised by the International Holocaust Remembrance Association (or IHRA).

It is a flawed definition because it singles out one group of people for special treatment.

This motion is specific to Israel and to Israel only. The motion moved by One Nation's Sarah Game— and I am quoting, respectfully, for the honourable member— gives Israel a 'get out of jail free' card.

The motion itself determines the ways in which we might be allowed to criticise Israel without finding ourselves labelled as antisemitic.

Those who uphold human rights criticise China for its treatment of the Uyghur people. No-one tells us a politically correct way to do it. What China is doing is morally wrong and deserves to be criticised.

Nor do we pull back from criticising Myanmar for its treatment of the Rohingya people.

So why should we pull back from criticising Israel for its treatment of Palestinians and carefully choose our words as dictated by IHRA?

Why should Israel be given this special exemption?

Let's look at some of what this definition says. It gives examples of what constitutes antisemitism.

For instance, anyone saying the existence of the state [of] Israel is a racist endeavour is being antisemitic.

Clearly this is aimed at silencing the critics who point to the many documented speeches and calls of numerous Israeli leaders for the suppression, even the destruction of Palestinian people.

Drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policies to that of the [Neo] Nazis is another of the examples given in this definition as being antisemitic. Speaking the truth about Israeli actions will not be tolerated.

How many Palestinians have to be killed to allow that comparison? In the almost 75 years since Al Nakba or 'the catastrophe' of Israel assuming ownership of Palestinian land thousands of Palestinians have been killed. It's a slower catastrophe than the Holocaust. So if it's done slowly, is that okay?

How many Palestinian children as young as 12 being held in military prisons without trial, and without legal representation, will there have to be before it's okay to criticise Israel for doing it?

If we declare, as we do, that Israel's occupying forces were responsible for the murder of Palestinian journalist Shireen Abu Akleh, will the IHRA motion give carte blanche to Zionists to label us as antisemitic? I'll bet you it will.

Whether or not it is what Sarah Game intends, it opens the way to vilify those who are active in the cause of Palestinian human rights.

Sarah Game is a scientist of sorts, she holds a Bachelor of Veterinary Science from Sydney University, but she's failing to do what a good scientist does when conducting an experiment, which is to look at the unintended consequences.

Imagine a pharmaceutical company developing a new medicine and not noting or listing the side effects on its packaging. That's what Sarah Game is doing.

She claims the definition is not legally binding, but that is naive. What starts as optional can become compulsory.

In the UK, universities are being threatened with funding cuts if they don't adopt it into their constitutions.

In June 2015, an analysis carried out by the Rand Corporation said that if the boycott, divestment, sanctions movement, BDS, was maintained over a period of 10 years it could cost the Israeli economy \$47 billion.

The IHRA antisemitism definition is a clever attempt to stop that happening, to shut down the BDS movement.

I have no doubt that Sarah Game is being used by the Israeli lobby to bring this about except she does not appear to realise it.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bonaros, I know you are quoting from a document, but that document comes from a former member of this place, who knows well that Sarah Game needs to be addressed as the Hon. Sarah Game.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: That is why I respectfully said at the outset that—

The PRESIDENT: I have allowed it to this point, but the Hon. Sarah Game will be referred to as the Hon. Sarah Game.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I addressed that issue at the outset when I said respectfully to the member I am quoting—

The PRESIDENT: I have given you an instruction.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Thank you very much. Any other instructions you would like to give me?

The PRESIDENT: No. Move on.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Thank you.

This motion was carried by stealth in Victoria and NSW. Fortunately, here in SA we were alerted to it and many of us have been lobbying our MPs to not support it.

It's a covert way of silencing criticism of Israel's ongoing actions against Palestinians in both the West Bank and Gaza. And we must resist!

For the record, the point that I made when I started referencing this document is that the honourable member's name was to be referred to, but it was a direct quote, not my words.

My view in relation to the issue of Ms Kanck's assessment of how these motions are used and specifically on the issue of racism is that she is absolutely right. She and I and many people in this place are the sort of people who turn out to rallies for refugees. We are the sort of people who support human rights and condemn racism.

To be clear, I am not suggesting by any stretch of the imagination that the Hon. Sarah Game does not support those same causes wholeheartedly. In fact, during her second reading speech in this place, she made her views on those issues, as well as others, well known, and I have a great deal of respect for that. But I cannot, in the face of all the concerns that have been raised with us and the documents that I have referred to, support this motion, for the reasons I have already outlined.

Despite any good intentions, it is my view that this is a motion that ought not be supported. It is an imprecise, it is confusing, it is open to misinterpretation and it conflates issues that ought not be conflated unnecessarily. I move to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out paragraphs 1 and 2 and insert new paragraphs as follows:

1. Rejects antisemitism and all other forms of racial and religious discrimination;
2. Recognises the centrality of freedom of speech to Australian democracy, and that civil discourse is essential to preserve freedom of speech;
3. Acknowledges the right of all Australians to advocate and organise on behalf of causes both foreign and domestic in freedom and without fear;
4. Is concerned that claims or accusations against a group or individuals should always be weighed against facts and not preconceived notions;
5. Supports the right of both Israelis and Palestinians to live in equality, peace and security in Israel and Palestine;
6. Calls on the Australian government to actively promote measures to end the conflict between Israel and Palestine on the basis of relevant UN resolutions and international law.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:09): I rise to speak on the motion of the Hon. Sarah Game. I will indicate from the outset, as my honourable colleague has already done, my deep concerns about

adopting the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance definition of antisemitism and its 11 examples. I will give my reasons shortly. After doing extensive research on this sensitive and complex debate, as a journalist I always try to look at all sides of the argument and make a balanced judgement that is not clouded by emotion, bias or influence.

I will make it clear that I actually have never formally met with members of the Friends of Palestine or their advocates, or in fact representatives of the Jewish community. My views on this, and that I am not supporting it, are most certainly perhaps going to result in accusations against me as being antisemitic or racist. That could not be further from the truth. I abhor all forms of racism. I deplore the evil, hate, cruelty, suffering and genocide inflicted by the Nazis that claimed the lives of millions of innocent Jews during World War II. We must never allow anything as vile as that to happen again, whether it is to Jews or others subjected to oppressive treatment because of their beliefs, the colour of their skin or their origins.

As a teenager from an impoverished European background, growing up in the 1960s and 1970s, I experienced racism, relentless taunts and beatings in the schoolyard and on my way home. 'Wog' is a hurtful three-letter slur. My friends were subjected to it, and waves of migrants to this country have endured it. Indigenous First Nations people here continue to be subjected to racism. I say bring on the Voice.

As for this motion, I am not so sure that many in this place will have taken the time to seek some clarity and consider the possible implications, particularly the chilling risk to limiting the freedom of expression in criticism of Israel and discussing the violation of the human rights of Palestinians in the occupied territories, should the IHRA definition be widely adopted—not just by governments but also local government, tertiary institutions and other community groups and organisations. I will note, and I stand to be corrected, that I could only find 11 countries that have adopted it. Although I stand to be corrected, as I said, I note that Australia was a signatory last year, and also the states of Victoria and New South Wales.

We live in a democracy and we must value and defend our freedom of expression highly, not allow it to be eroded or threatened by persuasive forces with specific agendas. In this country we already have strong and effective laws against discrimination and racism. Antisemitism is not excluded. There are hundreds of academics, legal minds and interest groups—many of them, I will point out, who are Jewish—who have expressed their reservations about the intent, deliberate or inadvertent, of adopting the IHRA definition with the 11 examples attached, seven of which directly relate to Israel.

I will endorse the Hon. Sarah Game's impassioned plea against antisemitism and the need to address the rise of that sentiment, particularly among extreme right wing groups and white supremacists. However, the honourable member's presentation to this chamber was, in my view, unbalanced, and fell well short of presenting a compelling case for all of you to contemplate when you consider your vote.

It lacked substance. I saw no mention of the criticisms and the flaws that have been recognised by hundreds of academics and legal experts on both sides of the debate, who have pored over it and have argued that it is incoherent, vague, vulnerable to political abuse and not fit for purpose, or how its structure was later manipulated and misrepresented by the IHRA's committee on antisemitism and Holocaust denial.

I sincerely hope the honourable member has not been misled, but there are serious problems with this and it has been acknowledged by people with far more expertise in these matters, and far more intelligent than me.

The Hon. T.A. Franks: Surely not!

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Surely there are, I will make that concession, the Hon. Ms Franks. 'The Politics of a Definition' is an explosive report by a University of Oxford PhD scholar, Jamie Stern-Weiner, and published in April 2021. It meticulously picks apart the origins of the IHRA working definition. Mr Stern-Weiner's investigations have concluded that the IHRA has misrepresented the truth about a key decision by its own plenary, its member countries, at a meeting in Bucharest in May 2016. The plenary, Mr Stern-Weiner explains, with irrefutable evidentiary material, reached a consensus with the opening two sentences, and I will quote them:

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

However, there was no consensus within the IHRA for including the examples in its working definition. Mr Stern-Weiner says that, on the contrary, the IHRA's decision-making body excluded all the examples from the working definition it adopted when it split the original draft in two, after objections from several member countries to the examples. In other words, those 11 examples, as we see in this motion, were separated from the working definition in a revised text and were to be merely used as examples, guides.

Mr Stern-Weiner rejects as untrue the IHRA working definition with those 11 examples, as reflected in an international consensus of antisemitism experts. He says his research has revealed there was no expert consensus. The IHRA's decision-making body, the plenary, did not adopt any examples of antisemitism as part of the definition. The IHRA's permanent office refuses to answer or put up proof of the claims it has made repeatedly that the plenary endorsed the examples.

Senior IHRA officials and pro-Israeli groups have misrepresented the IHRA plenary's decision in order to smuggle into the working definition examples that can be used to protect Israel from legitimate criticism. He goes on that these examples have been used in practice to censor Israel's critics. Allow me to read excerpts from it. I will start from a foreword by Emeritus Professor of International Relations at Oxford University, Avi Shlaim, who is Jewish. He states:

What is touted as the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) working definition of antisemitism is not a definition, has little to do with antisemitism, and was neither written nor endorsed by IHRA. Such are the findings of this meticulously researched and poetically explosive report.

Scholars and legal experts have convincingly argued that the IHRA's definition is incoherent, vague, vulnerable to political abuse, and not fit for purpose. It fails to meet the most elementary requirement of a definition, which is to define. The decisive role of pro-Israel advocacy groups in drafting and promoting the definition has also been established.

This remarkable report reinforces these conclusions. But it also breaks important new ground. Expert criticism and political controversy have focused on a list of 11 highly problematic examples of purportedly antisemitic statements and behaviours. Seven of these 11 examples relate to Israel. All of these examples, according to Israel supporters, formed an integral part of the IHRA definition.

The report shows that IHRA's decision-making body, the Plenary, in fact decided to exclude all of these examples from its definition. The IHRA definition includes no examples. If there is widespread confusion about this, it is because champions of the examples within and outside IHRA have systematically and methodically misrepresented the Plenary's decision.

The examples, falsely represented as part of the IHRA definition, have been used to delegitimise and censor legitimate criticism of Israel and, more broadly, to curtail free speech on Israel. This shields Israel from accountability for its serious human rights abuses, which consequently continue unchecked.

Meanwhile, the participation of even some IHRA officials in this misinformation campaign compromises the reputation of that organisation. The sad truth is that these officials have been complicit in a deliberate effort to conflate criticism of Israel policies with antisemitism. IHRA's core mandate—Holocaust remembrance and combating antisemitism—remains as important as ever, given the surge of ultra-right populism in Europe and elsewhere. To recover its moral authority IHRA needs to set the record straight on its confused and confusing definition.

Jamie Stern-Weiner's report demonstrates in irrefutable detail how a definition intended to protect Jews against antisemitism was twisted to protect the State of Israel against valid criticisms that have nothing to do with anti-Jewish racism.

The Politics of a Definition tells for the first time the untold story behind the IHRA definition. It is not only a fascinating chapter of diplomatic history but it also speaks truth to power. It is therefore of urgent policy relevance. It deserves the widest possible readership, especially among policy-makers—

which is what we are. It continues:

The report ought to lead any government or organisation that is considering the adoption of the IHRA definition to think again and those who have already signed on to it to reverse their decision.

That was by Avi Shlaim, Emeritus Professor of International Relations at the University of Oxford, on 22 April 2021. I would like to read the executive summary of that report, which has been written by the author:

It has been claimed that the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) Working Definition of Antisemitism, 'including its 11 examples', reflects an international consensus of antisemitism experts. This report, based on my doctoral research at the University of Oxford, exposes that claim as untrue:

1. There is no expert consensus supporting the Working Definition.
2. IHRA's decision-making body, the Plenary, did not adopt any examples of 'antisemitism' as part of its Working Definition.
3. Senior IHRA officials and pro-Israel groups have misrepresented the IHRA Plenary's decision in order to smuggle into the Working Definition examples that can be used to protect Israel from criticism.
4. These examples have been used, in practice, to censor Israel's critics.

Under the heading of 'There is no expert consensus supporting the Working Definition of Antisemitism' the author goes on to say:

The Working Definition was principally drafted and negotiated by pro-Israel advocacy groups, not scholars of Jewish history. The initial drafting and negotiation of the Working Definition in 2004-5 was led by the American Jewish Committee (AJC). From early 2014 to May 2016, Mark Weitzman of the Simon Wiesenthal Center (SWC) engineered its adoption by IHRA.

Both the AJC and SWC are interested, partisan organisations. They engage, inter alia, in blanket pro-Israel advocacy. The AJC promoted Israel's line on Operation Cast Lead, the Goldstone Report, the Free Gaza flotilla, Operation Protective Edge and UN Security Council Resolution 2334 reaffirming the illegality of Israel's settlements. Even where it disapproves of Israeli Government policy, the AJC pledged in 2020, 'the AJC will do what it has always done: explain Israel to the wider world...We will always be their advocates'. The SWC has urged Israel to 'reject a return' to its pre-June 1967 'Auschwitz borders' and described European Union (EU) guidelines prohibiting the funding of Israeli institutions established unlawfully in Occupied Palestinian Territory as 'redolent of the 1930's Nazi boycott of the Jews throughout the Reich...which was the prelude to the Holocaust'.

In the course of this advocacy, both the AJC and SWC have conflated legitimate criticism of Israel with antisemitism. The AJC applies the 'antisemitism' epithet to 'anti-Zionism' as well as the campaign for boycotts, divestment and sanctions (BDS) against Israel. For its part, the SWC in 2018 ranked among the world's most egregious 'anti-semitic incidents' a decision by Airbnb to delist Israeli rental properties located in Occupied Palestinian Territory and a German bank's refusal to cut-off a Jewish peace group. Its 2016 review branded UNSC Resolution 2334 the world's 'Worst Anti-Semitic/Anti-Israel Incident'. And when the Pre-Trial Chamber of the International Criminal Court ruled that it had territorial jurisdiction in Palestine, in February 2021, the SWC charged this—

and I quote—

'kangaroo court' with 'anti-Semitism'.

While the AJC and SWC were the principal drafters and promoters of the Working Definition, they were not objective experts on antisemitism. Meanwhile, academic as well as legal experts broadly agree that the IHRA Working Definition is imprecise, partial and open to political abuse.

There is no IHRA consensus for including any examples in the Working Definition of Antisemitism.

In May 2016, IHRA's general Plenary in Bucharest adopted by consensus a document comprising two distinct parts: a two-sentence working definition of antisemitism and a list of 11 examples of potentially antisemitic statements and behaviours.

This document, in its entirety, has been inaccurately referred to as the IHRA Working Definition of Antisemitism.

International, national and civil society bodies have been urged to adopt this so-called IHRA Working Definition on the basis that it reflects a hard-won consensus among IHRA's Member Countries:

'The significance of this definition lies in the international cooperation that led to it...[I]t was unanimously approved by government representatives from all IHRA Member Countries. Gaining this level of international consensus was no easy feat...Any "modified" version of the IHRA definition that does not include all of its 11 examples is no longer the IHRA definition. (Seven UK delegates to IHRA, August 2018)'

But in reality, there was no consensus within IHRA for including the examples in its Working Definition. On the contrary, IHRA's decision-making body excluded all the examples from the Working Definition it adopted.

The SWC had presented IHRA with a draft text that did not clearly distinguish between the two-sentence definition and the 11 examples. But after a number of IHRA Member Countries objected to the examples, a revised text was adopted in which the examples had been separated from the Working Definition.

An Ambassador who participated in these negotiations testified that IHRA consensus was achieved only when:

'the original draft text was cut into two, and only the first two-sentence part was to be the working-definition to be adopted, while the other part, the examples, remained what they were: examples to serve as illustrations, to guide the IHRA in its work'.

A second delegation head who attended the May 2016 Plenary corroborated this account. Two other members of delegations from different countries also confirmed their understanding that the IHRA Working Definition comprised only a two-sentence passage without any examples.

IHRA's press release about the adoption clearly distinguished the Working Definition from the illustrative examples by printing the two-sentence definition in a distinct typeface and demarcating it in a box. Germany followed this same distinction in September 2017, when it adopted an 'extended version' of the IHRA definition that incorporated none of the examples. IHRA publicly recognised this as an adoption of its Working Definition.

Pro-Israel groups do not value the Working Definition but prize the examples that protect Israel from legitimate criticism.

The IHRA Working Definition reads in full:

'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.'

Pro-Israel activists attach little value to this definition, which they consider 'neutered, [and]...unmoored from any current reality'.

That was what the Simon Wiesenthal Center remarked. The author continues:

What pro-Israel activists deem 'essential' is 'the list of examples'—

this is from the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs—

which the AJC goes so far as to designate the real definition: 'essentially the definition is the examples'.

This is because fully seven of the 11 examples relate to Israel. They include criteria which can be used to stigmatise and stifle legitimate criticism of Israel, such as calling Israel a 'racist endeavour' or '[a]pplying double standards' to it.

Such instrumentalization is not a theoretical prospect. The examples have been used, in practice, to delegitimise everything from reports by leading human rights organisations (including Israeli human rights organisations) to the EU's decision to accurately label imports from Israel's illegal settlements.

Under the heading of 'Supporters of the examples have misrepresented their status', the author goes on to state:

Supporters of the examples have misrepresented their status in respect of IHRA's definition. IHRA Member Countries were able to reach consensus only by excluding the examples from the Working Definition. The examples' supporters have falsely claimed that there was a consensus for including them.

In May 2018, IHRA's Committee on Antisemitism and Holocaust Denial unilaterally proclaimed that 'the definition and the examples constituted the full definition, and that the subject was not open to further discussion'.

The IHRA's Committee on Antisemitism and Holocaust Denial unilaterally proclaimed that 'the definition and the examples constituted the full definition, and that the subject was not open to further discussion'. The author continues:

This was prompted by Mark Weitzman, its former Chair and the SWC's Director of Government Affairs.

But the Antisemitism Committee had, and has, no authority to rewrite or override a decision of the IHRA Plenary, while the IHRA Plenary has neither revisited nor revised its 2016 decision.

The SWC must know that IHRA's Plenary decided, after heated debate, to exclude the examples from its definition. But the SWC still falsely asserts that the 'IHRA Working Definition...consists of a clear definition of antisemitism along with specific examples'.

Even as IHRA's core mandate is to preserve historical truth, IHRA's own Permanent Office has participated in this misinformation campaign. The IHRA website incorrectly states that the 'Working Definition, including its examples, was reviewed and decided upon unanimously during IHRA's Bucharest Plenary in May 2016.' In June 2020, IHRA's Chair stated:

'When IHRA member countries agreed to the text of the working definition, they adopted it in its entirety—the text inside the box, and the examples included. So that means, each Member Country stands behind the text of the working definition in its entirety—the text inside the box, and the examples included.'

The author of this report says:

This inaccurate claim was repeated in a Handbook co-published in January 2021 by IHRA and the European Commission.

These assertions are refuted by the documentary record. In fact, IHRA's Plenary excluded the examples from the Working Definition while multiple IHRA Member Countries have since reiterated and reaffirmed this distinction.

It cannot plausibly be suggested that the misrepresentations sampled here were wholly accidental. In the course of an extended written exchange, IHRA's Permanent Office was repeatedly asked whether, as its spokespeople and publications have repeatedly alleged, IHRA's May 2016 Plenary endorsed the 11 examples as part of the IHRA Working Definition. Up to the present day, IHRA has refused to answer this question.

Under a heading 'The examples have been used to censor legitimate criticism of Israel', the author of the report then says:

The list of 11 examples, misrepresented as the IHRA Working Definition, has repeatedly been used and promoted as a tool for censorship.

In the UK, multiple universities and at least one local council cancelled events because they might breach one or another example. The definition's 'architect' did not object but, on the contrary, applauded the censorship as a possible 'turning point in the struggle to curb the demonisation of the Jewish state at universities'.

In 2018, the British Labour Party was pressured into incorporating all 11 examples into its Code of Conduct. The result? When Israel's leading human rights organisation published a position paper on Israel's 'apartheid regime', Labour members were forbidden from discussing it because doing so might infringe an IHRA example.

So much for it being non-binding. It continues:

Going forwards, an international coalition of Jewish organisations along with Israel's Ministry of Strategic Affairs is calling on social media platforms to use the list of examples to regulate content.

Pro-Israel groups are lobbying governments to condition NGO funding upon adherence to the examples. The European Commission's IHRA Handbook recommends that the EU and member States introduce such funding conditionality.

These initiatives have falsely depicted the examples as part of the IHRA Working Definition, thereby mobilising IHRA's moral authority behind an assault on free speech. In truth, IHRA's decision-making body excluded the examples from the Working Definition.

Each and all of the claims by Israel's advocates to foist the IHRA definition on the international community are demonstrably false.

That was the executive summary from that report. As I said, it is titled 'The Politics of a Definition'. It was researched by Jamie Stern-Weiner from Wolfson College at the University of Oxford and was published by Free Speech on Israel in April 2021. I am not going to go through the entire document, but I will seek leave to table it as part of my presentation here today.

The PRESIDENT: Is leave granted?

The Hon. R.A. Simms: Yes.

Leave granted.

The PRESIDENT: Thanks for your encouragement, Mr Simms. That is excellent.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I know it is the subject of much mirth in here, but this is actually quite a serious issue that we are tackling. The honourable member brought it here with really good intent, and I think we should respect that. I would urge members to have a look and read that. It is a pity they will not be able to do that before the vote will be taken on this. There are other documents I will refer to later. As Mr Stern-Weiner says in the closing remarks of his report:

It is deeply regrettable that an organisation committed to Holocaust remembrance would misrepresent the historical record in order to shield Israel from accountability for its egregious human rights violations.

I would like to equate that to a comment from Australian investigative journalist Peter Greste, who is a strong advocate for freedom of expression and freedom of the press. He said:

Playing the racism card is a cynical way of misdirecting attention from uncomfortable journalism to the journalists themselves and ultimately undermines the value of good reporting and debate.

Numerous papers written by experts on the IHRA definition can be sourced online. The majority have found serious faults with it, like a report commissioned by the Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung and medico international e.V. written by Dr Peter Ullrich from Berlin Technische University, who is a fellow at the

Center for Research on Antisemitism. I will just read his executive summary from the report entitled, 'Expert opinion on the "working definition of antisemitism" of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance':

...a closer examination also reveals severe deficits. In particular, the 'Working Definition' is inconsistent, contradictory and formulated very vaguely. It therefore does not satisfy the requirements of a good definition. Moreover, the core definition of antisemitism is reductionist. It emphasizes some antisemitic phenomena and levels of analysis but largely omits other essential ones. This applies in particular to ideological and discursive aspects, for example antisemitism as a conspiracist worldview. Aspects of organizational sociology related to mobilization in movements and political parties as well as their consequences in discriminatory institutional regulations and practices are also not mentioned. Moreover, some of the examples related to Israel appended to the core definition can only be classified as antisemitic within context using further information, as what is described is ambiguous and occurs in complex, overlapping constellations of conflicts, which often do not readily allow singling out one specific problem such as antisemitism. An example is afforded by the so-called double standards. They are not sufficient criteria for distinguishing an antisemitic focus on Israel from one related to the specific features of Israeli policies and their geopolitical significance.

As a consequence, the 'Working Definition' is conducive to contradictory and error-prone application in practice and leads to assessments of incidents and facts that are not based on clear criteria but on the preconceptions of those applying it or on prevalent interpretations adopted without reflection. Applying the 'Working Definition' creates the fiction of an objective assessment guided by criteria. The definition provides procedural legitimacy for decisions that are in fact taken on the basis of other criteria that remain implicit and are specified neither in the definition nor in the examples.

The author of this report, Dr Ullrich, then goes on to say:

The weaknesses of the 'Working Definition' are the gateway to its political instrumentalization, for instance for morally discrediting opposing positions in the Arab-Israeli conflict with the accusation of antisemitism. This has relevant implications for fundamental rights. The increasing implementation of the 'Working Definition' as a quasi-legal basis for administrative action promises regulatory potential. In fact, it is instead an instrument that all but invites arbitrariness. It can be used to abridge fundamental rights particularly freedom of speech with respect to disfavoured positions on Israel. In contrast to what the designation 'Working Definition' suggests, no further development of the definition to rectify these weaknesses is occurring.

The bottom line is that the attempt to solve problems of general conceptual clarification and universal applicability by means of the 'Working Definition of Antisemitism' must be seen to have failed. Mainly due to its technical weaknesses, the deficient practice of its application, its nevertheless partly binding legal status and its potential for political instrumentalization with problematic implications for freedom of speech, the use of the 'Working Definition of Antisemitism' cannot be recommended. A potential exception could only lie in narrowly defined pedagogical contexts. As the genesis of the 'Working Definition of Antisemitism' and its wide dissemination indicate, there is—not least in view of the persisting threat from current antisemitism—a great need on the part of various institutions for practicable criteria for identifying antisemitic phenomena. The development of clear and context-specific instruments for practical application is therefore urgently recommended.

Again, this is a paper that I would strongly recommend that members do read. I seek leave to table that report on this working definition by a very esteemed academic.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Rather than be used in a hypothetical sense, those examples in the definition, as we have already heard from experts, have been weaponised to intimidate, silence and de-legitimise reports by leading human rights organisations, including Israel's human rights organisations, and individuals and academics, like a Toronto school board teacher who found himself suspended after emailing colleagues research on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which allegedly violated the IHRA definition of antisemitism.

Allow me to read from this article entitled 'Anti-racism and the IHRA definition' by Paul Weinberg, who is Jewish, and published in Canada's *Independent Jewish Voices* on 9 May 2022. The document reads as such:

A Toronto District School Board employee found himself under fire after emailing his colleagues research on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which allegedly violated the IHRA definition of anti-semitism.

It theoretically recognises that context matters, in the sense that particular situations influence whether a certain utterance or action may be considered antisemitic or not. Still, Palestinians, the Palestinian solidarity movement and all progressives are urged to—in fact, that is not the one I want to read. That will be following.

This is an excerpt from the article on the Toronto District School Board employee by the name of Javier Dávila. It goes on to say:

Antiracism or equity education in schools, corporations and government institutions did not begin with the killing of George Floyd and the rallies and protests inspired by the Black Lives Matter movement of 2020, but the events of that year help to encourage and expand this kind of instruction and make it increasingly relevant.

Not surprisingly, there is also a backlash, the so-called Woke culture is denounced in France while US teachers can be fired in some states if they discuss slavery, white privilege, anti-black racism and gender identity in classrooms. Legislators in the National Assembly in Quebec are planning to allow the utterance of the 'N' word by university professors. What is happening in anti-racism work across Canada is difficult to gauge. Its activity is fragmented and one has to pierce beneath the rhetoric of educational institutions.

The tumultuous events in Toronto last year laid bare the pressures faced by anti-racism educators and activists. On paper the Toronto District School Board has strong equity policies but its adoption in 2018 of the IHRA threatens to undermine them. The definition of antisemitism of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) is the accepted working definition for various national governments, including Canada, as well as in some provincial and municipal jurisdictions.

The origins of the IHRA remain controversial. It is not universally accepted by all international scholars. Starting in 2016, it has become a tool by which Israel seeks to counter an international boycott, sanctions and divestment movement on the part of groups seeking to draw attention to war crimes and international law violations committed against the Palestinian populations in Israel and the occupied territories. Seven out of 11 examples of antisemitism in the IHRA definition involve critical comments about Israel.

One major Canadian historian who the author interviewed is not too worried about the IHRA because the measure is not legally binding in Canada. Nobody in this country calling for Palestinian rights is going to be charged and hauled up before a court. Furthermore, there are no criminal penalties hovering over BDS advocacy as has been the case in France or some US states, so a McCarthyite witch-hunt is not in the works; yet, even in its aspirational form, the IHRA can still intimidate and silence.

I have interviewed two teachers at the Toronto School Board about equity or anti-racism instruction and both feel compromised pedagogically by the board's adoption of the IHRA definition. Both want to remain anonymous because they fear reprisals from their employer. The first teacher said there is no problem giving lessons on settler colonialism in Canada, Indigenous rights, land back and systemic racism within the Toronto school system. It is quite another matter to draw parallels between the European settlement of Canada and the Zionist colonisation of Palestine. In the latter situation, indigenous Palestinians were uprooted and expelled from the new Jewish state in the course of and following the 1947-48 war, and their empty properties were made available for incoming, post World War II refugees from Europe.

There is an accepted wisdom in the Palestinian community that the Nakba, which is Arabic for disaster or catastrophe, continues today. When we are talking about who is censoring these conversations there has to be permission to centre Palestinian truths, narratives and perspectives and history. If the Nakba cannot be spoken of without being subsumed under the speech of antisemitism then we are left with no language—

the first teacher says—

Whatever an instructor says publicly before students or on social media has consequences. Say the wrong word and parents, right wing columnists, various Israel lobby organisations and opportunistic politicians are ready to pounce like the vengeful furies of ancient Greek mythology. This is what happened to Javier Davila. For about 15 years the TDSB student equity program adviser had emailed—

The PRESIDENT: I would like you to seek leave to conclude your remarks because we are approaching the time of the dinner break. Please seek leave to conclude your remarks and you can continue after dinner.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I seek leave to conclude my remarks after the dinner break.

Sitting suspended from 18:00 to 19:45.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I will not take too long as I know that some members are getting a bit tetchy in here. I will go back to the document I was reading by Paul Weinberg, who is Jewish, and was published in the Canadian *Independent Jewish Voices* on 9 May 2022. He was telling us what had happened to Javier Dávila. For about 15 years, the TDSB student equity program adviser had emailed batches of background material on complex equity subjects from an anti-oppression perspective that teachers may have wanted to raise in class.

In May 2021, violence in Israel and the occupied territories erupted and culminated in the bombing of Gaza and Jewish settler attacks on Arab Israelis in mixed towns in Israel within the green line. To make sense of the escalation of violence, Dávila emailed two large batches containing a

diverse number of Jewish, Israeli and Palestinian sources. The aim was to provide insights from moderate and radical voices. It did not mean that the student equity program adviser necessarily agreed with all the perspectives, notwithstanding his sympathy for the Palestinian plight.

Apparently, the student equity program adviser was then later temporarily suspended and investigated in the spring of 2021 by the Toronto District School Board after a complaint by a columnist in the *Toronto Sun*, Sue-Anne Levy, with regard to the internal mailouts containing Jewish, Israeli and Palestinian voices, which she described as virulently anti-Israel.

I will wind up from that article, just to say that the mail-outs were not distributed to a broad audience, they were aimed to a little over 1,000 educators and administrators within the TDSB, with the expertise to sift through the material and determine what might be relevant for class. Despite all this, Mr Dávila was suspended and investigated. He garnered a lot of sympathy from former students, parents, teachers, unions and *Independent Jewish Voices* (Canada), and a petition containing 5,000 signatures circulated in support.

The suspension turned out to be temporary and Mr Dávila found himself reinstated in the summer. Vindication also came from the TDSB's independent integrity commissioner. Still in progress, there are complaints from other bodies against them, and Mr Dávila is also suing some of those, but the upshot of it is that the whole episode disrupted Mr Dávila's life. He is currently on medical leave and not available for interviews, and his lawyers have provided details of why their client is taking legal action. That gives you another indication of where the use of the definition can be weaponised and damage a person's reputation and standing. It is then a long road to recover that damaged reputation. I seek leave to table the entirety of that document that I have just read from.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Another example, an alternative to the IHRA's definition of antisemitism is the Jerusalem Declaration on Antisemitism. The JDA, like the other, is not a perfect document and has attracted some criticism but it has received endorsement from hundreds of scholars, legal experts and a broad range of interest groups with an underlying interest in combating antisemitism. One of those is Barry Trachtenberg, Rubin Presidential Chair of Jewish History at Wake Forest University and author of *The Holocaust & the Exile of Yiddish* and *The United States and the Nazi Holocaust: Race, Refuge, and Remembrance*. He is a member of the Jewish Voice for Peace Academic Advisory Council.

He actually assisted in the drafting and is a signatory to the JDA and says that there has been widespread abuse of the flawed IHRA and that it needs outright replacement. Here is a little of what he had to say in an article titled 'Why I signed the Jerusalem declaration on antisemitism' and it was published in *JewishCurrents* in March 2021. I will just read a couple of paragraphs from that where he says:

As the result of more than a year of conversations by an international group of scholars from the fields of antisemitism, Jewish, Holocaust and Middle East studies, the JDA is a vast improvement on the IHRA definition. While it is not a perfect document, and has indeed already been subject to important criticisms from those who argue, among other points, that it doesn't go far enough to unseat the IHRA definition, the JDA has the potential to make a significant impact both in countering antisemitism and in preventing critics of Israel and Zionism from being smeared as antisemites.

...the JDA repudiates notions of Jewish exceptionalism by locating antisemitism squarely as an ideology of hatred that is equivalent to and as pernicious as racism. The JDA's first guideline states unequivocally that, 'It is racist to essentialize (treat a character trait as inherent) or to make sweeping negative generalisations about a given population. What is true of racism in general is true of antisemitism in particular.' By drawing this comparison with racism, the JDA pushes back against the misguided belief about antisemitism that it is a unique and unparalleled form of hatred, as exceptional as Jews themselves. Not only does this belief strip anti-Jewish hatred from its historical context and make it much harder to combat, it gives rise to the notion that antisemitism is a permanent, almost natural, feature of our world and thus cannot be undone.

He goes on to say:

...the damage done by the IHRA definition of antisemitism is profound. It has restricted reasonable debates about Israel and done nothing to lessen antisemitism.

He goes on to say:

It must be stopped in its tracks.

This is the comment from another acknowledged scholar, very well respected and a Jew himself. I seek leave to table the comments from Dr Barry Trachtenberg, some of which I have read out.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Finally, and as has been mentioned by my colleague—

The PRESIDENT: Did you say 'finally'?

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: No, not yet.

The PRESIDENT: Sorry, I thought you said 'finally'.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I am just winding up, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: You are winding me up; thank you.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I had already been wound up before coming here, Mr President. There is a significant report of Amnesty International, which my colleague the Hon. Connie Bonaros referred to in her presentation. Like my colleague, I also received a letter from Sam Klintworth, the National Director of Amnesty International Australia. The Hon. Ms Bonaros has tabled that letter, so there is no need for me to table it.

With the letter, I received the report from Amnesty International that found that Israel has committed, and continues to commit, the crime of apartheid against Palestinians. This is supported by independent research that was conducted by Human Rights Watch and the UN special rapporteur.

Despite the extensive work that has gone into this report by highly accredited bodies, such as Amnesty International and the UN—a lot of which has been detailed and referenced; the report is more than 200 pages—and despite the evidence that has been presented, it has been condemned as antisemitic. Again, it indicates the volatility of this debate. I will not put members through my reading the 230-odd pages, but I do wish to table the report in order for people to be able to read it.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, if it is a public document perhaps you could refer to the link to it.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: It will not be public, and it will be very difficult to find, so I would prefer to ask that it be tabled.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: As I was saying, the extent of the work that has gone into this report is quite comprehensive, and for it to be dismissed in such a way is quite offensive. We know that Amnesty International is the world's largest independent human rights organisation, with more than 10 million supporters in over 160 countries. It is a defender of human rights and is impartial and independent of any government, political persuasion or religious belief and does not receive any funding from governments or political parties. However, sadly, the major political parties in this country virtually refuse to acknowledge the existence of this report. Also, some within those parties condemn its use of the term 'apartheid'.

The international community is working extremely hard to come to a resolution in one of the most complex political disputes in world history: the antagonism towards the Jewish state by its hostile neighbours. Many have tried and failed to get to a satisfactory resolution, but there are many on both sides who want to achieve a peace the world can live with, a lasting peace that Israel and the Palestinians can live with and a peace that its neighbours can live with.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (19:58): I rise to speak in support of the alternative motion moved by the Hon. Connie Bonaros. In so doing, I want to reference some of the comments made by my crossbench colleagues, the Hon. Connie Bonaros and the Hon. Frank Pangallo. The Greens share many of the concerns that have been outlined by the Hon. Mr Pangallo and the Hon. Connie Bonaros, and we do not support the original motion being moved by the Hon. Sarah Game.

The reasons for the Greens' position were outlined by my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks in this place during the last sitting period, and I do not intend to prosecute those arguments again.

The only thing I would draw the chamber's attention to is the longstanding concern of the Greens around prohibiting all forms of racial or religious discrimination.

Indeed, my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks introduced a bill, which was supported by the then Marshall government into the last parliament, that made hate crimes a crime in South Australia, that is, crimes that are motivated by bias, prejudice or hostility towards a victim based on their particular characteristics, such as race, gender, sexuality or gender identity, and the application of appropriate penalties in relation to those crimes.

That underscores the view of the Greens and, indeed, of other political parties around the importance of preventing the vilification of people on the basis of race or their religion, or other characteristics for that matter. As I say, we are supportive of the amendment put forward by the Hon. Connie Bonaros. We think this is a much more appropriate statement for this parliament to adopt, and we are advocating for other political parties to favourably consider that amendment over the substantive motion.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (20:00): I feel proud and privileged to have put forward this motion because it is the right thing to do, morally and ethically, and that has been my only influence. I want to thank Dr David Adler, President of the Australian Jewish Association, for bringing the importance of this motion to my attention and for his tireless advocacy of the motion. I thank Dr Adler for his enthusiastic, positive collaboration with members of the Jewish community in Adelaide, including members of the Jewish Community Council and the Adelaide Hebrew Congregation.

I thank Mr Norman Schueler OAM, past president of the Jewish Community Council and immediate past chair of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission, for his presence here today, his support, advice and relentless advocacy in the community for the passing of this motion. I know how hard he worked to assist in bringing this motion to resolution, and I am sure everyone in this chamber acknowledges Mr Schueler's continued advocacy for cultural and faith groups in South Australia.

I thank members of the Beit Shalom Synagogue, Jewish students at the University of Adelaide and University of South Australia and other leaders in the South Australian Jewish community for their direct support and encouragement to progress this. I thank the Liberal Party for their immediate and full support of this motion. In particular, I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition in the other place for his declaration of public support for the IHRA motion in full and unamended.

I want to note that this debate takes place in an atmosphere of rising antisemitism around the world. The Antidefamation League, which collects and collates antisemitic incidents in the United States, recorded a record high in 2021. The Community Security Index Group, which collates and collects information on antisemitic incidents in Australia, recorded an increase of almost 40 per cent last year. Research shows that antisemitism is increasing across Europe.

The hesitation, and in some cases refusal, from other parties to support this motion has been confusing and disappointing, especially considering the six million Jews murdered in the Holocaust and the obvious necessity for administrators and governments at all levels to have the framework in which to identify antisemitism in South Australia. It has always been made clear that legitimate criticism of Israel, similar to that levelled against other countries, cannot be considered antisemitic. It is in the explanatory notes of the IHRA definition. The conflation of endorsing this definition with the chilling of freedom of speech is untrue.

Adopting this definition has never been about taking a side on international conflicts. The Labor Prime Minister, Anthony Albanese, has publicly supported this definition, including in the recently released letter to the Israeli Prime Minister. Labor has supported this definition in New South Wales and Victoria, while maintaining their party position of a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Conflation with supporting the IHRA antisemitism definition with the suppression of any group of people is incorrect. There is a small Jewish community in South Australia that needs to be protected. I consulted with them and they want it.

I hope it is a great day for the Jewish community in South Australia and that sanity will prevail and that the IHRA definition will be received with bipartisan support in the Parliament of South Australia.

The PRESIDENT: I am going to put the amendment to the motion in the name of the Hon. Ms Bonaros first. The question will be that paragraphs 1 and 2 as proposed to be struck out by the Hon. Ms Bonaros stand part of the motion. If you are going to support the Hon. Ms Bonaros, you will vote no; if you are going to support the Hon. Ms Game, you will vote yes. I am trying to make it clear, because it is a little bit complicated.

The council divided on the question:

Ayes 13
Noes 4
Majority 9

AYES

Bourke, E.S.	Centofanti, N.J.	Curran, L.A.
Game, S.L. (teller)	Girolamo, H.M.	Hanson, J.E.
Hunter, I.K.	Lee, J.S.	Lensink, J.M.A.
Maher, K.J.	Martin, R.B.	Scriven, C.M.
Wade, S.G.		

NOES

Bonaros, C. (teller)	Franks, T.A.	Pangallo, F.
Simms, R.A.		

Question thus agreed to.

The council divided on the motion:

Ayes 15
Noes 4
Majority 11

AYES

Bourke, E.S.	Centofanti, N.J.	Curran, L.A.
Game, S.L. (teller)	Girolamo, H.M.	Hanson, J.E.
Hunter, I.K.	Lee, J.S.	Lensink, J.M.A.
Maher, K.J.	Martin, R.B.	Ngo, T.T.
Scriven, C.M.	Wade, S.G.	Wortley, R.P.

NOES

Bonaros, C.	Franks, T.A.	Pangallo, F. (teller)
Simms, R.A.		

Motion thus carried.

Bills

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (MINISTERIAL DIARIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 June 2022.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (20:14): I rise to speak briefly on behalf of the government on the bill before us from the Hon. Robert Simms. It will disappoint the Hon. Rob Simms to learn that the Labor Party's position has not changed from when the bill was introduced last time. This bill, I think, is the same bill that was introduced by the honourable member in 2021. Parliament was prorogued before the bill could reach its finality.

The Hon. Mr Simms indicates, correctly, that in other jurisdictions, particularly in the ACT and Queensland, ministerial diaries are made available. The requirement to proactively disclose, I am advised, is only enshrined in legislation, however, in the Australian Capital Territory. The requirement in the bill for ministerial diaries to be published within seven days, I am informed, would make the South Australian disclosure requirements by far the most onerous in the nation.

The publication of diary extracts elsewhere in Australia, I am informed, has raised questions about privacy, where meeting attendees may not give consent as to the information about them being published on the register. I note that ministers often meet with various members of the public, some of whom would understandably be reticent about their names being published for all to see.

The government will not be supporting the bill, as I mentioned, as we did not in opposition, but I am pleased to say that the government will be taking up other reforms that will have, in our view, a far more tangible reflection on transparency and trust in politics, such as banning election donations.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (20:16): I rise to make some comments in relation to this particular bill, which I understand was before us in the previous parliament but did not progress. Currently, under the act, copies of ministerial diaries can be disclosed through an FOI application, showing meetings, events and functions attended by the minister that relate to the minister's responsibilities.

This bill introduced by the Hon. Robert Simms will require a minister, within seven days of the end of each calendar month, to publicly make available a copy of the minister's diary for the previous calendar month that sets out all meetings, events and functions attended by the minister that relate to the minister's responsibilities, by publishing it on a website determined by the minister responsible for the administration of this act.

The proposal enhances transparency, including potentially providing clearer overview to the parliament of policy and funding decisions of ministers derived from meetings with stakeholders, as well as more easily identifying any conflicts of interest. Consideration should also be given to the additional administrative responsibilities and resourcing required to support the proactive disclosure of ministerial diaries, including that of the Ombudsman and SACAT in reviewing determinations, particularly if third-party consultations are required. The Liberal Party supports the introduction of this bill.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (20:17): I thank the Hon. Michelle Lensink for her speech. I will keep it even shorter than hers. I will just say that I have already spoken on this previously and that SA-Best will support the initiative by the Hon. Robert Simms, because we believe transparency, particularly amongst ministers, is paramount.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (20:18): I want to thank members for their contributions: the Hon. Kyam Maher, the Hon. Michelle Lensink and the Hon. Frank Pangallo. I am very disappointed to hear that the government will not be supporting this reform, given it is a very straightforward reform, but as the honourable leader has noted, this was the position of the Labor Party in opposition as well as in government.

Nonetheless, it is a very disappointing position that they have taken, because the Labor government ministers over in the ACT, New South Wales and Queensland are all subject to this level of transparency and scrutiny, and I cannot really comprehend why Labor ministers in South Australia would not want to subject themselves to the same level of scrutiny.

The Greens have always believed that transparency is the best disinfectant—let the light shine—and that the public has a right to know who is meeting with government ministers and for what reason. The Attorney-General has flagged privacy concerns, but the bill deals with those issues.

It makes it very clear that personal meetings are not to be disclosed and confidential information is not to be disclosed. It also gives the minister the power to appeal to the tribunal to request that information not be disclosed if they consider it is going to compromise the private information of an individual, so the claims that have been made are not accurate.

I am hopeful the bill will pass this chamber. If it does, I hope the government will reconsider its position in the other place. The Greens look forward to seeing the detail of the other transparency reforms the Labor Party has flagged tonight, and our position on political donations is well known and longstanding. However, this is not an either/or proposition: we can support this reform and also take other action to improve transparency. That is what the Greens will be advocating for.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

Bill taken through committee without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (20:22): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Motions

SELECT COMMITTEE ON HEALTH SERVICES IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. C. Bonaros:

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

(Continued from 1 June 2022.)

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (20:23): I rise very briefly to give the government's support in re-establishing the select committee into health services in South Australia. As a previous member of the committee in the former government, I have seen the power of this committee and the evidence it was able to bring to light, particularly through witnesses who appeared from the Women's and Children's Hospital, including parents, families and friends.

It is important that we have a strong health system. I will not go through the outcomes of that committee tonight and what it enabled us to develop as a policy, because we have heard many times about our policies through the Labor Party as well as in our government announcements. I thank the honourable member for bringing this back to the chamber. We support the re-establishment of this committee.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (20:24): I rise to indicate that the opposition will once again be supporting the establishment of this committee. The Hon. Connie

Bonaros established this committee with the support of all members in this chamber on 29 November 2018. I was fortunate to sit on this committee as a bright new member of parliament from April 2020 with yourself for most of that period, Mr President, and therefore can attest to the excellent work that this committee does.

We handed down an interim report prior to the last state election, which was tabled in this chamber on 26 October 2021. Over its period of existence, the health services select committee has provided the Legislative Council with the ability to gain a deeper understanding and insight into the government's policies and decisions within the health and wellbeing portfolio. We have heard from many individuals and stakeholder groups on a variety of issues relating to health in our state, and this committee has importantly provided these people with an avenue to share their experiences and concerns with our health system.

Given the Malinauskas Labor government's focus on health at the 2022 state election and the importance of the health portfolio to the state, the Liberal opposition thinks it is critical that this committee continues to do its good work, ably chaired by the Hon. Connie Bonaros. We look forward to the committee's contributions.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (20:25): Can I thank the chamber for its support for the continuation of this committee and the reflections from both the Hon. Ms Bourke and the Hon. Ms Centofanti in terms of the invaluable role it has provided. I am not sure I make the best chair of any committee, to be frank, but I think it has provided all of us with an insight that we would not have had otherwise when it comes to the health crisis in this jurisdiction. I look forward to its continuation.

Motion carried.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (20:27): I move:

That the select committee consist of the Hon. Russell Wortley, the Hon. Tung Ngo, the Hon. Stephen Wade, the Hon. Michelle Lensink and the mover.

Motion carried.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I move:

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

Motion carried.

POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN (20:28): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges that 27 June is Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day;
2. Notes that PTSD affects around three million Australians at some time in their lives, including over 10 per cent of military and emergency services workers and volunteers; and
3. Encourages the community to understand the causes of PTSD and support those who suffer from it.

Many within our community suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder. Whilst the culture and dialogue surrounding mental health has improved vastly over the last 20 years, more can always be done. Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day provides the opportunity to raise awareness and shine a light on PTSD and the significant impact that it has on not only one's life but the lives of those around them.

Trauma impacts us all in different ways. For some, they may experience sadness, grief or shock, just to name a few. Over time these feelings will pass, but for others they may develop PTSD, in which these feelings are intense and distressing and, if left untreated, can last a long time. Post-traumatic stress disorder are the physical and psychological reactions that may occur in people who have experienced or witnessed a traumatic event.

In light of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day, I would like to take a moment to acknowledge and thank those who put on a uniform every day to keep Australians safe, at times to

the detriment of their own wellbeing and safety. I would like to also acknowledge their families, who make many sacrifices to support their loved ones through the challenges they face.

As the motion notes, PTSD affects around three million Australians at some time in their lives, including over 10 per cent of military and emergency service workers and volunteers. Post-traumatic stress disorder is the second most common mental health condition in Australia, the most common being depression. It is often left undiagnosed and therefore left untreated. Whilst not everyone who experiences significant trauma will develop post-traumatic stress disorder, around 5 per cent to 10 per cent of Australians will suffer from the condition at some point in their lives.

It is estimated that around 2 per cent to 20 per cent of all people who have experienced a traumatic event develop post-traumatic stress disorder. Without adequate help and support in navigating a traumatic experience, it can put individuals at risk of developing other comorbid mental health disorders, such as anxiety and depression. As a parliament, we have a responsibility to raise awareness and continue to change the stigma surrounding mental health so that people feel more comfortable coming forward and asking for help.

The former Liberal government reactivated the Repat as a thriving health precinct that delivers on the needs of the community. An essential component of the Repat site activation was the inclusion of services and support for the veteran community. Supported by a \$5 million grant from the commonwealth, the Repat is home to a dedicated Veteran Wellbeing Centre, which includes a range of services, including counselling, which supports veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder.

Major disasters involve the risk of post-traumatic stress both for residents and responders. Following the bushfires on Kangaroo Island, SA Health's KI Health Advisory Council worked with SA Health Breakthrough Mental Health Research Foundation to offer free courses for 100 people. Responders were linked to services, including non-government organisations such as Trojan Trek. Trojan Trek's model includes a five-day trek into the wilderness of the Flinders Ranges, which benefits the mental health of emergency first responders.

Growing out of the Repat Foundation, the Military and Emergency Services Health Australia delivers high-quality research with meaningful practical health and wellbeing outcomes for our current and former military and emergency services and their families. Ambulance officers are vulnerable to post-traumatic stress disorder.

The Hospital Research Foundation Group charity Military and Emergency Services Health Australia is co-located at the Jamie Larcombe Centre as a world-class collaborative research institute focused on optimising the mental health and wellbeing of Australia's current and former military members, emergency service personnel and their families.

These are but a few examples of how the former Liberal government prioritised mental health services for those battling with PTSD. Those who are suffering from PTSD can often do so silently. It can be incredibly lonely and isolating, despite so many experiencing it in their lifetime. In summary, PTSD is often debilitating as well as all encompassing and impacts the lives of those who battle with it and impacts those around them.

I ask that we in this place do all we can to assist those who are impacted directly and indirectly by this illness. We must continue to raise awareness. I call upon my parliamentary colleagues to ensure that our frontline workers and volunteers have access to supports not only after their service but throughout their service, so that people have access to preventative help before they get to that point.

My hat goes off to those who battle with PTSD. I acknowledge your strength, courage and fight. I acknowledge your bad days and your good days. I acknowledge the hard work that goes into being able to have those good days. I acknowledge the courage that it takes to work on your mental health and to ask for help. To quote my dad when I was kid, 'Nothing, other than family, is more important than your mental health.'

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

NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.S. Lee:

That this council—

1. Notes that National Volunteer Week 2022 is being held from 16 to 22 May;
2. Recognises the valuable contribution that volunteers make to the economic and social wellbeing of local communities;
3. Commends the Marshall Liberal government for abolishing the screening fee for volunteers wishing to work with children and vulnerable people which has helped more than 135,000 volunteers; and
4. Commends the Marshall Liberal government for the release of the 2021-2027 Volunteering Strategy for South Australia to increase participation of young people, build the capacity of organisations to upskill, retain volunteers and help more people enjoy the rewarding experience of giving their time.

(Continued from 19 May 2022.)

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (20:34): I rise to also join in celebrating the dedication and hard work of the 900,000 South Australians who generously give their time and skills to volunteering in so many areas across South Australia. This equates to approximately 66 per cent of the population aged between 15 and 84 years, who collectively contribute an estimated 1.7 million hours of unpaid work each year. The value of that unpaid labour is estimated at almost \$5 billion.

Volunteers are in every part of our community, in health and welfare, emergency services, arts and heritage, environment and conversation, sport and recreation, youth development and engagement and education. It is also said that in giving we receive, and volunteers are the absolute embodiment of this. They do not do it for money; they do it because they get the deep sense of satisfaction from helping somebody else. They also do it because they know it makes our community stronger. They do it because it is the right thing to do.

National Volunteer Week is the annual celebration, initiated by Volunteering Australia, to acknowledge the generous contributions of Australia's almost six million volunteers. In supporting volunteers, I propose to amend this motion so that it all about volunteers are not about politicians. I move to amend the motion as follows:

Delete paragraphs 3 and 4 be deleted and replace it with a new paragraph 3, which reads:

3. Thanks the nearly one million volunteers across South Australia who give their time, skills and commitment for no reward but to make a better community.

The amended motion would thus then read:

That this council—

1. Notes that National Volunteer Week 2022 is being held from 16 to 22 May;
2. Recognises the valuable contribution that volunteers make to the economic and social wellbeing of local communities;
3. Thanks the nearly one million volunteers across South Australia who give their time, skills and commitment for no reward but to make a better community.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (20:37): I rise to speak on the motion in support of National Volunteers Week and the outstanding service volunteers provide for communities across the state and across the country. Volunteering, we know, is the unsung hero in the production and operating of essential services and a cornerstone of social goodwill. Without our dedicated volunteers, I am not sure how the broader community would survive. Just pause for a moment and think about the diverse roles volunteers play throughout our community.

Society as we know it is built on the foundations of volunteering, and our communities are shaped by it and, by far, better off for it. It is the bedrock to a number of local community ties, from local sporting clubs of all codes, life saving clubs, our schools and hospitals, aged and disability care services, local libraries—the list is endless. They play a pivotal role in crucial emergency services areas such as the CFS and the SES throughout the state. Just imagine the catastrophic damage a raging bushfire would cause without that level of commitment and dedication by our hardworking band of CFS volunteers.

As well as local voluntary organisations, it is important to acknowledge the service provided by community-based organisations such as the Salvation Army and St Vincent de Paul's and the

critical role they play in emergency accommodation services for those of us in personal crisis. It is a selfless gesture. We in this place rely on the generosity of volunteers, week in, week out, year in, year out. It is a way of generously giving one's time, offering your skills or lending resources to someone or something that needs help or simply offering company to someone in need of a chat.

It is a reflection of the best of our society and members of our community. In South Australia alone, there are almost one million volunteers whose contributions are estimated to be valued at around \$5 billion annually. That is a staggering amount, which puts into crystal clear focus the essential role volunteers and volunteer-based organisations have in our society.

South Australians have distinguished themselves among the nation, with 21.4 per cent of the population reported as having done some form of voluntary work according to data in the 2016 census. This represented the largest portion of the population compared with other capital cities, so we can hold our heads high. At a national level, volunteers contributed 596.2 million hours to the community in 2019 alone.

It is no surprise that the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic have had far-reaching impacts on volunteer output, as thousands of facilities were closed down and millions of Australians were isolated in their homes. However, the pandemic created an opportunity for more diverse engagement with a considerable shift from in-person volunteering to online or over-the-phone support, making access to volunteer services more available to a broader range of people seeking those services.

That said, national trends for volunteering through an organisation have declined over time. For people aged 18 and over, the rate has declined from 36.2 per cent in 2010 to 28.8 per cent in 2019. The younger generation are volunteering less than those who came before them. A Department of Social Services review of volunteer management activity highlighted several ways in which the volunteering landscape in Australia is changing and offers an explanation for the drop.

That includes an ageing population, contracting of workforce, the gig economy, people being more discerning about how to volunteer their time and, of course, the impacts of COVID-19. Notwithstanding that, I still acknowledge the absolute importance of that in our community and the value that it provides to our community overall.

I take this opportunity to reflect and thank all those who have volunteered with SA-Best, albeit on an election campaign—much less important in the grand scheme of things than all the other things that I have listed, but as I said yesterday, all of us in here rely on volunteers, whether it is an election campaign or outside of an election campaign, it is people helping us in our roles. They do so with a friendly smile, a can-do attitude and bucketloads of experience that we simply do not have.

No matter what forum people find themselves volunteering in, from local sporting events, food kitchens, goodwill organisations, election campaigns, legal centres, whatever the case may be: one thing is absolutely crystal clear and that is that we all benefit from volunteering and our collective lives are all better and richer for it.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (20:42): I thank the Hon. Emily Bourke and the Hon. Connie Bonaros for their contributions. I am sure all the volunteers listening will be very appreciative of the generous acknowledgement. It will come as no surprise that I do not support the amendment by the Hon. Emily Bourke. I am very disappointed the Labor Party is not prepared to give credit where credit is due, particularly when the Marshall Liberal government abolished the screening fees for so many volunteers who deliver so many benefits.

Furthermore, they do not have the decency to acknowledge those organisations, groups and individuals who have contributed to develop the 2021-27 volunteering strategy under the former Marshall Liberal government. In the interest of the welfare and wellbeing of everyone working tonight, I am not going to waste any more time debating this motion. I urge all members to support the original terms of the motion and oppose the amendment moved by the Hon. Emily Bourke.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

*Bills***ANIMAL WELFARE (JUMPS RACING) AMENDMENT BILL***Final Stages*

The House of Assembly agreed to the bill without any amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CHILD SEX OFFENCES) BILL*Final Stages*

The House of Assembly agreed to the bill with the amendment indicated by the following schedule, to which amendment the House of Assembly desires the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

No 1 Clause 10, page 6, after line 33—Insert:

- (a1) Section 56(1), penalty provision, (b)—after 'offence' insert:
(other than an offence of a kind described in paragraph (c) or (d))

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I move:

That the amendment be agreed to.

Motion carried.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MOTOR SPORT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Final Stages*

The House of Assembly agreed to the bill without any amendment.

*Parliamentary Procedure***SITTINGS AND BUSINESS**

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (20:48): I move:

That the council at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 6 September 2022 at 2.15pm.

Motion carried.

At 20:49 the council adjourned until Tuesday 6 September 2022 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***TASMANIAN BLUE GUMS, KANGAROO ISLAND**

In reply to **the Hon. R.A. SIMMS** (17 May 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I thank the honourable member for his question and provide the following response:

I assume that your question relates to germination of Tasmanian blue gum wildlings on Kangaroo Island.

Since the 2019-20 bushfires, the state and commonwealth governments have committed just over \$1.5 million to this issue. By 30 June 2022, it is anticipated that initial control work will have been undertaken on more than 1,000 hectares.

Control of Tasmanian blue gum wildlings remains a priority for this government, with this work to continue into 2022-23.

Since early 2022, landholders are required to control Tasmanian blue gums wildlings growing on their land.

I'm advised that the Department for Environment and Water are working with Kangaroo Island Landscape Board to ensure landholders, including Kiland, are aware of their responsibilities under the *Landscape Act 2019*.

KANGAROO ISLAND

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (17 May 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I thank the honourable member for his question and provide the following response:

I understand a significant amount of standing and stored plantation timber remains on the island. After the fires it was estimated approximately 750,000 tonnes of standing pine and 3.5 million tonnes of blue gum hardwood remained that could potentially be salvaged. About 60 per cent of the pine and 90 per cent of the blue gum is under the ownership of Kangaroo Island Plantation Timbers, now known as Kiland, the rest is owned by a small group of private landholders.

Ideally the pine would have been harvested and transported to sawmills as soon as possible after the fires—as the wood deteriorates over time. I am advised the former governments' softwood transport assistance scheme, has assisted with the transport of only about 5,400 tonnes of logs to date.

I assume your reference to dams is in relation to plantation timber storage. I understand Kiland has about 7,000 tonnes of softwood logs stored in dams on their properties.

The marine transport component remains a significant limiting factor with SeaLink currently the only transport provider available.

The government continues to support processes which aim to maximise the economic value of the remaining forest resource and is working with the Kangaroo Island Council on this matter.

The Minister for Climate, Environment and Water has advised:

I am advised that Kiland's property managers AAG Investment Management are developing a koala management plan that describes how their harvest processes will be conducted to remain compliant with the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 and the Animal Welfare Act 1985 with regard to koalas.

If any additional measures to support the koala population on Kangaroo Island are required to be put in place following the clearing of blue gum plantations, they can be considered at that time.

FERAL CATS

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (17 May 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I thank the honourable member for his question and provide the following response:

Kangaroo Island is home to highly productive primary industries, internationally recognised tourism industries and many unique native plant and animal species.

Kangaroo Island is also home to large numbers of feral cats, which impact primary industries as well as the island's biodiversity.

I am pleased to report that the Kangaroo Island Landscape Board and its partners are having significant positive impacts on the numbers of feral cats on the island.

I am also pleased to advise that almost 100 per cent of Kangaroo Island landholders support the feral cat management works being led by the Landscape Board. The program engages hundreds of local landholders to support cat trapping activities.

With funding from the SA state government, Australian government Bushfire Recovery Grants, Regional Land Partnerships, Landcare, World Wildlife Fund, private philanthropy and assistance from the Kangaroo Island

Council, Agriculture Kangaroo Island and many landholders, the Kangaroo Island Landscape Board and partners have been setting several hundred cat traps each day.

New technology being developed and applied on Kangaroo Island includes real-time cameras to monitor cat traps and app-linked trap-alert systems that cover vast areas and notify the operators when traps have been triggered.

High-tech trapping methods are being used in conjunction with a feral cat proof fence that separates the 384 square km Dudley Peninsula from the remainder of the island, which was funded by the Australian government and private philanthropy and completed in September 2021.

PLANT PROTEINS PROJECT

In reply to **the Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition)** (18 May 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries):

I refer to the Premier's response to the same question given in the House of Assembly on 18 May 2022.

INDUSTRIAL HEMP

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (19 May 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I provide the following response:

The four-year PIRSA SARDI industrial hemp trials project was completed in 2021, and an update report was published in January 2022. This report is publicly available on the PIRSA website.

Results confirm that industrial hemp can be successfully produced in South Australia and the most promising varieties for the Riverland and Limestone Coast regions are identified. The trials also confirm that the ideal sowing time for irrigated hemp production is mid-November to mid-December. Dryland production was not tested as it is not expected to be reliable in South Australia.

AgriFutures Australia commenced an Industrial Hemp Variety Trials project in July 2021. This is a national project with trial sites across Australia and will run until June 2024. SARDI is a participant in these trials, with trial sites at Loxton in the Riverland and Maaoupe in the Limestone Coast.

Up to 17 June 2022, PIRSA has issued 25 licences to cultivate industrial hemp and two licences to process industrial hemp.

As Minister for Primary Industries and Regions, I am responsible for the *Industrial Hemp Act 2017* and the *Industrial Hemp Regulations 2017* which provides a licensing framework to authorise and regulate the possession, cultivation, processing and supply of industrial hemp in South Australia.

I am advised that medicinal cannabis is regulated by SA Health and the commonwealth.

The Department for Trade and Investment supports commercial investor and exporter interests in South Australia. This is typically predicated on stakeholders meeting regulatory requirements.

FERAL DEER

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (19 May 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I thank the honourable member for her question and provide the following response:

Prior to any aerial control of pest animals, government staff obtain approval from land managers where the culling will occur. By doing so, farmers are able to ensure all people and livestock are safe. Aerial shooting only occurs on properties where landholders have given prior approval.

Aerial shooting teams comprise of expert, trained, accredited and professional pilots and marksmen. Requisite flight procedures and risk assessments are strictly followed.

REGIONAL LABOUR FORCE

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (19 May 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Tourism has advised:

This working holiday-maker campaign is one of many delivered by the South Australian Tourism Commission (SATC) into key markets to drive visitation to South Australia.

The campaign targeted the United Kingdom and Ireland as it was the largest working holiday market to South Australia pre-COVID. The working holiday-maker campaign's key objective is to drive awareness of South Australia as a destination in the UK and Ireland as there is a desire in these markets to travel to our state as soon as possible.

The arrival of these visitors will help fill employment gaps and skills shortages in the city and regional areas, and subsequently boost tourism, including the tourism, hospitality and primary industries.

I can assure you that the SATC is active in many regions, including the UK, Europe, New Zealand and South-East Asia to ensure South Australia is top of mind when people are thinking about where to work and travel next.

While the £10 fare is not offered beyond the United Kingdom and Ireland, the SATC continues to market South Australia as an appealing working holiday destination in other markets. Since February 2022, the SATC has been running digital marketing in France and Germany to inspire working holiday-makers in these key markets to visit South Australia.

I am pleased to report that the first person to arrive under the working holiday-maker campaign arrived in Adelaide on 31 May, so we are already seeing the benefits of this campaign.

AGTECH FIELD DAYS

In reply to **the Hon. D.G.E. HOOD** (19 May 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I thank the honourable member for his question and provide the following response:

The Struan Best Practice Demonstration Farm is a collaborative project between the SA government and Elders and as such, the costs for these field days are shared equally between the two organisations.

FERAL DEER

In reply to **the Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition)** (19 May 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I thank the honourable member for her question and provide the following response:

Feral Deer Scan is the main tool used to report sightings of feral deer across Australia. It was developed, and is run by, the Centre for Invasive Species Solutions.

GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (31 May 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I thank the honourable member for his question and provide the following response:

I am informed by my department that there were five exemptions for dealing with genetically modified (GM) food crops in South Australia granted between May 2018 and July 2019 in the term of the previous government.

I am told that currently there are no exemption applications under consideration.

BAROSSA CONTEMPORARY FESTIVAL

In reply to **the Hon. J.S. LEE** (31 May 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Tourism has advised:

The South Australian government made a tough decision to withdraw its sponsorship for the Barossa Contemporary. The South Australian Tourism Commission and the South Australian government were not the only sponsors for the event. Details of financial arrangements for the Barossa Contemporary and other sponsored events are commercial-in-confidence and subject to contractual confidentiality restrictions and cannot be disclosed.

The South Australian government remains committed to major and regional events that resonate with their communities and provide an economic and tourism boost. This is evidenced by the government's commitment of an additional \$40 million over the next four years towards major events across South Australia.

As the Minister for Regional Development, I will always advocate for additional funding for regional events across our state.

CITRUS INDUSTRY

In reply to **the Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition)** (31 May 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I thank the honourable member for her question and provide the following response:

The existing Ceduna Quarantine Station is part of the state's frontline defence to keeping the state fruit fly free and helping to protect the \$1.3 billion of susceptible horticultural produce grown annually in South Australia.

The Ceduna Quarantine Station plays a major role in helping to protect the states fruit and vegetable growing industry by defending against the risk of Mediterranean Fruit Fly entering from Western Australia.

The Ceduna Quarantine Station records in excess of 150,000 vehicle movements annually. All traffic approaching the Ceduna station is stopped and searched for fruit fly risk material, and other prohibited goods.

The government is committed to continuing to have a strong enforcement presence at Ceduna.

NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR

In reply to **the Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition)** (31 May 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Infrastructure and Transport has advised:

The 10.5-kilometre Torrens to Darlington (T2D) project is the most significant project ever planned in South Australia.

The Malinauskas Labor government committed to reviewing the Liberal's flawed reference design, to make sure that the project provides the best possible outcomes and minimises community impacts and unnecessary cost for the South Australian taxpayer.

The initial findings of the departmental review have revealed the project is nowhere near as advanced as suggested by the previous government.

This government's disappointment at the failures of the previous government cannot be overstated. Their four years of inaction and delay will cost all South Australians more time in traffic waiting for the completed north-south corridor to get them where they need to be.

Labor has a strong track record in delivering north-south corridor projects, not just talking about them. We look forward to delivering this critical project for South Australia.

LEAD POLLUTION

In reply to **the Hon. R.A. SIMMS** (1 June 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Energy and Mining has advised:

Further reductions to lead emissions from the Port Pirie smelter is an important priority for the government.

In relation to 'will the government rehouse affected families while the lead abatement project is taking place' I am advised that the Minister for Human Services will respond separately.

LEAD POLLUTION

In reply to **the Hon. R.A. SIMMS** (1 June 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Human Services has advised:

Port Pirie has been segmented into lead-risk areas: high, medium and low. A lead-risk map reflecting these areas was updated in April 2020 and provided to the Port Pirie Housing SA office. The current practice is to not allocate families with children under five within the currently defined high-risk area. Existing tenants with children under five residing in the high-risk area, who were allocated prior to the provision of the updated lead-risk map, were given the opportunity to relocate to another medium-risk or low-risk area within Port Pirie.

Families who reside in current medium-risk and low-risk areas will not be relocated during the lead abatement works as these works will focus on the exterior of the house. Work will include covering existing exposed soil and increasing dust suppression to avoid potentially contaminated soil from blowing into homes. The soil will be tested on site prior to commencement of works, and soil with greater than 300 parts per million of lead will be removed from the yard and replaced with clean fill.

AGRICULTURAL SECTOR LABOUR SHORTAGES

In reply to **the Hon. J.S. LEE** (2 June 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I thank the honourable member for her question and provide the following response:

The government of South Australia is focused on increasing the total supply of workers available to work in the agricultural sector, rather than asking industry to quantify the shortage of workers at a particular point in time.

The government has recently introduced the ten-pound Pom scheme to bring more working holiday-makers back to South Australia as another source of labour for our agricultural and regional industries.

In addition, the Department of Primary Industries and Regions continues to partner with the eight South Australian Regional Development Australia Associations in the delivery of the \$1.2 million Regional Work SA project.

This project helps match those seeking work in our regions with employers with vacancies available.

The Regional Development Australia Associations have also been working with organisations such as StudyAdelaide to host regional visits for tertiary students and promote work and lifestyle opportunities.

The Department of Primary Industries and Regions will continue to work with the commonwealth government to assist our primary industry sector address workforce shortages.

ABORIGINAL LANDS WEED MANAGEMENT

In reply to **the Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK** (2 June 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I thank the honourable member for her question and provide the following response:

This program is building capacity of Aboriginal land managers to control weeds of national significance and other high priority established weeds. The program is two years and federally funded.

There are 540,000 hectares of freehold Aboriginal land in South Australia, covering about 6 per cent of the state. These lands have experienced degradation from several problematic Weeds of National Significance, including African Boxthorn, Opuntoid Cacti and Athel Pine.

The Department of Primary Industries and Regions has implemented its Reconciliation Action Plan, which aims to create opportunities for Aboriginal people in primary industries and regional development, aligning biosecurity outcomes to local community needs.

The objectives of the Reconciliation Action Plan are aligned to Healthy Country plans, which are in place for Aboriginal land throughout South Australia.

By training and accrediting Aboriginal people in weed control and safe handling of herbicides, this new weeds program will achieve some of the objectives of the action plan and Healthy Country plans.

Consultation is underway with delivery organisations such as the Aboriginal Lands Trust, Indigenous Land and Sea Corporation and Landscape Boards, along with Aboriginal councils, organisations and corporations. The program is aiming to be implemented on Aboriginal lands across the state, including the APY lands.

The Department of Primary Industries and Regions is delivering this program, requiring that they are strategic about the lands and communities where the program will bring the most community benefits.

The coordinator for this program has been assisting Aboriginal land managers to prioritise sites for weed control by holding planning workshops on Country.

At some sites the coordinator for this program has run weed control training workshops and exercises with Aboriginal rangers and community members, followed by ongoing advice on best practice weed control techniques and emerging control technologies.

Weed management plans have been compiled for some sites utilising local knowledge to assess risks of weed invasion from other areas.

One public forum has been held in Port Augusta to determine weed threats to public amenity and biodiversity.

CROP AND PASTURE SEEDING INTENTIONS REPORT

In reply to **the Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK** (2 June 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I thank the honourable member for her question and provide the following response:

I am advised that the department is undertaking the first major revision of the crop and pasture data reporting process in 15 years. The aim of the review is to improve the focus and utilise contemporary reporting channels.

The department will work with stakeholders on how to best provide future data requirements.

CROP AND PASTURE SEEDING INTENTIONS REPORT

In reply to **the Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition)** (2 June 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I thank the honourable member for her question and provide the following response:

I am advised that the department is undertaking the first major revision of the crop and pasture data reporting process in 15 years. The aim of the review is to improve the focus and utilise contemporary reporting channels.

The department will work with stakeholders on how to best provide future data requirements.

LIVE ANIMAL EXPORT

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (15 June 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I thank the honourable member for her question and provide the following response:

The responsibility for exported animals and products lies with the federal agricultural minister. Every six months, the federal agricultural minister must table in parliament a report that includes livestock mortalities on every sea voyage. The report is compiled from information provided to the department by the ships' masters, as required by the Marine Orders Part 43 under subsection 425(1AA) of the Navigation Act 1912. These reports are available at Reports to Parliament—DAWE.

No live export ships have left a South Australian port in the last reportable year, so PIRSA cannot report on the South Australian figures.

COST OF LIVING

In reply to **the Hon. J.S. LEE** (16 June 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Housing and Urban Development has advised:

Relevant ministers and executives from the South Australian Housing Authority and Department of Human Services along with Minister Champion and Renewal SA met with councils and groups in the South-East recently at the first community cabinet. This helped to understand the unique and up to date issues facing each of the individual council areas and towns. The issues to each area are unique. Some of the issues are access to housing, crisis accommodation and others are key worker housing for employment industries. We have since been in contact with councils and will be working with them on what is needed and what can be done in partnership.

CHILD AND YOUNG PERSON'S VISITOR

In reply to **the Hon. S.L. GAME** (16 June 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Child Protection has advised:

The Malinauskas Labor government has a strong focus on both doing what we can to keep children and young people safe and on strengthening families so that they have the best chance of succeeding.

We must change and deepen the community understanding and discourse about the risk and tension that the child protection system carries, and about the interconnected issues families face, issues such as poverty, domestic violence, mental ill health and substance misuse. To achieve real change, we need to implement a whole-of-government approach and whole-of-community approach focused on child safety and wellbeing. And on the system that supports them to be safe and well if they are in out-of-home care.

The Child and Young Person's Visitor role is established under the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017. The role of the Child and Young Person's Visitor is to promote and advocate for the best interests of children and young people who are under the guardianship of the Department for Child Protection (DCP) chief executive, and who are living in DCP residential care. This is an important function to ensure oversight and advocacy for individuals and to provide advice on a systemic level. The guardian role is a key part of the holistic system approach that is needed to ensure we align efforts to keep children and young people safe.

In 2017, the former Labor government funded the guardian's office for a two-year trial of a Child and Young Person's Visitor program. In the trial program's final report (February 2020), the guardian sought ongoing funding for the program, but this was not provided by the Marshall Liberal government, ultimately resulting in the resignation of the incumbent from the role in August 2021.

The current government recognises the importance of having a Child and Young Person's Visitor and staff to support them in the role. We have committed \$1.87m over the next four years to resource the position. This investment is complemented by other commitments to child protection in the first budget of the Malinauskas Labor government, reflecting the deep commitment needed to strengthen the system.

Recruitment of the new Guardian for Children and Young People, who will serve as the Child and Young Person's Visitor, is entering its final stages, and the government looks forward to working with the office holder in the future as this important visitor role is reinstated.

We look forward to progressing a number of initiatives to better support and empower children and young people and enable them to thrive, and to the upcoming review of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017.

At the centre of all of our efforts will be children, young people, their families and communities.

GHOST MUSHROOM LANE

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (16 June 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I thank the honourable member for her question and provide the following response:

I am advised ForestrySA collects postcode information when members of the public purchase an access pass to visit Ghost Mushroom Lane. I am further advised ForestrySA uses this information to report visitor numbers.