

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 7 September 2022

The PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens) took the chair at 14:21 and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:22): I bring up the 12th report of the committee.

Report received.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I bring up the 13th report of the committee.

Report received and read.

Ministerial Statement

VET QUALITY AUDIT BLITZ

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:26): I table a copy of a ministerial statement made in the other place by the Hon. Blair Boyer.

Question Time

SHEEP AND GOAT ELECTRONIC IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development a question regarding traceability.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: On 20 July this year, in a meeting of state and territory agricultural ministers, federal Minister Watts announced that the decision had been made to develop a national mandatory sheep and goat electronic identification system. My questions to the minister are:

1. Does the Malinauskas Labor government support the mandating of individual electronic identification of sheep and goats?
2. Will the Malinauskas Labor government commit to providing financial assistance to support South Australian producers in adopting electronic identification and, if so, how much?
3. Will the Malinauskas Labor government commit to providing technical support for South Australian producers to switch from a paper-based system to an electronic system?

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. The state government is supportive of improvements to traceability that assist with emergency response and also maintaining access to international markets. At the meeting of Australian agriculture ministers on 20 July this year, there was unanimous support for the development of a national industry-led sheep and goat electronic identification system, known as EIDs.

A national framework will be developed by federal and state agricultural departments with industry input, because it is incredibly important that it is industry led, and that framework will be considered at future meetings of agriculture ministers.

The state government, through PIRSA, engages regularly with the state's livestock industry on national traceability systems. Over the past three years, the state government, through the red meat and wool growth program, has taken a proactive approach to the implementation of EIDs by working with producers and service providers in driving the uptake of EID and other precision livestock technologies to promote the productivity and also the traceability benefits that it can provide.

Livestock SA has been provided with \$140,000 to analyse the benefits of an EID system to the South Australian sheep and goat industries and to develop an implementation strategy to transition the industry to this system. Once that project is complete, I will be able to provide more information to the chamber about some of those transition mechanisms.

SHEEP AND GOAT ELECTRONIC IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): Supplementary: I thank the minister for her answers. My question to her is: will that framework include mandatory electronic ID tags for sheep and goats in South Australia?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:30): As I said, Livestock SA has been provided with \$140,000 to develop a framework that would be acceptable to industry and achieve the outcomes we are seeking.

SHEEP AND GOAT ELECTRONIC IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): Supplementary: so the minister is not committing to mandating electronic ID tags for sheep and goats in South Australia?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:30): I think I have already answered that question: Livestock SA is involved in a project to develop a framework that will be appropriate for our circumstances.

SHEEP AND GOAT ELECTRONIC IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): Further supplementary: when is the government expected to receive that report or framework—whatever the minister would like to call it—and will the recommendations be made public?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:31): The framework will be received as soon as it is completed.

SHEEP AND GOAT ELECTRONIC IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): Supplementary: will it be made public?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:31): I have not given that thought at this stage. I would imagine that it probably would be, unless there was any commercial-in-confidence or other issues that would arise, but my expectation is that I would be able to make that public.

FERAL ANIMALS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development about feral animals.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Research conducted by Professor Michael Ward, Chair of the University of Sydney School of Veterinary Public Health, suggests that in regions of a high concentration of feral pigs it is likely that foot-and-mouth disease would get into the pests and set up an ongoing transmission cycle with cattle, with the virus going back and forth between the two species.

On 29 July this year, the ABC reported that hunters and shooters say that they could help to cull feral animal populations and reduce the risk of foot-and-mouth disease. My questions to the minister are:

1. Does the minister support a national cull of feral pigs, goats and deer?
2. Has the minister received any offers from hunters or sporting shooters to help with the cull of feral pigs, goats and deer to reduce the risk of foot-and-mouth disease, or other emergency animal diseases spreading in Australia, if an outbreak occurs?
3. Has the minister requested or received advice from her department on a cull of feral animals to benefit control efforts against emergency animal diseases?
4. Has the minister proposed or discussed the benefits of a national coordinated approach to culling feral animals like pigs, goats and deer with her federal, state and territory colleagues?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:33): I thank the honourable member for her question. It is true that some feral animals, including feral pigs, are susceptible to foot-and-mouth disease. It is not possible to eradicate feral animals across Australia. However, the AUSVETPLAN Wild Animal Response Strategy outlines procedures to manage wild animals in the event of an animal disease outbreak, such as FMD.

Livestock producers should put measures in place where possible to prevent feral animals from coming into contact with their stock. This could include making sure boundary fences are in good order and developing a feral animal control program. South Australia has control programs for two feral animal species that can be susceptible to foot-and-mouth disease, namely, feral pigs and feral deer.

FERAL ANIMALS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): Supplementary: can the minister outline a bit further what her government is doing to reduce the feral populations of pigs, goats and deer in South Australia?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:34): Certainly. We have had a very successful program on Kangaroo Island in regard to feral pigs, and I think the most recent advice I had was that those numbers are now less than 100. There are a number of other programs in regard to feral animals, which I have put on the roster previously in this place.

FERAL ANIMALS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): Further supplementary, and I thank the minister for her answer: is the government looking to expand the feral pig eradication program outside of Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:34): If I recall correctly, there are opportunities to analyse the program to see whether it's feasible to extend them to other parts of the state. I will seek some more information from my department and report back to the chamber.

EYRE PENINSULA DESALINATION PLANT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding regional development. Does the minister support the Deputy Premier's view that all potential sites of the desal plant on Eyre Peninsula should still be considered after the site committee's recommendation was delivered?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:35): I had a meeting when I was in Port Lincoln recently in regard to the desal plant and the proposed sites. It was very useful to have that information and to hear some of the discussions, concerns and ideas that people within the local community had,

including meeting with the former member for the area, who is now involved in a committee in regard to the desal plant. I think it's important to continue to investigate the options that are there and to weigh up the benefits and potential disadvantages of the sites.

EYRE PENINSULA DESALINATION PLANT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): Supplementary: can the minister then confirm that she does support the Deputy Premier's view that, despite the site committee's recommendations for a preferred site, they will continue to be looking at all the potential sites for the desal plant on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:36): All appropriate considerations need to be analysed when making a decision that is so significant.

RETAIL WORKERS

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector. Will the minister update the council on the government's election commitment to provide better protections for retail workers from abuse at work?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:37): I thank the honourable member for his question and his very longstanding interest in, and advocacy for, workers in South Australia. It is unacceptable that people face potential violence and abuse in the workplace. We know that, for many retail workers, that sort of abuse is all too common.

We saw this particularly at the height of the COVID pandemic. Retail workers were among those who, during COVID, went to work day in and day out, without the option of working from home, and continued to provide essential services through the toughest of restrictions. Not only that, many became COVID marshals, often being required to enforce directions, such as mask wearing, social distancing and other restrictions for customers. I think everyone remembers the pictures of the hoarding of things like toilet paper and the long queues and the frustrations that many had and took out upon people in the retail sector. These were especially tough times for retail workers, who had to deal with some pretty difficult and horrific situations.

We went to the election with a very clear policy: we would increase the penalty for those who abuse retail workers. I am pleased to say that we have delivered on this commitment. Last week, I announced that regulations had come into effect to increase penalties for those who assault retail workers. People convicted of basic assault against retail workers performing their duties can now face up to five years in prison—an increase on the previous two years. Those convicted of assault causing harm against retail workers performing their duties can now face up to seven years in prison—an increase from three.

Our government is sending a very clear message to the community that threatening or abusing retail workers is completely out of line and unacceptable. There is a real need for this change. I am advised that the data shows an average of 50 assaults a month taking place in retail settings. These are workers who are often among some of the lower paid workers in our community and who often work in casual or insecure work. That they then face higher rates of assault in the workplace is disturbing, and it is something we are acting upon.

When I announced these changes last week, I was pleased to be joined by a retail worker in Rundle Mall, as well as a representative of their union, the SDA. We have worked closely with those representing workers in developing these changes. I am very pleased to be delivering upon this important election commitment.

As I pointed out yesterday, it stands in stark contrast to the former government. Upon coming to government, the Liberal Party broke election commitment after election commitment after election commitment. People remember the ironclad promise for a tram to do a right-hand turn that was broken almost immediately after coming into government—almost immediately.

We saw the GlobeLink proposal that was before the election with great fanfare from some who were then on this side of this chamber—

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Point of order: the relevance to the original question is very hard to see.

The PRESIDENT: The minister can answer the question as he sees fit.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I know those opposite are scared of the truth. They are scared of the truth and they will do anything to try to silence us.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: But we will not be silenced. I know those opposite don't like being reminded of how often they broke their election promises. They don't like it and they will do anything to try to stop us talking about it, but as we outlined yesterday, in the 41-page secret, damning report, the secret, damning report—

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Point of order: the minister is wasting everyone's question time with profligate nonsense.

The PRESIDENT: It is not a point of order. However, I am watching the clock. Minister, you have a Dorothy Dixier that you are working your way through, it's not going to be open-ended, but please continue.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will finish up, again noting how disturbed, worried and scared the now Liberal opposition are about being reminded of their failures.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will quote, just quickly before I finish up, from that 41-page secret election report into the Liberals' last term in government. In terms of broken—

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Point of order: this is getting beyond a joke. Come on, start talking about yourself.

The PRESIDENT: Sit down. It is not a point of order.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Relevance.

The PRESIDENT: It is not a point of order, but the minister will conclude his remarks so we can move on. Minister, I am watching the clock, can you please wind this up.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Thank you, sir. I was not aware of which number standing order 'beyond a joke' was from, but I understand that. I will just finish up with one quote from the 41-page secret election report, that the cancellation of this election commitment cost the Liberal Marshall government economic credibility very early on in their term of office. That's why it is so important that we act on our election commitments, in vast contrast to the former Liberal government.

RETAIL WORKERS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:42): Supplementary question: is the Attorney aware of criticisms that the definition of retail worker has been drawn too broadly, flagged by those in the local community, and what work will be done to ensure that there is clarity of the definition of retail worker?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:42): I thank the honourable member for her supplementary. I am not aware of such concern that has been raised, but I am happy to look at it. I will have a look and take that into account, but we are keen to—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti interjecting:

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

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We are keen to make sure that those who are forward, facing customers, providing very important services, get as much protection as is possible. We won't apologise for making sure that, as broadly as possible, those who are on the frontline serving us, particularly in times of need like the pandemic, are given proper protections.

RETAIL WORKERS

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN (14:43): The minister has spoken quite passionately today about the safety of workers.

The PRESIDENT: What is your supplementary? Just ask the supplementary question.

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN: Will the minister show the same passion for South Australian workers if we start to see the same conduct seen in Victoria by the CFMEU?

The PRESIDENT: Look, it's a long way—Attorney.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:44): As I said yesterday, we expect everyone to abide by the laws of the state.

NATIONAL THREATENED SPECIES DAY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:44): I seek leave to make—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I want to hear the Hon. Ms Franks, please. Order!

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question on the topic of threatened species to the Attorney as the minister representing the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Today is National Threatened Species Day, a day where we shine a spotlight on all native Australian animal and plant species that are under threat of extinction. At a state level here in South Australia, we have more than a thousand species listed as threatened under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972. Our terrestrial fauna species have been declining in abundance and distribution and 12 per cent of native animal species are considered threatened with extinction. I note that animals such as fish, invertebrates or even fungi are not actually able to be listed as threatened under our legislation, so in fact the numbers are far greater. My questions to the minister are:

1. What actions are required to be taken under the legislation to help protect the species once it's listed as threatened?
2. How is the threatened species listed in South Australia monitored and managed?
3. Does the minister believe the provisions are currently adequate?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for her question. As the member pointed out, it is Threatened Species Day today. I note one thing that has come to my attention on Threatened Species Day is that there has just been the release of I think 40 warru (wallaby) into the Everard Ranges in the APY lands where they haven't been seen for some 60 years—a very successful program of breeding a species that hasn't been seen in parts of the APY lands for years and years. It has been great timing on Threatened Species Day with that program and I congratulate those involved.

In terms of the questions the member has asked, I will be very happy to take them to the Minister for Environment in another place and bring back a reply for the honourable member.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): My question is to the Attorney-General regarding domestic violence. Does the Attorney-General agree with the Premier that domestic violence should be a politics-free zone or does he agree with domestic violence survivor Emma Waters? Can the Attorney-General please provide the reasons behind his response?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:47): I don't think any of us who are elected members should play politics with domestic violence. I think it's a very important issue.

SPIRIT OF EXCELLENCE IN AGRICULTURE AWARDS

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:47): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about the recent Ag Bureau Spirit of Excellence in Agriculture Awards and how they acknowledge the contribution of young people in agriculture?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:47): I thank the honourable member for his question, particularly as it is so important to encourage young people to be involved in the agricultural sector. I was fortunate to attend the Ag Bureau of South Australia's Spirit of Excellence in Agriculture Awards in Gawler last Friday night with the member for Light, the Hon. Tony Piccolo MP. Also present was the honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The awards have a strong emphasis on the achievements of young farmers and producers who are making a real difference to sustainable farming practices and furthering their skills and knowledge so they can work with others to create a thriving agricultural sector in South Australia. Earlier in the day, prior to the awards ceremony, I visited the Gawler and District College agricultural facilities with the member for Light. While I was talking to students and their teacher, Ms Trimboli, I was very impressed with their passion for agriculture and their excitement in showing both myself and the member for Light what it is they have been working on in their agricultural program.

Given the strong focus on the contribution of young people at the Spirit of Excellence Awards, I was pleased to invite three of the students, Louise, Jasmin and Kaitlyn, as well as Ms Trimboli, to the awards event so that they could experience the excitement of the evening and talk to other young people in the industry. I was heartened to actually see the way that those who were at the event made an effort and went out of their way to go to speak to the three young students and Ms Trimboli to encourage them to keep pursuing agriculture through school and as a career.

In terms of the awards, there were two scholarships and one bursary announced on the night, with the winners, Ben Castine, Nicholas Dawes and Aleah Bakota, managing to overcome extremely strong fields of candidates who ensured, I think, that the judges did not have an easy time in making a decision.

The winner of the 2022 Sustainable Agriculture Scholarship, sponsored by the Department for Environment and Water, was Ben Castine. Ben and his wife manage a fourth-generation vineyard, grazing and cropping property near Watervale in the Clare Valley. Ben has conducted extensive research into sustainable approaches to vineyard production and is now focusing on an under-vine straw mulching program and planting of native insectary plants around the vineyard with the aim of reducing insecticide and herbicide use and enhancing soil health and water-holding capacity. Unfortunately, Ben was not able to be there on the night but the acceptance speech read on his behalf really outlined how his positive approach is making a difference not only to his own business but potentially more broadly to other businesses in the future.

The winner of the 2022 Rural Youth Bursary, which I was very fortunate to be able to announce on the night, was won by Nicholas Dawes from Kingston South East. Nicholas works as an animal health specialist. He would like to further his knowledge of animal husbandry at a farmer/producer level so that he can increase his value to producers as an animal health specialist and help to educate on implementing best practice nutrition and animal management strategies.

Finally, Aleah Bakota was announced as the recipient of the 2022 Lois Harris Scholarship, which is awarded to a first-year student studying the Bachelor of Agricultural Sciences at the University of Adelaide. Aleah received the highest tertiary entrance score for a student studying this course in 2022 and is passionate about farming sustainability and working to minimise the impacts of climate change.

It was an inspiring night and it showed just how brightly the future shines in our state with the young people who study and work across agriculture. I congratulate the finalists, the winners and the board of Ag Bureau of SA, who put on a wonderful event.

STATE CORONERS OFFICE

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:51): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about funding to the Coroners office.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: In response to a question I asked yesterday about a backlog of post-mortems in the Coroners office, the minister revealed additional funding had been provided in 2022 for the appointment of another coroner for a 12-month term. My questions to the Attorney are:

1. What is the total amount of additional funding?
2. Given the extreme backlog, why is the funding only for a 12-month period?
3. Has the search begun to find that person?
4. Do you foresee a problem filling the position, given it is only for 12 months?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:52): I thank the honourable member for his question. I will double-check if any of the details are wrong, but to the best of my recollection there was funding for an additional coroner, whose time limit had run out, and funding was provided in the budget so that could extend for an additional 12 months. The amount of the funding is, I think, at the rate of a magistrate plus a small additional loading. As I said, it was funding that had run out for an additional coroner but we extended it for a further 12 months and it's something we can look at at the end of the 12 months to see what funding there is and the need for it at that time.

STATE CORONERS OFFICE

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:53): Supplementary: did that funding include additional funding for the overall coronial jurisdiction, and what is the total budget overall for the coronial jurisdiction?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:53): I thank the honourable member for her question. The additional funding for the next 12 months would have been an addition to the overall coronial budget. In terms of the overall coronial budget, I don't have those details with me at the moment—the breakdown—but I am quite certain we can find that and I will bring the answer back for the honourable member.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:53): My question is to the Attorney-General regarding domestic violence. What does the Attorney-General have to say in response to Emma Walters' public comments that the Premier 'is happy to take money with domestic violence fingerprints'?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:53): Sorry, I missed the last bit—'happy to'?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Emma Walters' comments that the Premier 'is happy to take money with domestic violence fingerprints'.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. I really don't know what it refers to or the context, so I find it a little bit difficult to answer.

The PRESIDENT: Have another go.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Thank you, Mr President. Emma Walters, being the wife of Mr John Setka, has described the Premier as 'happy to take money with domestic violence fingerprints' in relation to the CFMEU donation.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for the clarification. I think the donation the member refers to has been returned.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:54): Supplementary question: the Attorney might need to take it on notice. Is he able to check whether the money has in fact been returned and the date on which it has been returned?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:54): I thank the honourable member for her question. I would direct her to the Labor Party secretariat and if she wishes to write a letter, I am sure the state secretary of the Labor Party has that information. That's not something I have information on or that I am responsible to parliament for.

The PRESIDENT: A further supplementary question, the Hon. Ms Lensink.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: From the original answer?

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:55): From the original answer, indeed. On what basis did the Attorney say that, 'I think that the money has been returned'?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:55): On the basis of reports that I have seen.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:55): Further supplementary: does he agree with Ms Walters' comments or not?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Point of order, Mr President: the honourable member knows that it's out of order to ask a minister an opinion outside of his portfolio.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: You need to protect the Leader of the Government.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Outside of his portfolio.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Brush up on your rules, Michelle.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: You don't come in here with sloppy questions. You never liked it when you were a minister.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Don't you come in here with sloppy questions.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Enough!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Enough!

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: And your Premier called my comments cute.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: What an insult.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

WILD DOG EXHIBITION

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister inform the chamber about the official launch of Wild Dog at Tandanya?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:56): I thank the honourable member for his question and his very longstanding interest, I think from the very start of the time he was a member in this place and before that, in the area of Aboriginal affairs and certainly Aboriginal art and exhibitions.

A short time ago, I was deeply honoured to attend and speak at the official opening of Wild Dog, the premiere held at Tandanya National Aboriginal Cultural Institute in Adelaide. Wild Dog is an immersive installation and exhibition exploring the importance of one of Australia's most misunderstood but significant cultural symbols: the dingo.

The exhibition that was showing up until the end of last month showcased artistic materials that had been created by artists across communities and across five nations, including the Narungga nation in SA, the Kurna nation, the Lardil nation in Queensland, the Kaiadilt nation in Queensland and the Bunun nation in Taiwan.

The project, conceived and artistically directed by Kurna and Narungga artist Jacob Boehme, has been created to preserve and maintain the Wild Dog story. Often regarded as a pest to agriculturalists, the kadli, or dingo, has been and continues to be a significant living figure in Aboriginal cultures and a presence within Australia.

Presented by Tarnanthi, Wild Dog featured renowned artists Jacob Boehme, Sonya Rankine, James Henry, Kaine Sultan-Babij, Tjarutja First Nations Dance Collective, Netta Loogatha, Roxanne Thomas, Aluaiy Kaumakan and Biung Ismahasan, amongst others. The exhibition featured film, animation, puppetry, dance, song and immersive artworks, along with a public program of panels and talks that further explored the themes within the works. There were also school holiday workshops and shadow art and Kurna night sky talks with people such as University of South Australia astronomy lecturer Paul Curnow.

Leading up to the exhibition, works were held in Point Pearce and Port Adelaide, with local children learning about country and culture from elders. The project included significant work and consultation with elders where, by 2021, an additional extensive consultation with Narungga elders was undertaken at Stenhouse Bay Hall where, I am informed, some 50-plus Narungga elders and community members gathered over the three days to discuss Wild Dog and other related stories.

Simultaneously, consultations with Kurna elders have been ongoing. Senior Kurna elders such as Uncle Lewis O'Brien and Aunty Lynette Crocker worked with Jacob to gather, collate and record stories about Kurna's relationship with the dingo. They explored themes of the dingo's role and significance to Kurna people in dreaming stories and as a cultural symbol.

I commend the work of Jacob Boehme, the artistic director, who has created this outstanding opportunity and outcome for cultural learning. Jacob's work is a fantastic opportunity for Aboriginal people to tell their own stories in their own way as well as engaging with children to learn important cultural stories that were taken away or have never been taught. It is a significant cultural revival project of stories and knowledge that communities have lost through colonisation, particularly for Kurna and Narungga.

I am pleased that this project has had such a strong focus on young people and engagement with young people and will continue to educate through a digital online portal that will be accessible in the world.

REGIONAL COUNCIL AMALGAMATIONS

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 Primary Industries and Regional Development on the topic of council amalgamations in the regions.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Yesterday, the Malinauskas government announced its intention to introduce a bill to include an amalgamation plebiscite in November's council election ballots for residents of Mount Gambier and Grant. Just last month, the state of New South Wales started the process to demerge some regional councils that merged just five years ago.

Financial and staffing issues have made it unworkable for the Cootamundra-Gundagai Regional Council to manage such a large landmass. Other councils in New South Wales have now indicated that they are investigating demerging, such as the Inner West Council, Canterbury Bankstown Council and Central Coast Council. My questions to the minister are:

1. Were the City of Mount Gambier and the District Council of Grant consulted before this announcement was made?
2. Has the minister been engaged in discussions with regional communities regarding potential council mergers?

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. In terms of whether there has been engagement with local communities about a potential merger, it's the sort of issue that comes up very regularly, particularly in regard to the District Council of Grant and the City of Mount Gambier. I live in the District Council of Grant and often the issue around potential amalgamation is raised.

What's really key here is that the proposal gives a high level of consultation to local communities. If legislation passes this place and the other place, people will be asked the question—I don't have the exact wording, but I am paraphrasing—'Do you want further investigation of a potential amalgamation?' That involves a high level of involvement by the local community to determine whether they want it further investigated.

REGIONAL COUNCIL AMALGAMATIONS

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:02): Supplementary question: has the minister spoken directly with the City of Mount Gambier and the District Council of Grant to gauge their views on whether such a plebiscite should be put?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:03): The Minister for Local Government is obviously the lead in regard to this and so that question I will direct to him.

REGIONAL COUNCIL AMALGAMATIONS

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:03): Further supplementary: has the issue of a plebiscite as a vehicle to deal with amalgamations been raised with the minister in her capacity as the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:03): I have had some informal discussions with individuals who live in the area.

REGIONAL COUNCIL AMALGAMATIONS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:03): Supplementary: as the Minister for Regional Development, has the minister herself had any conversations with the City of Mount Gambier or the city of Grant in regard to this plebiscite?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, do you choose to answer?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:04): It's appropriate for the Minister for Local Government to have discussions in regard to local government.

REGIONAL COUNCIL AMALGAMATIONS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:04): Supplementary question from the original answer—

The PRESIDENT: I will listen to it.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Does the minister think that as Minister for Regional Development it's not appropriate for her to have conversations with these councils regarding such significant legislative changes?

The PRESIDENT: No.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will make the call.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN (15:04): My question is to the Attorney-General regarding domestic violence. What does the Attorney-General have to say to Emma Walters, who has described the response by the South Australian Premier's behaviour as:

...a normalisation of domestic violence, bully tactics and coercive control where it becomes quietly acceptable.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:05): I thank the honourable member for her question. To anyone who has suffered domestic violence, I would say I am sorry for your experience and, as legislators, we have done on both sides and continue to do all we can to protect those who suffer this sort of violence.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:05): Would the Attorney-General be prepared to meet with Emma Walters to understand her experience of coercive control?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:05): I am always prepared to meet with people, particularly who put their lived experience to me about how we should best make policies.

HIGH SCHOOL AQUACULTURE PROGRAMS

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:06): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about the important announcement the government has made regarding high school aquaculture programs?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:06): I thank the honourable member for his question. It was a pleasure for me to be able to visit Port Lincoln High School recently during one of my visits to the region to announce that the Malinauskas Labor government will be waiving the licence fees for the six schools around the state that hold an aquaculture licence.

The six schools—Ceduna, Lucindale, Cowell, Kingston, Kangaroo Island and Port Lincoln—will have their fees waived for 2022-23. The schools all hold land-based licences. There are several reasons why this is a fantastic announcement for our schools and for our aquaculture industry. The attraction, education and retention of skilled workers has been identified as a major barrier and one of the key areas of support needed to ensure a growing aquaculture industry.

Having the opportunity to educate students in aquaculture and potential employment pathways available to them while they are contemplating their careers is crucial for the longevity of the industry. The skills, and just as importantly, the passion for this kind of work that students can

obtain in these settings is invaluable. Places like Port Lincoln that are built on the seafood industry will need future generations to be just as passionate as generations past.

The aquaculture program at Port Lincoln High School has been run by Mr Chris McGowan since its inception in 2001 and I was fortunate to have Mr McGowan show me around the facility on the day. I was really impressed by his absolute passion for teaching on the subject. He really has quite an infectious enthusiasm and a huge wealth of knowledge developed over many years that is clearly of great benefit to the students.

It is hard not to be impressed also by the fantastic setup that the school has that was undeniably the hard work of Mr McGowan and his team and has been achieved over a 20-year period. There are eight large grow-out tanks, a processing room and a classroom setup. Those eight tanks housed barramundi that the students have been growing since they were fingerlings at the start of the year and are now starting to grow to a good size.

I can attest personally that they love their dinnertime after having had the opportunity to feed them and they certainly get very excited—the barramundi that is, not necessarily the students, but maybe so. Barramundi are the species of choice in this program due to their growth being well aligned to running the program throughout the school year.

As mentioned, the students grow the barramundi from fingerlings at the start of the school year and follow the process right through the end of the year, where they package and sell their product. Throughout that process, students are learning about water quality, feeding, breeding and so much more, along with work placements and industry exposure.

The programs are run by small and dedicated teams with limited resources and that is why this licence fee waiver is important. It means that the money that would have been spent on licence fees paid to the government can now be spent on an upgrade of equipment or used to replace an item or for any reason that the schools see fit in benefiting their aquaculture programs that the students enjoy taking part in so much.

I very much look forward to visiting some of the other schools that this measure will assist. I know that, if they are anything like Port Lincoln, they are doing a great job in getting young people interested in skills in what is such an important part of the state's economy.

HIGH SCHOOL AQUACULTURE PROGRAMS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:09): Supplementary: just in regard to the waiving of the licence fee, can the minister confirm that the waiving of this licence fee will be for these six agricultural schools or schools that have aquaculture in them—will they be continued indefinitely? Is there a time line?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:10): Currently, they are temporary waivers, and I have committed to undertake to see whether we can make them permanent.

HIGH SCHOOL AQUACULTURE PROGRAMS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:10): Further supplementary: the minister says that the fee waiving is temporary. Can the minister outline the time frame? Is it a year, two years, three years, four years?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:10): The setting of licence fees is made each year, so the waiver at this stage can only be for the current year. But as I said, I am looking at ways to make that a permanent waiver.

COVID-19 VACCINE, FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

The Hon. S.L. GAME (15:10): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, on COVID information transparency.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: I have been contacted by a constituent who submitted a freedom of information application to understand the research, studies and datasets behind the 'Get the facts, get the vax' television campaign implemented by SA Health. It took over seven months and an external review intervention by Ombudsman SA to receive a communication containing 21 pages of information about face masks, not vaccines; four publicly available PDFs about the importance of COVID intervention measures; and a line stating, 'Unfortunately, there was no documentation that addressed the description of [the applicant's] application'.

The only two conclusions the applicant and the Ombudsman could draw are that there is no evidence behind the 'Get the facts, get the vax' television campaign or SA Health is deliberately choosing to withhold information and evidence from the community, in contradiction of the Freedom of Information Act 1991.

The review also notes several incidents of procedural contraventions of the legislation, all documented by the Ombudsman. People have genuine concerns over the vaccine, and they want to see information with their own eyes. My question is:

1. Why is the department withholding evidence from people seeking FOIs on important, specific COVID vaccine information?
2. Will the government commit to being timely and transparent with requested information?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:12): I thank the honourable member for her question. I will refer that to the relevant minister in another place and bring back a reply.

FORENSIC SCIENCE SA

The Hon. S.G. WADE (15:12): My questions to the Attorney-General are as follows:

1. What progress has been made in engaging a consultant to progress the capital works and facilities improvements for Forensic Science SA?
2. Can the minister guarantee that Forensic Science SA will be provided with suitable accommodation prior to the end of the current lease on the current premises?
3. How has the minister satisfied himself that this vital service will be appropriately accommodated beyond the current lease?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:13): I thank the honourable member for his very important question. I am aware that there is work that has been started and is ongoing in relation to the Forensic Science premises in Divett Place. As the honourable member points out, its lease is due up—I think it is in 2027, but I will check that.

In terms of the nature of the work and who is doing the work, I am happy to take that on notice and bring back an answer for the honourable member. But I certainly do know that work has started, knowing that there is an end of the current lease, about the future of where Forensic Science South Australia is housed.

FORENSIC SCIENCE SA

The Hon. S.G. WADE (15:14): Supplementary question: I thank the Attorney for his answer. On the point of the facility, as I understand it, not being available to 2027—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I think that's right but I will check.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —will it be the case that the CT scanner to which the minister referred yesterday and announced to the Hon. Frank Pangallo will continue to be housed in the loading bay until 2027?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:14): I thank the honourable member for his question.

I am not sure exactly where that is located, but I am happy to find out and bring back a reply to the honourable member when I answer the substance of the original question.

WORKPLACE HARASSMENT

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:15): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney-General update the council on the recent announcement of funding to combat sexual harassment in the workplace?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:15): I certainly will and I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this area. I was pleased recently to join my colleague in the other place, the Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, as well as the new commonwealth Attorney-General, the Hon. Mark Dreyfus, in the federal parliament, in making an important funding announcement in this area.

We announced a commitment to provide funds to the Working Women's Centre of South Australia to allow for additional legal assistance for victims of sexual harassment in the workplace. In announcing the funding, I was very pleased to be able to visit the Working Women's Centre here in the city and speak directly with its director, Abbey Kendall, as well as one of the clients who had benefited from the service the centre provides.

We know that sexual harassment remains a significant issue in workplaces and it is never acceptable for someone to suffer that kind of abuse at work. We also know that it is overwhelmingly women who face this sort of behaviour in the workplace. We are fortunate in South Australia to have the services of the likes of the Working Women's Centre here in Adelaide, to support people who experience this kind of behaviour at work.

Our state's Working Women's Centre is exceptionally well regarded, both in South Australia and nationally, and we are pleased to be providing them this additional boost. It is a good example of state and federal governments working together to deliver results for the community. The funding provided is through the NLAP (National Legal Assistance Partnership) between our two governments. I have had the opportunity already to meet with the new commonwealth Attorney-General, the Hon. Mark Dreyfus, in the short time since he has been sworn into the portfolio, and I am confident that we will have a productive working relationship that can deliver outcomes for South Australia.

One of the areas of collaboration between our governments has been the Australian Human Rights Commission's Respect@Work Report, which detailed the scale of sexual harassment and gender-based violence across the country. The funding for the Working Women's Centre is an important part in implementing recommendation 53 of that report, that all Australian governments provide an increase in recurrent funding to community legal centres, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander legal services and legal aid commissions to provide legal advice and assistance to vulnerable workers who experience sexual harassment, taking into account the particular needs of workers facing intersexual discrimination.

I am pleased that we have been able to work with the commonwealth on delivering extra funds, and I look forward in the future to working with the Working Women's Centre and other providers of legal assistance for women who face harassment in the workplace.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:18): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing in another place, and the Attorney in his capacity as industrial relations minister, a question about overworked doctors.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Research recently published in the Medical Journal of Australia reveals that female doctors are taking their own lives at 227 per cent the rate of the general population; male doctors died of suicide at 141 per cent the rate of other Australians. The pandemic, overwork and shortage of staff are listed as factors in increasing rates of suicide, according to that research. This is supported by an investigation into a potential landmark wage theft legal claim for

doctors, which found that junior doctors in SA are working up to 30 hours unpaid overtime every week, which the lead lawyers warn is 'placing patients and themselves at risk'.

InDaily has reported that a national law firm specialising in group actions, Hayden Stephens and Associates, is mounting a case against SA Health on behalf of the SA Salaried Medical Officers Association for the recovery of unpaid overtime, which if successful could see the government forced to pay out millions of dollars in back pay to doctors. My questions to the minister are:

1. What is the government doing to reduce workplace stress and, hopefully, the number of doctors dying of suicide across the public health system?
2. Are you aware of the legal case being mounted by Hayden Stephens and Associates against SA Health?
3. Have you sought your own advice, in your capacity as industrial relations minister, about the potential financial payout if that claim is successful?
4. How many official claims has SA Health received over the past 12 months from doctors seeking to be compensated for being short-changed?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:20): I thank the honourable member for her question. I will take some elements of that on notice and particularly refer some elements to my colleague in the other place. As the honourable member I think indicated at the start of her answer, it traverses a couple of fields, in industrial relations and in health.

Generally, departments give their own instructions and practices for their workforce in these sorts of claims. Again, I will double-check, but I think that probably workplace claims for someone working in the health system would be the responsibility of the health department and that they give their own instructions, rather than through the industrial relations minister. But I will double-check that for the honourable member.

She also asked about the potential class action. I am aware of it. I think I read a report in InDaily in the last couple of days, so that's the extent of my knowledge, but I certainly will be seeking to understand more about that. In relation to the elements that I don't have information for and which are the responsibility of the Minister for Health, I will refer them to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

BUILDING BETTER REGIONS FUND

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:21): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding regional development.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The Building Better Regions Fund is a federal government grants program that is operated over five rounds, with \$1.15 billion allocated to support regional projects around our state and the nation more broadly. The new federal Labor government has said that it will redesign the grant program, leaving those who applied for \$250 million worth of grants in round 6 between December and February in limbo, including projects in our state such as the transformation of the Mount Gambier and District Saleyards and the upgrade of the facilities at Calperum Station. My questions to the minister are:

1. Is the minister confident that the round 6 grants will be distributed?
2. Has the minister written to her federal colleagues, advocating support for the fund and seeking clarity on the future of the program?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:22): I thank the honourable member for her question. I, too, am disappointed that the former federal Liberal government opened a round in the middle of December and didn't finalise those announcements before the election. I think it has left a lot of uncertainty.

Why they would have done that just prior to an election and going into caretaker is certainly an interesting question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I note the interjections from those opposite, saying that it was because they wanted to grow the regions.

The Hon. R.P. Wortley interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley, I don't need your help.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: If the former federal government had wanted to grow the regions, they would have ensured that those grants actually were finalised to an announcement stage before the election. I think it's really quite fascinating that those opposite continue to talk about what the regions would want, given that they were so wholeheartedly rejected by the regions in the most recent state election. We know the number of—

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Point of order, Mr President: relevance to the question.

The PRESIDENT: It's not actually a point of order.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Government, I don't need your help on this one.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Government, I don't need your help. Minister, please continue your answer.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Thank you, Mr President. We saw at the last state election that, overwhelmingly, regional voters rejected the former Liberal state government. They obviously didn't feel that they were being listened to by those who purported to represent the regions. They obviously felt that the former Liberal government was not interested in growing the regions and, indeed, that they were in a similar situation to the federal government, who didn't bother to finalise round 6 of the Building Better Regions Fund before they went into caretaker mode.

Of course, given the former federal Liberal government lost the federal election, clearly most of the country also found that the former Liberal federal government was not representing their needs, was not caring about looking after them and had failed on every important measure. I think it is quite remarkable for those opposite to come in now purporting to represent the regions, purporting to listen to what regional people want, purporting to care about what regional people want, when we have had four years of absolute disappointment from regional people.

When I was in opposition, obviously I was going around the regions a lot, particularly when I was shadow for regional development, but prior to that as well, and as a regional resident myself. Overwhelmingly, people would come to me and say, 'Look, I never thought I would be voting Labor, but the Liberals have been such a disappointment.' They said, 'The Liberals have been such a disappointment. We had such high hopes. They promised everything and have delivered very little.'

I think it is really quite remarkable for those opposite to now come in and start complaining about what hasn't happened in regional areas when they were in charge for the previous four years, and federally for many more years than that. It really is evidence that they are out of touch, and we continue to hear from those opposite—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, conclude your remarks, please, so we can move on.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Okay. We continue to hear from those opposite—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —about how the electorate got it wrong. We continue to hear from those opposite that actually they were a wonderful government, that actually they did care about the regions, despite the outcome of the election, that actually it is the regions and the electorate in general that misunderstood the Marshall Liberal government. Those silly voters just didn't know when they were well off, and the reason that they have been rejected is that the voters got it wrong.

I think it is important to note that the voters never get it wrong. Democracy is a function of individuals being able to vote based on the policies and the records of the government that is there and the policies that are being promised by the proposed alternative government.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, this is a rather longwinded argument.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Of course, there is a report that was leaked in regard to the reasons for the Liberal Party loss. I don't know if it's purely because of shabby dressing that the Liberals lost. I personally don't think that's the only reason. I think it's because of their lack of policies, their lack of listening, especially their lack of listening to the regions, and their lack of care for regional voters as well as others across the state.

Matters of Interest

R U OK? DAY

The Hon. S.G. WADE (15:27): Tomorrow, Thursday 8 September 2022, is R U OK? Day, a day of national action dedicated to reminding Australians that any day is the day to ask 'Are you okay?' and support those struggling with life. R U OK? Day is an initiative of R U OK?, the national public health promotion charity, and encourages people to have conversations that can help others through difficult times in their lives.

R U OK? was founded by the late Gavin Larkin. Gavin was an advertising executive, but first he was a son, a son who lost his father to suicide. He passionately wanted to do something to prevent others experiencing this loss. He founded R U OK?, which focuses on building the motivation, confidence and skills of the help giver, the person who can initiate a meaningful conversation with someone who is struggling with life. R U OK? knows that a conversation could change a life.

R U OK? contributes to suicide prevention efforts through fostering personal connection and building the capacity of informal support networks, friends, families and colleagues, to be alert to those around them and to be able to identify signs of distress or difficulty. People often do not find it easy to reach out to seek support, nor easy to offer support, but by keeping it simple and breaking down the conversation into everyday language, people are empowered by R U OK? to believe, 'I can and should do this.'

Asking, 'Are you okay?' is something we can all do. A key element of the success of R U OK? is that simplicity—a simple, strong message that cuts through and can mobilise large numbers of people to become more engaged in suicide prevention. Through its four-step conversation model, R U OK? helps people navigate a conversation and provides signposts to support services when the conversation becomes too big.

R U OK? is proudly quirky and distinctive. In an accessible way, R U OK? nudges all Australians to look out for each other in creative, hopeful and vibrant ways. The evidence shows that R U OK? is having an impact. Those exposed to the R U OK? campaign are up to six times more likely to reach out to someone who might be experiencing personal difficulties, compared to those not exposed to the campaign.

Eighty-seven per cent of Australians are now aware of the R U OK? message; 62 per cent have asked someone face to face if something was troubling them one or more times in the last month; and 19 per cent answered, 'I'm not okay,' among those who were asked if they were okay. Sixty per cent of Australians believe R U OK? has reduced the stigma associated with seeking help, and 60 per cent of Australians say R U OK? makes people feel more connected.

R U OK? Day is an important part of raising and maintaining awareness of the R U OK? message and maintaining the social fabric of Australia. One-fifth of Australians actively participate in some form of R U OK? activity throughout the year. This broad community capacity building is vital. Almost 50 per cent of Australians believe that only mental health professionals can engage with a suicidal person, but the reality is that around half of those who die or attempt suicide do not access professional health services in the period prior.

Research shows that vulnerable people may disclose their distress to other services or people around them, people who may be best placed to notice changes, shifts in mood or demeanour, and make the offer of help. Therefore, R U OK? provides a vital component of the overall Australian strategy for suicide prevention and boosts the protective factors for maintaining people's mental health and wellbeing.

R U OK? is a strong, rich thread in the growing tapestry of suicide prevention. The Marshall Liberal government had a strong commitment to enhancing that tapestry. The Suicide Prevention Council was led by the Hon. John Dawkins, the former President of this place and the Premier's Advocate for Suicide Prevention and a former distinguished member of this council. The government delivered Australia's first Suicide Prevention Act. We expanded the Suicide Prevention Networks to 42.

There is much to be done to prevent suicides in South Australia. I have no doubt that broad community-based initiatives such as R U OK? are vital partners with governments at all levels to pursue that goal.

ADELAIDE 500

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:33): Often, a newly elected government has difficult decisions to make, difficult laws to introduce and is forced to take pathways that are not necessarily going to attract widespread approval. The reintroduction of the Adelaide 500 motor race is not one of those instances. The new state Labor government has been given a welcome gift by those on the other side of the house, allowing us to make an easy decision that makes sense, that almost every one favours and that will simply work.

In short, we have been gifted a no-brainer. It is an interesting saying, that, 'no-brainer'. It seems to have been the level of thought the former government used in scrapping, at the first sign of difficulty, an event that had worked for years and put us on the map. Yes, COVID caused a lot of issues and, yes, the former government, at least in the early stages, did a pretty fair job keeping the state running. We are on the record commending them for the things that they did right. But for reasons only the former Marshall government could explain, they closed down something that created wealth and, perhaps more importantly, gave South Australians something to look forward to.

The Adelaide 500 was going to be difficult to maintain while COVID was rampant—we understand that. How about pausing the event for a year or two until everything got back to normal or at least to the new normal? No, the former Liberal government, as it had a habit of doing in previous incarnations, put it in the too-hard basket and they scrapped it altogether.

Fortunately, South Australia has the Labor Party available to make the decisions that require foresight and imagination and does not balk at the tough decisions. We could very easily have said no to the South Australian road improvements that were 25 years overdue, we could have kept the Royal Adelaide Hospital as an outdated medical facility trapped in a 19th century building that made people sick just by visiting.

We could have banned AFL football from the city precinct and denied businesses the opportunity to flourish. We could have simply not worked overtime to encourage the growth and development of the restaurant and dining scene in the city's East End and, more recently, the western side. No, we did not say no to any of those initiatives.

That is the stuff the other side has always done as it counts its pennies, scared to spend money to make money, and goes to frightening lengths to make sure nothing ever changes. It is curious then that the Marshall government chose the Adelaide 500 to be its one significant change. It finally makes a decision to change things and the best it can do is change it back to a time when we did not need to concern ourselves with the obstacles of dealing with a thriving city centre.

No, Labor will not make those sorts of changes. By reintroducing the Adelaide 500 for at least five years, Labor has given the local economy plenty of impetus. We have given tourism operators, restaurants, hotels, cafes and retail outlets a guaranteed time around which they can plan. For some very odd reason, the former government could not see the economic, cultural and uplifting benefits of having this major event in December, followed by all the excitement of the festive season leading into what has become affectionately known as Mad March.

These numbers were somehow lost on the former state government, but Liberal governments do not have a good record at adding up the numbers and making the right decisions based on simple mathematics. Any government that can sell a TAB for less than one year's profit and builds a one-way motorway for almost the same cost as a two-way road cannot list economic foresight as one of its strong suits. Some people panicked when COVID hit. The former government did okay for a while but then dropped the ball on the Adelaide 500 motor race but now thankfully Labor has everything back on track.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

The Hon. S.L. GAME (15:37): Nuclear energy technologies have made huge advancement over the past decades. It is an efficient, low-carbon source of baseload energy and, once established, it is cheap. Let's take a European example: in December 2021, Denmark paid \$US0.391 for each kilowatt hour of electricity used per household. Down the proverbial road, France paid \$US0.187 per kilowatt hour per household. The reason is that 80 per cent of Denmark's power relies on renewables; 57 per cent was wind power alone in December 2021 when those statistics were calculated.

France, on the other hand, is increasing its baseload capacity on more nuclear reactors. They are the largest exporter of electricity in Europe due to how cheaply they can produce masses of clean energy. Fourteen new nuclear reactors are planned across France. In the same year, 2021, the French derived 69 per cent of their baseload power from nuclear sources, with the remainder a mix of renewables and fossil fuels. As countries continue to diversify their energy portfolios, those receiving a lower cost of energy are those increasing the percentage of power from reactors.

Why is high-tech nuclear energy more attractive than green renewables? Nuclear reactors do not emit carbon dioxide into the atmosphere while in operation and also their physical footprint is tiny in comparison to wind and solar, and they are also highly reliable. The uses of uranium are vast, from important medical applications to powering our new submarines. We need processed uranium in our modern society.

I have found some interesting statistics valid as of July 2022. There are currently 440 nuclear reactors operating at over 220 different nuclear power plants, producing 11 per cent of global energy. There are 55 new reactors currently being built in 19 different countries and a further 100 reactors are on order, and 300 proposed reactors are currently on government tables, up for debate, as they weigh the cost of production, maintenance and benefits to their communities.

In terms of reliability, let us look at another international example. In 2016, nuclear energy provided over 20 per cent of the United States' power needs. Importantly, reactors were efficiently operating for 93 per cent of that year, or 336 days. That same year, hydroelectric systems, which you may envisage as steady providers, were only operable for 138 days; wind turbines, only 127 days; and solar electric was only operable for 92 days. Even coal and gas plants had less days of operable energy output than nuclear, due to energy markets rendering them uneconomic to operate.

Of particular interest to our own energy market in South Australia is the development of small modular reactors. These can be connected directly into our existing energy grid or set up in particular locations, such as regional towns or mining sites, to operate independently as off-grid. These small reactors produce under 300 megawatts of energy, have a lower cost than traditional reactors, produce far less waste than traditional reactors and, if introduced effectively, would become the cheapest 24/7 zero emission power source in the country.

There are small modular reactors designed to use dry-cooling operations rather than water cooling, making this a highly appropriate technology for water-scarce South Australia. They can power our desalination plants. They can power our regional and remote towns and they can form part of the power networks for our mining and manufacturing operations. But this technology is

currently inaccessible. Our policies do not allow for nuclear power. We mine uranium, we export it, we store it, but we cannot utilise it for clean, consistent energy. There are several steps we should take swiftly:

- we can remove the barriers to incentivise the private sector for investment;
- we can encourage global high-tech research and development for nuclear innovation across sectors;
- we must establish a working group across states on pathfinding through regulatory blockades;
- we must encourage open-mindedness in considering environmental approvals for specific nuclear power generation proposals across the regions; and
- we here must encourage our federal colleagues to petition the removal of uranium mining, decommissioning and rehabilitation from the definition of 'nuclear action' in the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999. It needs to be reclassified as mining activities, falling under the Mining Act 1971 and other associated legislation.

I encourage everyone to think about the facts before them and consider opening discussions in their party room. The sooner we start doing our jobs and making necessary legislative and regulatory changes, the sooner we can assess the positive impact small modular reactors could have on our economy.

CHILD PROTECTION

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN (15:42): I rise today to call upon the government to appoint a dedicated child protection minister to better protect vulnerable children in our state. I take an interest in the space of child protection as the shadow parliamentary secretary to the shadow attorney-general, responsible for child protection and the prevention of family and domestic violence.

The Malinauskas government is currently in the middle of a child protection crisis. Recent media reports detail harrowing accounts of abuse and neglect of our state's most vulnerable citizens, citizens the government has an obligation to keep safe. Recently, the Adelaide *Advertiser* has launched a Save Our Kids campaign, which calls upon the Malinauskas government to take immediate action.

The opposition has called on Premier Malinauskas to dedicate a standalone child protection minister to protect vulnerable South Australian children with the sole priority of overseeing the Department for Child Protection. The opposition calls upon Premier Malinauskas to urgently reshuffle the portfolios of his 15 ministers, following tragic and distressing incidents involving children who, reports say, were known to the department.

The former Marshall Liberal government had one less person in its cabinet but still had a minister dedicated to working exclusively with the Department for Child Protection. As current Minister for Child Protection, the Hon. Katrine Hildyard, grapples with two additional portfolios, which means the focus is taken away from child protection and away from our state's most vulnerable, after a spate of horrifying incidents in recent months involving vulnerable children, South Australia finds itself confronted with a child protection system that is losing the battle to keep our children safe.

A dedicated child protection minister is needed right now without delay. The current system is not working and urgent action is necessary to protect our children while current reviews are underway. These reviews will likely take months and any recommendations could be years away from being fully implemented. How many reviews must be conducted before we see action and change?

Former police commissioner Mal Hyde is now leading a review of multiple government agencies. In 2014, Mr Hyde conducted a major review into carers working with vulnerable children, but that report was never made public because the former Labor government chose to keep it secret by making it a cabinet document.

The 2014 Hyde review no doubt makes for uncomfortable reading, but not releasing this report fails to assist in any way the protection of vulnerable South Australian children. Learning from the problems of the past will allow us to achieve better policy development in child protection in the future and will ensure that no child is let down or left behind by a system that is at breaking point.

If the current Hyde review is made public, as it should be, it makes little sense why the 2014 report was made a cabinet document and not released. We need the original contents of the Hyde report to be released as a reference point so we can be sure its recommendations have resulted in meaningful changes for vulnerable children. To not do so further shrouds this critical issue in unwarranted secrecy.

We call upon Premier Malinauskas to appoint a dedicated Minister for Child Protection to investigate all notifications made to the department. We no longer want to see files closed without probing reports of potential harm to children. We cannot have a situation where around one-third of reports deemed by the department to require investigation are closed, often due to a lack of resources.

The state Coroner has previously recommended tougher reporting requirements around truancy and holding parents to account for persistently not sending their children to school. We need to better recognise cases where reunification with parents is unrealistic, making long-term guardianship of a child easier to obtain. The 2016 Child Protection Systems Royal Commission made several recommendations. It is time for a dedicated child protection minister to urgently consider them and to enact some positive change.

GRANITE ISLAND LITTLE PENGUINS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:46): I rise today to speak with great sadness and concern about the plight of the little penguins on Granite Island. Our iconic colony of little penguins on Granite Island faces many threats and, devastatingly, their numbers are declining. The current population was estimated last year at some 20 penguins, with a new survey scheduled for the end of the month. Advocates for the little penguins are saying that they are expecting the numbers to be even lower this year. This colony is the last colony on the Fleurieu Peninsula, and the community is rightly worried that the Granite Island penguins might soon be extinct as well.

I had the pleasure of going down to Victor Harbor last week and meeting with some of the dedicated volunteers from the Save the Granite Island Penguins Committee, who are monitoring and fighting to protect this precious and much-loved population of little penguins. The little penguins on Granite Island have been a part of the local environment there for over 100 years. For decades, tourists have come from near and far to see these little penguins, and in that time their population has plummeted.

More than 20 years ago, there were 2,000 penguins on the island. Now, there are barely 20 due to the ongoing threats of climate change, human disturbance and feral animals. There are also concerns that the new causeway will bring a tidal wave of people back to the island which, while great for tourism and the local economy, could lead to further disturbances to the little penguins, and that will affect the colony's ability to breed and survive. These little penguins are a vital part of our state's ecosystem. As we face losing them, we must remember that their loss, even just a further decline in their numbers, can lead to sudden losses and other impacts in our marine ecosystem.

Extinction is forever, but extinction can also be avoided. We know that this little colony's population can bounce back quite well when given the chance. In fact, it had that chance; it was given that chance with the advent of COVID. While people were staying home in 2020 and 2021, the population thrived and bounced back. There were new burrows, penguins roaming, noises, and it looked like there was about to be a bumper breeding season. But then Granite Island was reopened, and we saw a brutal fox attack that set numbers plummeting back down to just 16.

To add to the colony's stresses, this year they have had to contend with the ongoing construction on the island. We know what works and have interstate examples in both WA and Victoria of governments that have stepped in to save their penguin colonies. There are very simple things we can do, including things as basic and long called for by the community as establishing a curfew for visitors on Granite Island around the penguin colony.

We need to be more explicit in our community and tourist education in the area as well. People must keep clear of burrows, with no bright white lights aimed at the penguins. I think, Mr President, you would remember, as I do, when I had my now very adult young children, that people would take their torches and go look for the little penguins. In fact, that torchlight can blind them for an entire day. We need little noise and we definitely need no dogs. We are approaching our last chance to help these little penguins survive.

It is long past time that we needed a strategy to secure the future viability of this population of little penguins in our state. The government and the Department for Environment and Water must step up, and I must say that it is both incredible yet heartbreaking the work that volunteers and academics have had to undertake down there to protect these penguins, with little to no help from the government. Flinders University and the Save the Penguins Group have been paying for signage, research, necropsies for dead birds and for the ongoing monitoring of the colony.

While the department used to contribute some money, it is my understanding that even the paltry funding that they used to get has now been cut. This is not good enough when it comes to the loss of such an iconic and important population of little penguins in our state. There is so much more we could be doing to protect these penguins and I urge the government and the department to consider the following:

- implement a curfew for visitors to the island. It does not have to be permanent, but at least two years—not just one year but two years—so that this population, as it did under COVID, can start to bounce back;
- the funded scientific reports from the department with the recommendations that still have not been implemented need to be implemented;
- increase communication and collaboration with volunteers and researchers who have been monitoring and advocating for these little penguins and, as they said to me last week, 'We just want the government and the department to work with us.'

Time expired.

AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDER

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:51): Australian research published in 2007 found that one in 160 children between the ages of six and 12 years had a diagnosed autism spectrum disorder. Just four years later, the number of people diagnosed with autism, or ASD, was growing by around 14 per cent or 15 per cent annually. The 2018 Census placed over 200,000 Australians as autistic, with 39 per cent of South Australians participating in the NDIS having autism, which is higher than the national average.

Today, right now, one in four Australians has an autistic family member and I am proud to be part of one such family. In truth, for everyone in politics it is not every day that we can so proudly say that what we do best represents who we are but today, I can proudly say, is one of those days for me. I am proud that my Labor Party has taken such great steps towards establishing awareness about those who have a family member like my own.

While I am certain that I was not thinking all that much about having a family at the time, I recall being at a Labor conference in 2010. As part of the then Labor government's election commitments, we announced an additional \$1 million a year for assessment and early intervention services to help those with autism. That was in 2010.

The commitment then, by current standards, was not grand, but it was an echo of what was to come. It marked then, in 2010, clearly that my party, much like myself, was seeking an understanding of the scope of what was facing us. It is fair to say that since that time we have that scope. It is fair to say that with the development of national initiatives like the NDIS there is a level of awareness that is well and truly established in the South Australia community.

Currently, autistic people are half as likely to complete year 10 as anyone else. Currently, autistic people are three times more likely to be unemployed than other people with disabilities. So while we have taken great steps forward, it is well past time that we move beyond just creating awareness and establishing scope.

I can proudly say that now, 12 years on from our 2010 \$1 million dollar commitment, Labor has now moved on to lasting cultural change. We are investing, right now, more than \$28 million to appoint an autism lead teacher in every single public primary school. We are investing \$50 million to fund 100 additional speech pathologists, occupational therapists, psychologists and counsellors for access in public schools. And, of course, unless you were living under a rock you would know that we have the world's first Assistant Minister for Autism, the Hon. Emily Bourke.

I am proud to say that, other than proudly watching our state feature on every single news bulletin, both here, nationally and internationally, our new assistant minister has hit the ground running. In just a few weeks the Hon. Emily Bourke has already established guidelines for autism inclusion teachers. Five of the 16 guidelines are specifically focused on assisting autistic students. The Hon. Ms Bourke has also established the autism advisory group, which consists of parents with lived experience, experts, community stakeholders, unions and, indeed, most helpfully, those with autism.

I look forward to joining the assistant minister and indeed the Premier at the autistic and autism community forum she has organised for this coming Sunday—I think about three weeks after she was first made an assistant minister. I am reliably informed that, unfortunately for everyone, the event is packed out, but I am certain that, consistent with Labor's and indeed Ms Bourke's commitment to the thousands of South Australian families with autism, very much like my own, we will not be short of action taken from it, and I look forward to seeing how far we are going to go.

AGRICULTURAL TOWN OF THE YEAR

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:55): The hunt for the 2022 South Australian Agricultural Town of the Year is down to five. The five finalists were selected from 54 nominated towns across the state after more than 4,000 public votes were cast. The five finalists towns are Crystal Brook, Kapunda, Myponga, Orroroo and Waikerie. Every nominated town should be incredibly proud, and I would like to thank everyone who took the time to enter their town and cast their vote.

All South Australians benefit from a strong agricultural sector and strong regional communities. They are the backbone of our state. Our regions and the industries that make up these regions contribute \$29 billion to the state's economy each year, with less than 27 per cent of the state's population. We punch well above our weight.

It is important that we acknowledge the importance of regions in all of our lives and celebrate this contribution, particularly given the challenges our regions have experienced in recent years. In the last couple of years alone, they have adapted to drought, frost, COVID-19 restrictions, bushfires and trade barriers.

Previous finalists and winners of the South Australian Agricultural Town of the Year have unearthed stories of resilience, community spirit and determination. I am very proud that this award, established in 2019, was an initiative of the former Liberal government, and I am pleased to see that the current government is continuing this excellent program.

It is a wonderful way to highlight our regional towns and their support in promoting agriculture. It is about recognising townships that excel in agricultural lifestyles and the influence these towns have on the region. It is also a valuable avenue for communities to learn from one another, showcase their innovation and help to build capacity and increase growth in regional South Australia.

The inaugural title was taken out by Cleve on central Eyre Peninsula in 2019. The winter break was so long that I was able to visit Cleve twice during that period as well as other areas on Eyre Peninsula. Cleve is a buzzing country town that has a strong agricultural community and active agricultural research groups, which are constantly working towards improving agricultural practices throughout the region and beyond.

In 2020, the Agricultural Town of the Year was Pinnaroo, a town I am very familiar with, having visited often during my time as a mixed practice veterinarian in the Riverland and Mallee region, and in 2021 Kimba, a town with a rich agricultural history, especially with dryland farming, was named Agricultural Town of the Year.

It is fantastic to see a diverse range of finalists vying for the title in 2022, representing different aspects of agriculture but all bringing jobs to their area and driving regional development in this state. Incredibly, Kapunda has been a finalist every year since the first award in 2019. Orroroo and Mypolonga have also been finalists before, and it is wonderful to see Crystal Brook and Waikerie as new additions to the top five this year.

The town of Kapunda is a town that primarily produces cereal crops, such as wheat, barley and oats. Their use of local value-adding services has increased productivity in the region—services such as stockfeed milling and hay processing, which is really benefiting the community. Orroroo, north of Peterborough, is a town that is a service centre for the surrounding farming district, which is largely cereal cropping and pastoral land. It has seen heavy drought in recent times, but the community resilience has been remarkable.

Mypolonga, a town along the Murray River, has also been incredibly resilient. It has been traditionally an orchard and dairy farming soldier settlement but has adapted into new industries and evolved into a boutique market town which is bustling. Crystal Brook, a town in the South Flinders Ranges, has been an agricultural hub for generations, and there is a real sense of productivity in the town, with many start-up local agricultural businesses flourishing, helping to drive jobs and regional growth.

Lastly, Waikerie, located in my home of the Riverland, is a town with a diverse set of industries. From agriculture and dryland farming to horticulture, with many citrus orchards and vineyards, Waikerie has a wonderful sense of community and a proud history in irrigation with the Golden Heights irrigation scheme.

Finalists will now go through a judging process with an independent panel of judges to visit each of the finalist towns individually. The 2022 Agricultural Town of the Year will be announced on 4 November, and I wish all of the finalists the very best of luck. I think they are all worthy of taking out the prize, and I am glad I am not on the judging panel, as they have a tough job ahead of them.

Motions

TELEPHARMACY REGULATIONS

Notices of Motion, Private Business, No. 5: Hon. C. Bonaros to move:

That the regulations under the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010 concerning telepharmacy, made on 17 February 2022 and laid on the table of this council on 3 May 2022, be disallowed.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:02): I will not be proceeding with Notice of Motion, Private Business No. 5.

Notice of motion withdrawn.

ROACH, MR A.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:02): I move:

That this council expresses its sincere regret at the death of singer songwriter Archie Roach and notes his profound contribution to our cultural and community life.

Archie Roach is best known as a singer songwriter, but he was a proud Maar nation and Bundjalung man who will be mourned for a long time for his contribution to our cultural and community life. It is a very sad moment for the community, but I do believe that the legacy of Archie Roach and his legend will live on far beyond his life.

When Archie Roach first performed his breakout song *You Took the Children Away*, he was a support act for Paul Kelly and it was the year 1989. He thought he had tanked. He finished the song and the crowd stayed silent. Thinking he had missed his chance, he turned to leave the stage and, as he did, the crowd began to applaud and the applause just kept coming. Paul Kelly at the time described it as like nothing he had ever seen before, just an incredible reaction. The silence of the crowd was because they needed time to process what they had just heard and, once they did, history had been made. Roach's words were raw and his rendition was gentle, but the effect was incredibly powerful.

Archie Roach's poignant words draw attention to the history of Indigenous Australia. Uncle Archie was stolen at the age of four. He and his Scottish foster family were told that his parents had died in a fire. When Archie was 15 years old, he received a letter from a sister he did not even know he had. That letter told him that his birth mother had just died and that his parents had not died in a fire, as he had grown up believing. Like others who had their identity and culture stolen from them, this news was a catalyst for Archie. He left his foster family, and over the following decades he experienced periods of homelessness and alcoholism.

It was during this time that Archie met the love of his life, Ruby Hunter. While they were both living on the streets of Adelaide—and I certainly remember them busking on the streets of Adelaide—they formed a bond that would last 35 years, the rest of Ruby's life. Ruby was a proud Ngarrindjeri-Erawirung woman. She was born in 1955 near the banks of the Murray River. When she was eight years old, government authorities came and told her grandmother, who was caring for her, that they were taking the children to the circus. Ruby was stolen, separated from her sisters and brothers and taken into the Seaforth Children's Home.

At the age of 16 years she left, and, with no family and nowhere to go, she ended up on the streets of Adelaide. It was here that Ruby and Archie met, homeless on the streets of Adelaide. It was Archie who inspired Ruby to learn to play the guitar and to write her own music. Ruby was the first Aboriginal woman to sign a major recording deal, and she created her debut album, *Thoughts Within*, as a result. Her second album, *Feeling Good*, earned her the best female performer of the year award at the 2000 Deadly Awards.

Ruby has been remembered as a nurturing soul who, through her music, campaigned for the rights of Aboriginal women and children; indeed, this support extended far beyond her songwriting. Indeed, she and Archie over the years supported, fostered and provided a home to more than 30 Aboriginal children in the Riverland, without any government support. Ruby and Archie's dedication to helping those young people in the Riverland has not been forgotten and will not be forgotten. Indeed, there are memorials that were unveiled on the Barmera lakefront in honour of this.

Back in 1989, when Paul Kelly asked Archie Roach to support his show, Archie had actually said no. I was struck by an interview with Ruby Hunter at the time, in which he said to Ruby that he just wanted to play music to his community and not be some big music star. She was sitting with him at the table, and she looked him in the eye and said, 'It's not always about you, Archie Roach.' It was not just about Archie Roach; it was about his music and his words and the way they resonated with those who shared similar stories and who felt that finally their lives were reflected and recognised—they moved so many of us.

Both of these artists have a legacy of putting other people first. They put their community first. They used their artistic success to foster generations of others. Archie and Ruby both found support and strength in each other, and through this they created a body of cultural work that will endure and a community that will be forever grateful. Ruby encouraged Archie to translate his experience of despair and homelessness into music that resonated not just across our nation but across the world. Ruby and Archie supported their community and opened their homes to those who needed them.

I think there could be no better tribute than the South Australian parliament recognising the cultural and community contribution that Archie Roach and, of course, Ruby Hunter have made. With that, I commend the motion.

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

Bills

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE (WOMBAT BURROWS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:09): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:10): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise today to bring back a piece of legislation that I previously introduced that is still, regrettably, necessary. Unfortunately, we still have people in our community who feel they have the right to be cruel to animals, and so here we are. Further, we appear to have government departments that are unwilling to enforce our existing laws and protect our native animals. I commend the work of dedicated wildlife carers, and in particular Brigitte Stevens from the Wombat Awareness Organisation, for their dedication to protecting and advocating for our beloved wombats.

The bill I have introduced to the chamber today would make it explicitly illegal to bury wombats alive. I think most people would be shocked to hear that such legislation would be necessary, but it is. The southern hairy-nosed wombat is the faunal emblem of our state, and though it was once widespread in semi-arid regions of our state the species is now restricted to isolated populations.

Wombats are supposed to be a protected species in South Australia and technically they can only be killed under certain circumstances and with a permit. However, often during farming or construction work they can be seen as a nuisance, in particular because of their burrows, so those burrows are filled in, sometimes quite deliberately, with the wombats still inside. These wombats are then doomed to die a slow and horrible death.

This is a clear sign that our laws are inadequate and not properly enforced. The current provisions under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 allow a penalty for killing a hairy-nosed wombat without a permit at \$2,500 or six months' imprisonment. I want to be clear: even with a permit, it is not permissible to kill a wombat by burying it alive. Yet, it is estimated that hundreds of wombats are killed by being buried alive every year as their burrows are bulldozed, and nothing is being done to prevent this.

Wombats cannot dig themselves out of bulldozed burrows as they have nowhere to put the soil. They become entombed and they suffocate. If the wombats are not helped, they can live for up to 21 days once their burrows have been filled in. This is a truly horrible, slow and painful death. This form of eradication can be stopped by protecting wombat burrows by law.

Wombat burrows house many other species of wildlife, such as echidnas, small native mammals, reptiles and birds. They are ecosystems in their own right. So many of our beautiful endangered wildlife rely on wombat burrows for habitat and they too are buried alive with the wombats. The killing has to stop. We need to find a better way to coexist with these beautiful animals, and we need to actually protect them, not just pay lip service that we are doing so.

Wombat burrows are sometimes seen as a nuisance to landowners, but this is in no way, shape or form an appropriate response to a perceived nuisance. Wombats are iconic native animals, and this cruelty is unwarranted and unacceptable. At present, it is the responsibility of the Department for Environment and Water to ensure that wombats are not being killed in this way, but the experience over many years has been that reports of wombats being buried have been met with indifference at best.

Indeed, I am reminded of an incident in 2017. When reports of wombats being buried alive were raised with the department, they issued a statement that investigators 'do not believe that any wombats are trapped underground', but seven dead wombats had been collected from the property. The day after that statement was released, we were further informed by the then department—DEWNR, now DEW—that the advice they had received from some unidentified wombat expert was that 'any buried wombats would be able to dig themselves out' and that they had removed no dead wombats from the property.

The inconsistency and the unwillingness to take action to rescue buried wombats was disappointing at best and continues to be disappointing today. In fact, that is a very tame word before those actions. Even last year, I shared with this chamber the disturbing story of wombats being buried alive once again, this time at Lake Carlet.

The incident was reported to the RSPCA, which was unable to assist as wildlife matters were under the department's jurisdiction. It was then reported to the department, which indicated that they would investigate. It was then reported to SAPOL, which was unable to, as the footage did not show

the wombats being maimed or injured. What an utterly ridiculous situation. This is not the first time I have raised the issue of wombats being buried alive.

Despite being repeatedly being told that wombats are protected and that this is technically illegal under the act, wombats are still being buried alive and no-one is being held responsible, and no-one is stepping up. With this bill, I want to act on the calls that have been made for some years by the community, and in particular the calls of the Wombat Awareness Organisation, and make burying wombats alive and destroying their burrows explicitly illegal.

People who are responsible for such horrific killing of wombats need to be brought to justice. We must ensure that we have the right tools to properly prosecute those who break our laws and the laws must be explicit in condemning and preventing animal cruelty. There is never an excuse for such a senseless and cruel killing of animals, especially when the animals in question are our precious and threatened native fauna. It is only by showing that there are significant repercussions to these incidents of animal cruelty that we can start to protect them properly. With that, I commend the bill to the chamber.

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

Motions

RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES ACT REVIEW

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

That this council—

1. Notes that the state government is undertaking a review of the Residential Tenancies Act.
2. Recognises that the voices of renters should be included in all deliberations.
3. Calls on the Malinauskas government to:
 - (a) end no-cause evictions;
 - (b) introduce rent capping to protect vulnerable people from unfair rent hikes;
 - (c) give renters security and stability through long-term tenancies;
 - (d) prohibit 'no pets' clauses in leases;
 - (e) end rent bidding that forces unfair rent increases; and
 - (f) ensure all homes meet energy efficiency and ventilation standards.

The motion I am moving today recognises that the state government is undertaking a review of the Residential Tenancies Act, notes that the voice of renters should be included in the government's deliberations and calls on the government to address some of the serious issues with the Residential Tenancies Act in South Australia.

The Greens, for some time, have been calling on this Labor government and, indeed, the previous Liberal government, to bring South Australia into line with other jurisdictions across our country by:

- ending no-cause evictions;
- introducing rent capping to protect vulnerable people;
- providing security and stability for renters through providing for longer term tenancies;
- prohibiting 'no pets' clauses in leases, which we know force many people into homelessness and also force pets out onto the street;
- ending rent bidding, which forces unfair increases; and
- ensuring that homes meet energy efficiency and ventilation standards.

I want to commend the Malinauskas government for undertaking a review of the Residential Tenancies Act. It is well overdue. Last month, I was given the opportunity to observe a round table

convened by the minister and the consumer commissioner, Dini Soulio, to look at the Residential Tenancies Act, and that included a range of stakeholders.

I was concerned, however, that the Anti-Poverty Network was not included in those discussions because we know that what happens in the rental market has a huge impact on poverty and that people who are forced out of residential tenancies are often plunged into homelessness, particularly in the middle of this rental crisis. It was an oversight of the government to not include the Anti-Poverty Network in those deliberations, and the Greens are very keen to ensure that the voice of renters is front and centre of this review. I urge the government to ensure that they are talking to those who are directly impacted by the Residential Tenancies Act.

We know that for far too long this act has been skewed in favour of landlords. That is the way our system works. One of the big problems we face in South Australia are no-cause evictions, which allows a landlord, at the end of a fixed-lease tenancy, a 12-month tenancy, to say, 'Well, that's it; you're out.' We know that what that means is that a number of tenants are reluctant to come forward with legitimate issues concerning their tenancy.

I have had many constituents contact me, not only as a member of this place but also in my former life as an Adelaide City councillor, a number of tenants contacting me talking about issues that they have had in getting their landlord to make basic changes to the property or to undertake basic maintenance. Many of these tenants are in fear of taking a landlord through to the tribunal because they are worried that they are going to earn a reputation as a bad tenant, that they are not going to have their lease renewed and that they are going to find themselves homeless. This is a situation that is exacerbated by the record low vacancy rate we have in South Australia.

I welcome the review, but it is integral that the government consults with renters, the people who are directly affected, and it is integral that they take the action that is needed to fix our Residential Tenancies Act so that South Australians do not find themselves in a situation where they have less protections than their counterparts in other states.

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

Bills

GAS (BAN ON NEW CONNECTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:21): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Gas Act 1997. Read a first time.

Second Reading

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill seeks to ban all new gas connections for new builds from 2025. We are taking this step because we are in the midst of a climate emergency in South Australia. The South Australian parliament has passed a climate emergency declaration and it is time for us to take action to transition away from dirty fossil fuels. Unless we keep global warming to below 1.5°, the IPCC claims that South Australia will see more hot days, declining rainfall, more drought and more dangerous fire conditions.

To meet climate targets we must reduce our reliance on fossil fuels, and that includes natural gas. Gas is a non-renewable resource and we need to start transitioning to sources of energy that are not going to run out over time. Some argue that gas produces less emissions than coal and should be used as a transition fuel source, and it is true that gas is less emitting than coal, but if we power our electricity grid with renewables rather than coal, electricity is a far cleaner option. The Grattan Institute states:

The transition fuel argument should not distract from the fact that Australia, and the rest of the world, must consume less gas over time to reduce the effects of climate change.

Fifty-six per cent of South Australian homes are connected to gas. As a non-renewable resource, gas is going to increase in price as supply reduces. The Grattan Institute report indicated that gas prices will climb in the coming year, putting extra pressure on families who are locked into gas connections in their home.

Renewable energy is now seen as substantially cheaper to produce than natural gas, with prices continuing to fall; therefore, our best solution for household energy needs is to transition to solar and wind to reduce emissions rather than relying on gas and non-renewable fossil fuel. This bill starts the process by banning future connections from January 2025.

I understand that only 7 per cent of South Australians use gas for cooking, but many cooks and chefs have now publicly stated that they are turning to induction cooking, given it is superior in terms of precision and speed. I will have to take their word on that. I am not renowned for my cooking skills, but I have heard that the induction cooktop is a lot better.

I commend the Malinauskas government's commitment to green hydrogen as an alternative fuel source, but the reality is we are not yet in a position where we can pump green hydrogen through the existing gas network, so what we really need to be doing is banning gas connections for new builds. I do not intend to provide much further detail on this bill at this point because you will be hearing a bit from me over the next little while. With that, I conclude my remarks.

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

FOOD (RESTRICTIONS ON ADVERTISING JUNK FOOD) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:26): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Food Act 2001. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:27): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill seeks to place restrictions on junk food advertising in South Australia. It seeks to prohibit junk food advertising within 500 metres of schools and it seeks to prevent junk food from being advertised on publicly owned buildings and properties, including bus stops, train stops, trams and the like.

Any parent knows the power that advertising has over children. Kids take ads at face value and they respond accordingly to bright colours, catchy jingles and the promise of free toys. It is often referred to as pester power, I believe. Studies have shown that children are more likely to request unhealthy food from their parents after exposure to junk food advertising and so parents are forced to either give in to unhealthy food or find themselves in a state of constant friction with their child.

Really, parents are pitched in a David and Goliath fight. Those who are seeking to ensure their children have healthy food are being pitched against multimillion dollar corporations that are intent on trying to sell junk food to their kids. We know these ads work. That is why advertising companies spend over \$550 million every year on food and non-alcoholic drinks in Australia.

Advertisements are placed where kids are most likely to see them: near schools, near sporting arenas or on public transport. According to the National Obesity Strategy report, the majority of foods advertised are high in fat, high in sugar, high in salt and low in nutrition. Australia has one of the highest rates of obesity in the world with one in four children being overweight or obese.

Being overweight or obese can affect a person's health and wellbeing, but it can also limit their economic and social opportunities. There are direct costs in terms of increased health costs both to the individual and the state, but there are increased indirect costs too. Absenteeism, reduced productivity and early retirement are just some of the examples that have been cited in the research, and we have all come to understand over recent years the importance of public health.

Young people are further at risk of weight-related discrimination. School-aged children with unhealthy weight are more likely to be bullied, which can trigger subsequent mental health issues.

Children living with obesity have reported lower quality of life, and it has been shown that discrimination experienced at school can lead to lower quality of education, as learning can be impacted by prejudice, social rejection and bullying.

The World Health Organization has stated that preventative measures are the best approach to childhood obesity and can lead to reduced risk of subsequent adult obesity. The National Obesity Strategy of 2022 has set a target of reducing overweight and obesity in children and adolescents aged two to 17 years by at least 5 per cent by 2030. To achieve this target, they have set out several strategies, one of which is to reduce children's exposure to unhealthy food and drink marketing, promotion and sponsorship.

Advertising plays a major part in childhood obesity. According to the Cancer Council, 53 per cent of students were prompted to try a new food or drink in response to advertising. Food advertising can have huge impacts on the emotional response of a child. A UK study demonstrated the emotional reaction of children after seeing junk food advertisements. The kids in the study reported feeling 'happy, excited, hungry and tempted to eat the advertised food immediately'.

Academic research from Western Australia looked at how marketing affects children, with research showing that children are vulnerable as they lack cognitive skills to understand the persuasive intent of marketing. In a New South Wales study, it was found that 83 per cent of food advertising was for unhealthy food, indicating that kids are exposed to a high proportion of unhealthy food ads.

A call to ban junk food advertising in certain places has come from the South Australian Public Health Association, the Cancer Council SA as well as the Australian Medical Association. This is not a radical green idea. It has widespread community support. Indeed, the AMA has called for advertising and marketing of unhealthy food and beverages to children to be prohibited entirely. This initiative also has significant support among parents.

The Cancer Council of Victoria reports that 82 per cent of parents think that it is unethical for the processed food industry to market unhealthy food in places popular with kids. Just last week, the Australia Institute released a report on junk food advertising on television. Two in three Australians agreed that junk food ads should be banned during children's viewing hours.

In a federal government survey, 78 per cent of respondents agreed that 'strategies to reduce exposure to marketing and promotion of unhealthy food and drink were extremely or very helpful'. Additionally, participants in the study from the health and education sectors favoured 'stronger approaches to advertising' and restrictions on promoting unhealthy foods.

The bill we are considering today should make sure junk food advertising is prohibited in certain places frequented by children—that is, within 500 metres of any school, on buses, tram stops or railway stations, or on any state government property. These measures have been implemented in other jurisdictions. Indeed, South Australia is the odd man out. In Queensland, they have banned junk food advertising at more than 200 government-owned spaces, including train stations, bus stops and road corridors. Studies in other states have shown that between 61 per cent and 83 per cent of all advertisements on public transport are for unhealthy food.

In 2015, the ACT banned junk food advertising on public buses. In countries such as the UK, Amsterdam and Brazil, there are examples of bans of junk food advertising on government property and public transport. This is a very easy step that we can take to protect young people from the impact of junk food.

This bill goes one step further. It restricts unhealthy food advertising within 500 metres of schools. Kids on their way home from school are exposed to an increasing number of unhealthy food and drink advertisements. In Victoria, a study found that 62 per cent of food ads near Melbourne schools promoted unhealthy food and drinks. Hungry kids leaving school in the afternoon do not need to be enticed to make unhealthy food choices. Instead, we need to be promoting healthy lifestyles to set our young people up for success.

Banning junk food advertising near schools, on public transport and on government property is not a difficult thing for us to do to address obesity in South Australia. This is a proposal that is

modest, but it is one that has widespread support—support amongst parents and support amongst public health advocates. I hope that all members of this place will get behind this simple reform.

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

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (USE OF VACANT LAND) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

Motions

PROHIBITION OF NEO-NAZI SYMBOLS

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:36): I seek leave to move Notice of Motion, Private Business, No. 25 standing in my name in an amended form.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: I move:

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on the prohibition of Neo-Nazi symbols, with particular reference to:
 - (a) the symbols used to identify and promote Neo-Nazi and other ideologically motivated (extreme far right) groups, and options to prohibit their display;
 - (b) the activities of Neo-Nazi and other ideologically motivated extremist groups in South Australia;
 - (c) discrimination faced by Jewish South Australians and other groups within the community targeted by Neo-Nazi and other ideologically motivated extremist groups;
 - (d) prohibitions on such symbols in other jurisdictions, including proposed prohibitions;
 - (e) the requirements of the Australian Constitution and other legal matters relevant to the prohibition of Neo-Nazi symbols; and
 - (f) any other relevant matters.
2. That the committee consist of four members and that the quorum of members necessary to be present at all meetings of the committee be fixed at three members.
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.

In moving this motion, I am pleased to call for the establishment of this committee. The image of a fascist salute on the steps of the Adelaide Holocaust Museum and Steiner Education Centre was abhorrent. There has been no consequence for this action because currently this is not a prohibited activity.

The Australia wide Neo-Nazi organisation responsible for this action and the ideologically motivated extremist groups need to be investigated and dealt with. Many of you would have read the article published in the *On Dit* student paper at the University of Adelaide calling for death to the state of Israel. Again, there have been no consequences for this publication because this is not a prohibited activity.

Any practical tools we can give our law enforcement the better, and any sensible way we can keep our communities safer. I want to assure the public that this select committee will include a broad community of constituents affected by these organised groups. We will consult with the local Jewish community, people of gender diversity, the disabled community, people of other ethnicities and races, all of whom have been targeted by Neo-Nazi groups.

The committee will help to identify the scope of the problem and hear suggestions from experts on how to resolve this. As previously mentioned, this is not about stopping historical displays or educational pieces. It is not about banning the use of ancient religious symbols. It is about halting

the glorification of Nazis and the intimidation of the community by the brazen use of a hate symbol. All avenues should be approached in the effort to stamp out racial hatred. I trust my colleagues here to agree that establishing a select committee is the right thing to do.

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

PARENTAL ALIENATING BEHAVIOURS

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:39): I seek leave to move Notice of Motion, Private Business, No. 26, standing in my name, in an amended form.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: I move:

That this council acknowledges that—

1. Parental alienating behaviours are a form of child abuse and family violence and there are three documented levels of alienation:
 - (a) mild parental alienation: where a child maintains contact with the targeted parent but has become influenced and aligned with the alienating parent;
 - (b) moderate parental alienation: when transition to a targeted parent's care is difficult for a child because of the alienating parent's pattern of behaviour and language and after transition, the child will bond with the targeted parent; and
 - (c) severe parental alienation: a child emphatically rejects the targeted parent and refuses all interaction.
2. Parental alienating behaviours may include:
 - (a) emotional harm;
 - (b) coercion and fear tactics;
 - (c) threats, intimidation, stalking and harassment;
 - (d) physical and sexual abuse of both the child and/or the targeted parent;
 - (e) economic exploitation;
 - (f) gaslighting and manipulation; and
 - (g) isolation and abduction.
3. The impacts of parental alienating behaviours are long lasting for the alienated child, targeted parent and targeted extended family and support members.

A 2021 Australian research paper defines parental alienating behaviours as:

A form of family violence during and/or after separation when a targeted parent is rejected by his/her children for no justifiable reason. The rejection is provoked by nothing more than a campaign of alienating behaviours used by an alienating parent and his/her allies to hinder the relationship.

Parent alienation has a negative impact on all members of the family affected by it and it occurs regardless of nationality, religion or gender.

I want to see the parliament and the courts taking this matter seriously. It is a well documented issue, researched by people in Australia and around the world. To ignore its existence is to perpetuate family violence. It extends to grandparents and other family members—all those who play an important role in a child's upbringing. I am dedicated to ensuring that parental alienating behaviours become legitimised as abuse in legislation and regulations. To the children involved, it causes an utter corruption of their reality and can cause a loss of identity and connection to family, community and relationships.

Parental alienation occurs through a pervasive, targeted campaign that seeks to create conflict and distrust between the child and one of the parents, despite any former positive relationship. A groundbreaking 2016 study utilising telephone interviews produced the first known representative poll to determine the prevalence of alienating behaviours. The results were staggering: it suggested that millions of adults and their children may be impacted by alienating behaviours and that it is across all socio-economic and demographic indicators.

This is a widespread issue. Why is it not being addressed? This is an unrecognised crisis for thousands of South Australian families, yet neither the current nor previous governments have acknowledged the problem exists. I am putting this on the agenda and being a voice for those families until we see legislative amendments and procedural change in our courts.

If a parent calls out an ex-partner for participating in parent alienating behaviours, it can result in a worsening of conditions, an increase in false accusations and extended detriment to children, just like other forms of family violence and abuse. These parents feel helpless. They have no voice, no backing in the legislation or court system.

In one American study, 85 per cent of participants, surveying both targeted parents and reunited targeted children, described parent alienating behaviours as child abuse. It is described as introducing a false fear and being emotionally manipulative. The result is the infliction of deep psychological wounds. As one respondent describes: 'No one has the right to mess with a child's head.'

A small, Australian 2020 study, sought comment from 54 self-referred alienated parents, referred to in the literature as 'target parents'—52 per cent of them fathers, 48 per cent mothers. The leading cause of parental alienating behaviours identified by the targeted parent was revenge: revenge for a new romantic relationship, to punish someone for leaving, to inflict financial anxiety through increased child support payments—the list goes on.

The second leading identified cause was mental health. This is a major mental health crisis for these South Australian parents, yet they remain unrecognised, despite the government's pledge to prioritise mental health. One of the several victims I spoke with, a father of three boys, told me of the long-term impacts these behaviours had on his children and his own life.

The lies spread about him resulted in his working with children's check being temporarily revoked, which is now fully reinstated, and that leading to the loss of his job. The stress of the court proceedings and constantly having to reschedule court appearances flowed on to other financial impacts. He was not able to secure steady work for almost three years whilst these court proceedings continued.

Now reunited with his sons, they are able to articulate the full extent of the parental alienating behaviours they experienced. The eldest told him that the mother stated that he, the father, would bash him and his brothers, despite there being no history of violence. The middle child had to be treated for stomach ulcers due to being heavily overmedicated by the mother with ADHD treatments that kept him sedated and under control. His youngest son barely knows him, having been alienated from age four. He is now only getting to know his dad for the first time.

This example is similar to many stories I have heard from concerned South Australians. In this instance there was successful reunification with the targeted parent. Many people my office has dealt with remain in anguish, struggling through the Family Court system and desperate to see their children. It is critical to acknowledge the effect on children involved in these cases. The alienating parent often has no insight that their behaviour has an impact of such consequence. They refuse or are unable to understand the child's losses and the long-term impact those losses have cumulatively on a child.

The removal of prior support networks and loved ones, often into extended family units, can cause long-term damage and relationship issues. At least two separate studies have suggested that alienating parents exhibit a high presentation of cognitive distortion, which is described as an irrational thought pattern at the onset of a psychopathological state. Relationship counsellors must be aware of this form of family violence and abuse and be able to recognise the signs and offer appropriate support, which includes a currently unavailable pathway for legal and domestic violence referrals.

Both studies demonstrated that parental cognitive distortion can cause distress on children, who in turn have a higher presentation of mimicked cognitive distortions themselves. Cognitive distortion is well described in cognitive behavioural therapy literature and it can lead to mental illness. A 2018 article in the international *Journal of Family Issues* acknowledged that more than half the survey target parents reported that their child had been taken away from them in a manner akin to

kidnapping or abduction. This was again reiterated in a 2021 paper by different authors. The more recent article collated four years of research from Australia, Canada, USA, Israel and the United Kingdom.

We have all heard horror stories of children being taken for a holiday by one parent and not returning. This style of abduction happens more regularly in Australia than you would think—shifting house suddenly without notice, ignoring custody arrangements or moving interstate and not forwarding details. On a less extreme level, people would know of a family break-up within their sphere, where one parent has subtly and pervasively discredited the other in front of the child, told petty lies, or made visitations difficult. This impacts thousands of South Australians.

Key findings from a study released earlier this year noted the profound lasting impact parental alienating behaviours had on children later into their adulthood:

- 95 per cent reported emotional pain;
- 55 per cent continue to report depression and/or anxiety;
- 50 per cent of respondents noted maladaptive coping strategies;
- 50 per cent reported past or current substance abuse;
- 40 per cent had diagnosed personality difficulties or self-esteem issues;
- 30 per cent reported suicidal ideation; and
- 20 per cent suffered eating disorders and body issues.

One adult reflected, 'I'm still stuck in this mess that someone else created. I'm still grieving the person I was and I still find it hard to build up trust.'

We should acknowledge that parental alienating behaviours do constitute a form of child abuse. I would like to acknowledge Amanda Sillars and the team at Eeny Meeny Miney Mo Foundation for their relentless work in advocating for target parents and the reunification of children across Australia. Together with advocates and researchers, I will be persistent in following this topic through, working hard to investigate legislative options, as well as appropriate regulations for affected families.

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

Bills

AUTOMATED EXTERNAL DEFIBRILLATORS (PUBLIC ACCESS) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:49): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to require the installation and registration of automated external defibrillators in certain buildings, facilities and vehicles, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:50): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise today to reintroduce the private member's bill I initially put forward in October 2019. I was pleased that the Legislative Council saw the enormous merits—social, health and economic—in passing the Automated External Defibrillators (Public Access) Bill that made these life-saving devices mandatory. Unfortunately, it languished in the House of Assembly because the then Marshall Liberal government did not deem having life-saving devices publicly and readily available to save lives in our community a real priority.

The former Treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas, told me that his department had estimated it would cost \$18 million to have defibrillators in public buildings and elsewhere in the community. That equates to around 10,000 AEDs. He reasoned that it was uneconomic, but who knows how many lives could have been saved, and the anguish of grieving families avoided, if the law had been in

place, not to mention the savings to the healthcare system because of the rapid response in reaching and treating out-of-hospital cardiac arrests.

It begs the question yet again: is saving just one life all about dollars and cents? What does it take to convince a government that life-saving devices like AEDs must be as visible and available as, say, fire extinguishers, which are mandatory in all buildings, and how many times have you had to use a fire extinguisher in your workplace or had a need to access one?

Since I last introduced the bill, the need for AEDs to be within easy reach of where we work, live and play has never been greater. Close calls with cardiac arrests have touched members in this place. Indeed, I am a survivor myself. We would all know of someone who has either passed away because of a cardiac arrest or who has been hospitalised because of it. Cardiac arrest kills 486 Australians every week, and 31 people per day, nationally, experience an out-of-hospital sudden cardiac arrest—only 5 per cent manage to survive.

Much has changed since 2019, and there is even more reason now to support what I am proposing. We had the pandemic, which is not over by a long shot, and the flow-on effect of this unprecedented health crisis resulted in our entire health system being so overloaded that it has gone beyond breaking point, with hospitals overflowing, services being reduced or cancelled, people unable to even see their doctor within a reasonable time frame and ambulances stuck with patients for hours outside emergency departments. People are dying because help cannot reach them on time.

Once upon a time, you could count on an ambulance reaching you within eight minutes. That blew out to 16 minutes, and now it is a frightening lottery. This is not the fault of the South Australian Ambulance Service or the fantastic dedicated and professional paramedics, who are working under the most trying conditions because the system and the government has failed them and the people of South Australia, who have come to expect a first-class First World health service, not one that belongs in a Third World country. We know that South Australians have died because ambulances were delayed in reaching them.

In opposition, the Labor Party made much political capital of this. They have made commendable commitments to greatly boost the numbers of paramedics and ambulances, but it should go further than that. If they have the will, they can also improve survival rates if people cannot be reached by expert care in a reasonable time by at least ensuring there are responders who can have quick access to an AED. Only 3 per cent of out-of-hospital sudden cardiac arrests receive defibrillation by a responder before emergency services arrive.

In early August, a relative of mine came close to dying after suffering a massive heart attack and was left to wait more than two hours for an ambulance to ferry her to hospital. It prompted me to write to the health minister, expressing my concerns at the astonishing delay for a cardiac patient and warning him that a tragedy would unfold unless the situation drastically improved. Sadly, that warning materialised just a week later on 8 August, when a 47-year-old father of two young boys, Andrew Ren, suffered a cardiac arrest on Anzac Highway at Plympton and died while on the side of the road, waiting more than 40 minutes for an ambulance to arrive.

Mr Ren had pulled over while driving after suffering chest pains and, doing the right thing, he called 000 for emergency assistance. Yet, tragically it failed him. Despite the efforts of bystanders who went to his aid, administering CPR and trying to use an AED taken from a nearby hotel, it was far too late by the time the ambulance got to him.

In what are known as the critical steps in the chain of survival—the call for help, the push with CPR and then the shot from a defibrillator—AEDs can lift survival rates from 10 per cent to 89 per cent, but with every minute defibrillation was delayed the chance of Mr Ren surviving decreased by 10 per cent. After five minutes, he had a 50 per cent chance of recovery. When nine minutes had elapsed, his chances were down to 10 per cent. After 10 minutes or more, his hopes would have been grave.

I cannot imagine what thoughts were going through Mr Ren's mind as each minute ticked by and he could not hear an approaching siren. The situation would have also been quite distressing for the others concerned, including the initial bystanders who came to his aid and the paramedics

who had been delayed for hours by ramping at the Flinders Medical Centre and who would have been conscious they were in a desperate race for survival. It should never have got to that stage, and I would like to extend the Legislative Council's condolences to Mr Ren's family.

I note that the Premier has ordered an inquiry into the incident. That will not bring back Mr Ren. It will not erase the ongoing pain for his family. Ramping is still happening, ambulances are still being delayed, but at least our Chief Medical Officer, Dr Michael Cusack, who is conducting the inquiry, can identify positive measures that can help others. I would suggest that quicker and easier access to defibrillation should be an important priority.

At the weekend, the Andrews government released a review of the deadly failures in Victoria's 000 system. Thirty-three Victorians died waiting too long for ambulances. We await to find out the situation in this state, but I fear we are headed the same way as Victoria. We cannot allow it to occur here where we become so desensitised and accepting of inordinate delays in getting an ambulance or stricken patient when it is so avoidable.

As I have pointed out previously, South Australians cannot wait another minute. We cannot wait any longer while our government procrastinates, putting the cost ahead of a life. They should not leave their responsibility to the actions of generous volunteers and organisations working in the community.

There are many good Samaritans and corporate citizens who are installing AEDs at their own cost: the Australian Hotels Association, Woollies, Coles, Mitre 10, Bunnings and the Peregrine Corporation, which runs the On the Run petrol outlets. The Adelaide City Council has also rolled out more than 20 in the CBD. There are more than 45 installed around Kangaroo Island, thanks to the efforts of benefactors and the determination of local GP Dr Tim Leeuwenburg and his team on the HeartSafe KI program. Twenty-five per cent of islanders know how to perform CPR. Many more are needed, however, in our community.

Recently, I read a Facebook post proudly posted by the chief executive of Multicultural Youth after raising money to install an AED outside their office near the busy entertainment precinct of Hindley Street. She was motivated to do it because both her grandparents have died from cardiac arrest aged only in their 40s. They would have left behind very young children. AEDs are simple to operate and come with voice-activated instructions to apply them and do CPR—part of the chain of survival. People using them are covered from any legal liability in assisting in life-threatening emergencies under the good Samaritan clause in the Civil Liability Act.

An AED of the type you can see in public areas and around the precincts of Parliament House, in hotels or shopping centres, can cost between \$1,600 and \$1,800. However, the good news is that the price is not only coming down but since I last introduced this bill Australian innovation and ingenuity has led to the development of the CellaAED, a single-use small device that comes loaded with voice instruction and is the size of a larger smart phone, which can fit in a pocket, purse, car glovebox, on buses, trains, trams, as well as in emergency vehicles, and it is deceptively easy to use.

The CellaAED has been approved for sale by the Therapeutic Goods Administration and costs just \$360. So 10,000 devices (that is, if you needed that many) would cost a grand total of \$3.6 million. That is a \$14.4 million saving from the modelling done by Rob Lucas. Of course, they would be cost-effective and compliant with legislation. I would like to thank Louise Dawson from Defibs Plus, who flew here today from Melbourne and is in the gallery. She drew my attention to the incredible technology last year.

Thousands of these devices have been sold to New Zealand and are also in the European Union. Today, Louise also introduced me to an incredible palm-size compression device called the Cardio First Angel. Developed in Germany and about to go on sale in Australia for around \$200, the non-invasive device is placed on a person's chest and compressed down to perform the CPR technique. Anyone not trained in CPR can use it effortlessly. In conjunction with an AED, it is an invaluable life-saving tool.

I can assure you, I will have both the portable AED and the Cardio First Angel in my vehicles. I can see them becoming commonplace items in first aid kits. But we can immediately kickstart the

acceptance and take-up of these devices through this bill. I seek leave to table an information brochure published by Defibs Plus for the benefit of members in this place, just to get a visual understanding of the technology I am talking about.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I was pleased recently to hear Leah Watkins, the secretary of the Ambulance Employees Association, say that she was supportive of this legislation and advocated for the registration of AEDs so that 000 operators could direct persons to locations. Furthermore, Leah and the chief executive of SA Ambulance, Mr Elliott, confirmed that they were working on the introduction of the GoodSAM app, which enables first aid trained people to opt in and their location be tracked and notified in the event of an emergency. GoodSAM operates successfully in Victoria.

Can I point out that among the measures in this bill, the health minister must keep a register of AEDs along with the provision of a smartphone app like GoodSAM to make all relevant information available. The minister would also be required to roll out an information and AED awareness strategy for the public as well as establish a training scheme for AEDs for persons completing first aid training under the Education and Care Services National Law SA or the Health and Safety Act 2012.

The automated external defibrillator bill would start 12 months after the day on which it is assented to by the Governor, providing plenty of time to get the devices and have people trained to use them. AEDs would be mandatory in a wide range of buildings and vehicles, which can also be added through regulation. Stiff penalties will apply for noncompliance. Designated public buildings and places include sporting facilities, schools, tertiary and skills training facilities, corrections facilities, police stations, retirement villages and aged-care facilities, residential parks such as caravan parks, casinos and theatres. To be clear, this section also uses the definitions of public building and facility consistent with the building code. These can be added to by regulation.

An AED will be required in any building used for commercial purposes that exceeds 600 square metres. Prescribed buildings can also be added to by regulation. This does not, however, cover residential homes. Also, the owner of a larger designated or prescribed building or facility, like a large shopping centre complex, must ensure that one AED is installed for every 1,200 square metres of floor space. An example of best practice is in the O'Hare Airport in Chicago, the largest in the US, where there are AEDs positioned every 100 metres. Tokyo has 40,000 AEDs scattered throughout the city.

AEDs will also be required, under this bill, in all emergency service vehicles, including police, CFS, MFS and SES, and on public transport, like trains, buses and trams. Owners of prescribed buildings or facilities will be required to install a sign indicating an AED is nearby, near the AED, and outside near the entrance to the building or facility. I have made an addition in this bill which will impose severe penalties for persons caught damaging or stealing them. However, on a positive note, it seems to be common practice around the world that people do respect the devices, and reports of damage and theft are quite low. Even if they are stolen, inbuilt tracking technology can locate them.

The minister must also establish a training scheme for AEDs for persons who complete first aid training under the Education and Care Services National Law SA or the Health and Safety Act 2012, or any other person prescribed in the regulations. This will then greatly increase the number of people in our community who will have CPR skills. I recently met with the new health minister, the Hon. Chris Picton, and the SA Ambulance chief executive, Rob Elliott, to discuss this bill and they both acknowledge the value and need to have AEDs readily available in the community.

I am hoping that, now they are in government, Labor shows the same enthusiasm for this bill as they did in opposition, likewise my colleagues on the crossbench, and I trust the Liberals will also now consider it favourably. My bill has caught the attention and gratifying support of many organisations and individuals here and interstate connected with heart and cardiac care. They include St Vincent's Hospital cardiac specialists in Sydney and the Yellow Wiggle, Greg Page, who survived a cardiac arrest after being treated with an AED and is now a staunch campaigner with his own national program, Heart of the Nation, which advocates for the installation of AEDs and to maintain a national register as well as being linked to an app.

I cannot speak highly enough of what Greg is doing to educate Australians and encourage governments to do more and be an important part of the chain of survival. Greg has written to the Premier, the health minister and the opposition leader, pleading with them to support this legislation and to be the catalyst for change across Australia. He wrote, and let me quote:

This would be a huge step toward many more people being in the right place at the right time when they have their cardiac arrest—wherever they may be. And that is something you could be very proud of as you lay your head on the pillow each and every night, knowing that many more people have had their loved ones return home because of a decision that you and your government have made.

I have also had inquiries from as far away as South Africa. Dr Shamara Hochstadter in Johannesburg is passionate and determined to save lives and wants to work on introducing a public access defibrillation program to prevent deaths due to out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. Dr Hochstadter wants to begin the conversation on having a legislative process, like this one, in South Africa and now hopes to engage with politicians and medical professionals in that country by using this bill as an example of what can be achieved to save lives.

As a footnote, South Africa is a pioneer in heart surgery, with the world's first human-to-human heart transplant performed in Cape Town in 1967 by the late cardiac surgeon Dr Christian Barnard. I conclude my remarks by asking honourable members in this place to help save South Australian lives by supporting my bill and show how South Australia will lead the rest of the country in being a heart-safe state. I intend to bring this bill to a vote on 16 November.

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

Motions

FOSSIL FUEL NONPROLIFERATION TREATY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:13): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges that the scientific consensus is clear that human activities are primarily responsible for accelerating global climate change;
2. Recognises that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change reported in 2018 that we must achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions by the middle of this century in order to have a reasonable chance of limiting global warming to 1.5° Celsius;
3. Acknowledges that phasing out fossil fuel production and fast-tracking the transition to 100 per cent renewables will require unprecedented international cooperation on nonproliferation, global disarmament, and a just transition; and
4. Calls on the South Australian government to endorse the call for an international treaty on fossil fuel nonproliferation.

I rise today to call on this parliament to join the many other parliaments across the world in calling for and endorsing a fossil fuel nonproliferation treaty. This treaty is modelled on the nuclear nonproliferation treaty and would end expansion of new fossil fuel projects, phase-out existing projects fairly and in line with climate science, and ensure a just transition globally for workers, for communities and countries that have been dependent on fossil fuels.

These pillars of the fossil fuel treaty have been endorsed by more than 120 parliamentarians; 2,500 scientists and academics; 101 Nobel laureates; cities, including Sydney, Barcelona and Los Angeles; 800 civil society organisations; health institutions, representing 100,000-plus professionals; Indigenous peoples around the world; senior faith leaders, including the Dalai Lama; and 500 youth climate leaders.

The message is clear: the end of coal, oil and gas is inevitable. We must stop subsidising this dead and deadly industry and join the global push to phase-out fossil fuels. There are better, cleaner ways to get our energy. The technology is there and what we need to do is follow through and invest in it.

It is immoral that, as the climate crisis escalates, fossil fuel companies are able to post record profits on the back of the exploitation of a global resource, their growth fed by government subsidies and tax cuts and further enabled by this spineless approval of ever more destructive and dangerous

projects. The time for incrementalism is well and truly over. We have had over 50 years since the public has known, and there have been well-known warnings about climate change and the risks of fossil fuel.

As we hit 1.2° of warming, any further delay in action is actually an act of denial. This denial will kill many. It already has. We have spent decades focused on climate policy that is not giving us action fast enough. As much as we invest in alternatives such as wind and solar and increase the price of carbon, we have no mechanism at present to counteract the tax breaks, fossil fuel subsidies and delay tactics that are distorting the energy market and allowing fossil fuels to flourish. Tzeponah Berman, the chair of the Fossil Fuel Non-Proliferation Treaty Initiative, says it best:

We can't rely on the fossil fuel industry to break business as usual, especially one that delivers unthinkable profits for the industry while the rest of us reel from the ripple effects of high fuel prices. That's why there is an urgent need for a Fossil Fuel Non-Proliferation Treaty to end the expansion of oil, gas and coal, phase out existing production to limit warming to manageable levels and accelerate a fair energy transition where wealthy, fossil fuel-producing nations lead and support other countries so there is affordable, clean energy from sun, wind and water for everyone.

We cannot have it both ways. If we are committed to a net zero future as we say we are, if we are committed to limiting the impacts of climate change as we say we are, then we cannot keep delaying. We must urgently commit to a global framework to phase-out coal, oil and gas fairly and forever. The International Energy Agency has warned that no new oil and gas reservoirs should open up if the world is to do what it has agreed to do at the Paris Agreement.

A study last year found that 90 per cent of coal and 60 per cent of oil and gas reserves need to stay in the ground just to give a 50 per cent chance of limiting global heating to 1.5° Celsius. Just last week, we heard from the National Geological Survey of Denmark and Greenland that major sea level rise caused by melting of the Greenland ice cap is 'now inevitable', with a 'very conservative rock-bottom minimum' rise of 27 centimetres set to occur regardless of what climate action is taken from this point onwards. It is devastating.

The time for incrementalism, if there ever was one, is well and truly over. We need strong, significant commitments now, and we must fast-track the transition away from fossil fuels. We have had decades of missed opportunities, and the consequences are now catching up with us. We are seeing record heatwaves, droughts across Europe and Asia, rivers drying up, including the Rhine and the Loire in Europe, parts of the Yangtze in China and the Colorado River in the US, and no-one in South Australia can forget about the Murray. At the same time, one-third of Pakistan is currently submerged—one-third of that country—due to catastrophic flooding.

All of this news is terrible. The impacts of climate change are terrible. I know that it can be hard and dispiriting to listen to this information again and again, but we are living this and there is a lot to be hopeful for. The good news is that rapid global exit from coal, oil and gas is possible. We have more than enough energy renewable resources to meet the energy needs of everyone.

We have used global treaties in the past to defuse global threats before: nuclear weapons, deadly landmines and ozone depleting chemicals, to name a few. We know that this approach can work. We must come together in the spirit of international cooperation and begin to negotiate a fossil fuel nonproliferation treaty. I commend the motion.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:20): I rise to speak in support of the motion moved by my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks. Ongoing investments in fossil fuels by Australian governments put us not just at odds with the science but with the rest of the world. They pose a threat to our trade and our economy as well as to our climate.

In South Australia we have declared a climate emergency and it is now time for us to declare our support for a fossil fuel nonproliferation treaty. This would be an empowering next step for our state, demonstrating how even small jurisdictions can lead the way by joining with other cities, states and nations around the world to speak with one clear voice.

We all know the historical and ongoing contribution fossil fuels make to climate change, and this industry—one that is aided by the Australian government, propped up by both of the major political parties—has ongoing expansion plans. We cannot accept this and so instead we are calling for a solution that matches the scale of the problem. We must cooperate globally to address this

global problem and everybody, every state, every city, every individual has a role to play. In the words of Professor Lesley Hughes:

...every fraction of a degree of warming is doing us harm. This means that every day we delay cessation of fossil fuel burning, we come closer to catastrophe.

It is people who created this crisis and it is the people who must stop it. Our state has a proven capacity to be a renewable energy powerhouse and I do recognise the work of all sides of politics in this regard. We are a state that is largely powered by the sun and the wind and soon will be powered by hydrogen as well. But emissions and their impacts—whether they are generated here or by other states—do not stop at our borders.

What happens in one place affects us all. Indeed, that has been the story of this climate crisis. While South Australia has been a leader when it comes to renewable energy, our federal government continues to subsidise the fossil fuel industry to the tune of about \$10.3 billion per year. Who can forget the forgotten years, the forgotten decade under the failed leadership of Scott Morrison, the do-nothing Malcolm Turnbull and the hopeless Tony Abbott.

We must therefore call on all of our colleagues, both interstate and federally, to face the reality that climate change is here, and to avoid making it worse we need to keep coal and gas in the ground. To that end, earlier today I introduced a private member's bill to ban gas connections to new homes from 2025 as part of the Greens leadership in this place in taking action on this climate crisis.

Any ongoing fossil fuel extraction and burning would deny us the chance of a safe climate future. By advocating for this treaty, South Australia could join the ACT and be a pillar of a strong national and international approach to pursuing efforts to limit temperature increases to 1.5° above pre-industrial levels.

We have had some incentives, but we need more. We need incentives for sustainable transformation of the energy sector in our state but with that it is clear that we also need disincentives, the carrot and the stick, to deal with the consumption and the production of fossil fuels. The ongoing extraction of fossil fuels via coalmining and oil and gas extraction, including coal seam gas, shale gas, tight gas, shale oil and underground coal gasification, pose unacceptable risks to Australia's land, our water and our industries, such as agriculture, grazing and tourism.

We need to take this seriously. How long can we watch our communities be consumed by flames and floods at an ever-increasing rate? These disasters are not inevitable. We must demand a different path, one that embraces renewable energy sources and that allows our communities to live in harmony with ecosystems and thrive within the limits of our planet. After all, it is this planet that constrains us all. A fossil fuel nonproliferation treaty is the next logical step on such a pathway. I commend the motion.

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

WORLD TEACHERS' DAY

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN (17:26): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes that World Teachers' Day is celebrated in Australia on 28 October 2022 and acknowledges the work of our dedicated teachers across South Australia; and
2. Recognises the commitment of our teachers and education staff over the past two years to keep our schools open and our children safe during COVID-19.

Our teachers make a difference every single day, educating and inspiring young South Australians. World Teachers' Day is a wonderful opportunity to celebrate and thank South Australian teachers for their significant role in our communities and for the positive impact they have on the lives of students. This year, we say thank you to our teachers for teaching through every moment of what has been most definitely a challenging past two years as we continue to navigate the pandemic. We acknowledge and show appreciation for the many ways teachers provide support and inspiration to our students.

Celebrated worldwide in more than 100 countries, World Teachers' Day was established by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation in 1994 to recognise the important role of teachers in society. World Teachers' Day is held internationally on 5 October. As this date often falls during Australian school holidays, South Australia celebrates this day on the last Friday of October, this year being 28 October.

Teachers require great determination and passion to meet all students' learning needs in the classroom. The approaches are used to bring about enriching interactions, allowing students to remain engaged and help students to achieve their learning goals. The strategies teachers use affect the learning processes and achievements our students make. Our education system strives to implement the best teaching strategies, ensuring that South Australian students are motivated to learn and increase their academic achievement.

Our teachers work hard to communicate a learning objective while mapping out ways to improve student academic performance. As facilitators of learning, teachers must consider how they teach. This is critical, as the act of teaching either builds up student confidence or can impede learning if not effective. When teachers meet the needs of their students, they are giving them the best opportunity to gain experience in setting them up for life whilst allowing students to take ownership of their learning. This requires the thoughtful adoption and application of effective instructional strategies.

All students learn in different ways, and as time changes the way our students learn changes too. Our teachers deserve recognition for the way they are constantly adapting to provide the support and challenges that our students need. I commend our diligent teachers and acknowledge the importance of World Teachers' Day.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (17:29): I rise in support of the motion moved by the honourable member recognising World Teachers' Day on 28 October. I would like to take this opportunity to draw special attention to those teachers working in our regional and remote schools and those who are working in our state's most disadvantaged schools.

It takes extra effort to build aspirations in students with complex and often challenging needs. I have met with school leaders across the state and they agree that more incentives are needed for dedicated, passionate teachers in the most challenging of schools. We need to match the right teacher to the right classroom and particularly reward those teachers who go above and beyond for students with difficulties and in situations of disadvantage.

All children have the right to thrive in their education; it should not matter in which school you enrol. South Australian students are entitled to a quality education with inspired and energetic teachers. I feel passionately that socially disadvantaged children should not be taught a different curriculum to their wealthier peers. Quality of academic content should not drop for socially disadvantaged children. The doctrine of meeting learners where they are at perpetuates inequity of standards and lowers expectations—we are doing children a disservice. We need to halt the continuation of disadvantage.

I have spoken with frustrated school leavers. They want evidence-based reforms for their teaching staff, they want the same education offered to poor students as is offered to wealthy students. So-called targeted teaching often ends in poor results and lower long-term outcomes. The government must provide quality teaching resources in all classrooms, not make up different standards for various groups of children. The better the materials the better the outcomes. This has proven to be more effective for student learning outcomes than initiatives only focused on improving teacher quality.

An enthusiastic teacher, set up with high-quality materials, will make a positive impact. The drift from knowledge-based learning to skills-based learning inside the classroom does not work. Our results, when compared internationally, show this. Skills-based learning cannot fully substitute specific standardised knowledge-based learning.

When I was a teacher I set high expectations for my students, no matter their external circumstances. I believed in their abilities and the results followed. I know that with dedication and investment young people can increase their self-confidence and self-belief. Teachers play a vital

role, especially in schools that are isolated or in disadvantaged communities. This government must acknowledge that important role and equip teachers with high-quality materials everywhere to ensure equity of learning.

We must ensure that great teachers not only stay in the profession but are targeted to the primary and high schools that need them most. I want to see targeted rewards for our most motivated teachers to work in regional and rural areas, and with our students who attend schools in socially disadvantaged areas.

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

Bills

**CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (SAFETY) (CHILD AND YOUNG PERSON'S VISITOR)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 July 2022.)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (17:32): I rise to make some comments in relation to this bill. In doing so I thank the honourable member for moving this piece of legislation, so that we can discuss these important issues, which she introduced on 6 July. The role of the Child and Young Person's Visitor was established in 2017, with the aim of regularly visiting and inspecting individual residential and emergency care homes and to meet with an advocate for the children and young people living in them.

The position was created in response to a recommendation by royal commissioner Margaret Nyland, who found there needed to be a dedicated advocate for children living in residential care. Ms Penny Wright was appointed to the role of Child and Young Person's Visitor on 13 February 2018, which was funded as a two-year trial. Additional resources were provided to the program on 30 June 2019 at Ms Wright's request. A final report on its findings was released in February 2020 and formal evaluation was undertaken by Flinders University.

Under the Marshall Liberal government, the Department for Education and the Department of Human Services provided almost \$2 million in funding to the Office of the Guardian for Children and Young People to undertake the statutory functions required under the act. Ms Wright resigned from the role of Child and Young Person's Visitor on 23 August 2021. She continued in her role as the Guardian for Children and Young People and Training Centre Visitor to 31 July 2022, and we thank her for her service over those years in these multiple roles. We also congratulate Ms Shona Reid on her appointment as the new visitor and guardian.

The Office of the Guardian for Children and Young People continued to visit DCP residential facilities through 2021-22 as part of its monitoring functions, including conducting virtual visits during the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, the Marshall Liberal government continued to invest in evidence-based programs, including \$18.2 million over seven years for the Newpin SA family reunification program, \$11.3 million over six years for the Resilient Families social impact investment, \$3.8 million over 2½ years for Treatment Foster Care Oregon and \$3.7 million over four years for Family Group Conferences.

In April 2022, this government announced that it would spend \$450,000 each year to reinstate the role, for which the visitor/guardian claimed that a business case commissioned by her office had found she needed a minimum of \$1.637 million each year. The role and functions of the Child and Young Person's Visitor are legislated in chapter 9 of the act. There are several references in the act in relation to staff and resources, which the Liberal Party believes mitigate the need for this particular legislation. That is, section 117A states:

Staff and resources

The Minister must provide the Child and Young Person's Visitor with the staff and other resources that the Visitor reasonably needs for exercising the Visitor's functions.

Furthermore, section 14 of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 in subclause (1)(c) also states that:

...the Minister must, in order to promote the wellbeing of children and young people and early intervention where they may be at risk of harm...

- (c) promote, support and adequately resource evidence-based programs delivering preventative and support services directed towards strengthening and supporting families, reducing the incidence of child abuse and neglect and maximising the wellbeing of children and young people...

We believe that this piece of legislation may have the effect of mandating resourcing of a discretionary office, and for that reason we are unable to support this particular measure, but we do appreciate the intent of the honourable member and look forward to further debate on this important subject.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (17:37): The government thanks the honourable member for introducing this bill and for highlighting the importance of the role of the Child and Young Person's Visitor. We also note the honourable member's strong interest in child protection matters.

The Children and Young People (Safety) (Child and Young Person's Visitor) Amendment Bill 2022 was introduced into this place on 6 July this year. The government will not be supporting the changes proposed at this time. We acknowledge that the intent of the amendment put forward is to ensure that the state government provides sufficient funding and staff for the role of Child and Young Person's Visitor, a role that the Guardian for Children and Young People performs in an ex-officio capacity.

Members will be aware that, after the initial trial of the Child and Young Person's Visitor role under the former guardian, Penny Wright, the former Marshall Liberal government declined to fund sufficiently the continuing resources required for the guardian to fulfil the visitor function. The funding and role were something this government committed to reinstate as part of our election commitments. We did this through a \$450,000 per annum commitment, indexed from 2022-23, in our first state budget. This is because the government is committed to the important visitor role. At this stage, the funding provided is suitable for the function envisaged.

The government, and in particular the Minister for Child Protection in the other place, will work closely with the new guardian, Shona Reid, as a visitor program is implemented. We welcome Ms Reid's input around resourcing and other requirements going forward. However, at this stage there is no need to legislate for this funding. Indeed, we will have the opportunity to address this and a range of other matters in the full review of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act, which has commenced this week, I understand.

The review provides an opportunity for all South Australians to consider input into, and support efforts to build, a better child protection system. This review will be informed by feedback from key stakeholders, including children and young people, carers, families, non-government and government partners, advocacy groups, the academic sector and those with direct experience of the system.

It is a critical opportunity to rigorously examine and improve the central legislative framework through which South Australia's child protection system operates and to redefine what our child safety responses look like going forward, to deliver on our commitments to Aboriginal children and young people, and to make sure we have the legal frameworks in place that reflect community values and expectations.

The review will help make sure South Australia has the right settings in place to prioritise responses to those children and young people in our community who are most at risk of harm and to place their safety at the centre of our decision-making. For the sector and the community, it is an important opportunity to think about how the legislation can enable us all to better support children, young people and their families.

Public submissions to the review opened via the YourSAy online platform yesterday, supported by a discussion paper. A series of metropolitan, regional and Aboriginal focused

consultation sessions will be held during September and October, and more information about these will be published next week.

The government looks forward to the honourable member's involvement in the review and welcomes her valuable input into the broad range of legislative considerations for the child protection system. I also know that the Minister for Child Protection would be very happy to brief her on the review and any other matters of interest.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:41): I rise to speak on behalf of SA-Best on the Children and Young People (Safety) (Child and Young Person's Visitor) Amendment Bill 2022 and indicate that this bill has our unequivocal and full support. Children and young people in residential care facilities are some of the state's most vulnerable citizens—arguably the most vulnerable citizens—and it is appalling that a legislative role which was established to check on and provide advocacy for our most at-risk kids remains inadequately resourced.

The Child and Young Person's Visitor was established under the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 to specifically conduct visits to and inspections of prescribed facilities, communicate with and promote the best interests of children and young people who reside in those facilities and provide advocacy on their behalf. The role also requires the provision of advice to the minister on systematic reforms. It was in direct response to recommendation 137 of Commissioner Margaret Nyland's report, *The Life They Deserve*, which called for the development of a Community Visitor Scheme for children in all residential and emergency care facilities.

The framework was left to legislators, but the intent was very clear. At the time, it was estimated it would cost \$1.7 million per year for visits to be made to all children and young people who were new to residential care. Of course, the numbers were nowhere near what they are today. Disturbingly, the upward trajectory has been steep. As at June 2022, there were 4,741 children aged under 18 in care in South Australia. That is for a heartbreaking range of reasons. Of those, 650 were in residential care. Five years ago, that number was just 388.

The Child and Young Person's Visitor role was initially funded for a two-year trial, as has been alluded to, but funds dried up at its conclusion in September 2019 under the previous Liberal government. Still, the visitor and her staff were able to meet with 99 children aged two to 17 living in DCP facilities and make 37 visits to 24 individual facilities during that two-year period. In 2020-21, the scheme did not receive a dedicated budget to implement its legislative function and was unable to employ dedicated staff to undertake them.

In announcing her resignation from the role in August last year, Penny Wright made the following statement:

In February 2018, as well as my existing roles of Guardian and Training Centre Visitor, I agreed to take on the new role of 'Child and Young Person's Visitor,' to head up a visiting and advocacy scheme focused specifically on the children and young people living in residential and emergency care.

Since then, my staff and I have worked extremely hard to make the role work for the benefit of these children.

As Guardian, I conducted a funded two-year trial visiting program then, when that funding ceased, we spent many more (often unrecorded) hours, refining a system of visiting and feedback that reflected children's voices, serious safety concerns and both good and poor practice.

Before the last budget I submitted a detailed business case to government to support a scheme to visit a reasonable proportion of the 200 residential care properties which now house over 600 children and young people.

As this was not successful, there is no ongoing funding for the role or scheme.

I have now concluded that, in the absence of any dedicated resourcing for the Child and Young Person's Visitor, and no likelihood of resourcing in the foreseeable future, I am just not able to meet the obligations of the role.

In principle, the South Australian community would take some comfort in knowing that there is a statutory position dedicated to looking out for these vulnerable children and young people. However, a role in name only, without resources, does not enable me to fulfil its functions even to a minimum standard.

That is an indictment of the work of this parliament and our child protection system. While the power of the Guardian for Children and Young People to conduct visits is entrenched in legislation, in reality budget constraints mean less than 10 per cent of residential care homes are able to be visited under that scheme.

Fast-forward to the new Labor government, which has committed a very modest funding of \$1.87 million over the next four years to establish and partially recommence the scheme. It is a start but a very poor, tight-fisted start and yet another indictment of the importance that we place on keeping our most vulnerable kids safe, especially when you consider that \$1.7 million annual cost was estimated over seven years ago and that was limited to kids who are new to residential care only. The \$467,500 just does not cut it—not then and certainly not now.

There is, indeed, a need to legislate in this area, and both major parties have failed in that regard. Where are this government's priorities? Our child protection system continues to be a politically vexed issue, which I find completely disappointing. If this government is serious about significantly improving our child protection system, throwing around words like 'strong focus' and 'deep commitment' are extraordinarily hollow without funds to back them up. If they are going to talk the talk, then they have to be prepared to walk the walk.

If the government is happy to spend \$18 million on a car race and \$82.4 million on a new swimming pool, then surely it can ensure that a properly resourced asset such as this legislative role is undertaken to ensure our most vulnerable kids are looked after. I know I am not comparing apples with apples, but it is important. The Cross Border Commissioner has been allocated \$230,000 more funding over the same period as that which has been requested in this instance.

We can probably come up with countless examples of where money has been spent. I think I recall a recent story online about the Malinauskas government spending something like \$750,000 in its first six months in government on advertising alone and I am sure that money could have gone a long way to assisting in this area. Our child protection system is broken and there are many things which can and must be done to improve the outcomes for vulnerable South Australian kids and their families. Yes, they require money, but the outcomes of those funding arrangements can be profound.

We continue to see Aboriginal children and young people grossly over-represented in out-of-home care in South Australia, which is nothing short of a disgrace. The figures for Aboriginal kids in detention in South Australia are 23 times higher than non-Aboriginal kids and 17 times higher than all ethnicities combined. Despite comprising only 5 per cent of the state's young people, Aboriginal kids also make up more than half the daily average population in our detention centres. We also have those figures I alluded to in relation to our child protection system.

When I speak of these issues, I am always reminded of something as simple as a hearing test that could change the trajectory of an Aboriginal child's life away from child protection and, indeed, from the criminal justice system. I will never forget the day I heard Dr Kelvin Kong, a trailblazer for Indigenous health in Australia, say that something as simple as a hearing test could have had the potential to change the outcome of the sad and sorry events that took place at the Don Dale Detention Centre and the trajectory of the children who were detained there.

Hearing problems amongst Aboriginal youth have been linked to increased rates of child protection contacts but also incarceration rates in Australia. In fact, in the Northern Territory 94 per cent of Indigenous prisoners suffered impaired hearing compared with 45 per cent of the wider Indigenous population. The royal commission into the protection and detention of children in the NT heard that six out of 10 boys at the Don Dale Youth Detention Centre suffered hearing impairment. When you cannot hear instructions that are being given to you by the authorities it has the potential, as we have seen, to result in catastrophic outcomes.

Dr Kong has seen the consequences of allowing ear disease to fester for decades, and I think it absolutely beggars belief that these people meet people and wonder if they had met them at the age of two or three whether indeed they would have spent their entire life in and out of jail or the criminal justice system or suffered the other social injustices that they have endured.

Again, I am going to speak a little bit more about this but in terms of those rates of Aboriginal children entering child protection and, indeed, detention, we know that they are worsening. We know that Aboriginal children account for 36.7 per cent of young people in care, and yet they make up only 5 per cent of the total population. There is a continued worsening rate of Aboriginal compared to non-Aboriginal children being drawn into that system, and they are vastly over-represented in both the child protection and the youth justice systems, as I said, despite comprising only about 5 per cent of the state's young population.

I think it is also worth noting that South Australia is well below par when it comes to our figures relating to state care, which are currently the second worst in the nation, and the Closing the Gap target requires a 45 per cent reduction in the over-representation of Aboriginal children and young people in care by 2031, but as former Commissioner Wright has told us, if we continue with this rate of removals then, sadly, we will fail to meet those targets. Without significant reforms and investment in culturally safe family support and early intervention programs we will fail to meet those targets.

About 53 per cent of the 1,519 Aboriginal children in state care—I think that number is slightly higher now—defined in the commissioner's report as 'out-of-home' care prompted by child safety concerns, were placed with relatives, but the report made the point that less than a third of those children have been placed with Aboriginal relatives or kin and that the rate of placement with Aboriginal family kin has also declined over time—another problem that this parliament has struggled to deal with.

Then, of course, we have the issues of the continued legacy of dispossession that gives rise to. Aboriginal elder and Ngadjuri woman Pat Waria-Read, who I am sure most of us by now have had the pleasure and honour of meeting, grew up at Point Pearce Mission and was taken out of the care of her mother at a young age. She has been a leading advocate in this space and talked about the impacts this is having in terms of the worsening state of our child care protection system, and it is of little surprise when you hear her say that not much has changed.

Indeed, the groups that I have spoken to, together with Ms Waria-Read and Indigenous families and groups who work in this space, is that we are creating a second wave of stolen Aboriginal children. There must be a continued focus on this very important legislation because we continue to see children, but especially Aboriginal children and young people, grossly over-represented in our out-of-care system in South Australia, which I think is nothing short of a disgrace. A specific focus of the current review of the act must be full and considered and the implementation, in my view, of those Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander child placement principles must also be one of our priorities.

The children and young people who find themselves in residential care come from complex backgrounds. They often have experienced a lifetime of trauma, trauma many of us could not even begin to imagine. They have no adult close to them who can provide a safe home environment. They find themselves living in facilities with other children and young people with equally complex and traumatic backgrounds.

These places are not playgrounds; they are often places of last resort. There are kids we have heard about who have not attended school for months or even a year because they have been in a residential facility. We have heard reports not just here but across the nation of kids living in hotel rooms and the only contact they have had is with the people who come in to do shiftwork to care for them—no friends, no family, no loved ones, just shiftworkers who come in to do their bit, look after that child for their eight hours or whatever it is and then leave them until someone else comes. That is an indictment of our child protection system in this state as well.

The June 2022 final report of the South Australian dual-involved project reaffirmed the need for specialist and intensive monitoring of children and young people in residential care, given their disproportionate over-representation in detention, something I have already spoken about and I always have a lot to say about in this place, as do my crossbench colleagues on the other side of the bench.

That project observed that dual-involved children and young people—a term used for children and young people who are in residential care and have interactions with the youth justice system—do not feel safe in residential care placements, find it difficult to contact their allocated DCP worker and continue to bear the brunt of systemic placement and staffing shortages. Many prefer to be detained at Kurlana Tapa, the Adelaide Youth Training Centre, than remain at their residential placement, which really says it all.

I know I have said this time and time again when I have spoken on this and other issues, but again I am reminded by Dr Kong that prevention, early intervention, wraparound services, education, supports and hearing tests, for God's sake, might all come at an up-front cost but we know they work and their benefits far outweigh the long-term costs that we pay as a community. It is the same story

across the board, but successive governments, we know, pick and choose between these issues they invest in. We treat them in silos. We do exactly the same with child detention, we do the same with youth detention, we do the same with the criminal justice system and we do the same with human services, and that has been an abysmal failure in this jurisdiction.

In doing so we fail to acknowledge the likely trajectory of a child from care, from the child protection setting or from detention, moving to the criminal justice system, and fail at the most basic things we do to turn things around when we pass pieces of legislation like this and then pay lip service to them in return when it comes to funding when we should be looking at this holistically and not in a vacuum.

I think I have made my point. I think this is a very good bill. It has overwhelming support not just from members in this place but, as I said, from Commissioner Nyland, from the former Commissioner for Children and Young People, Penny Wright, and from experts in this area who have all said that if we are going to do this then we had better do it properly. On that basis, I indicate again our full support for the bill and look forward to working with the Hon. Sarah Game on our shared interest in this area going forward.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:58): I rise to speak briefly, given the hour, on behalf of the Greens in support of this bill. This bill is not only vital, it is a no-brainer. It is long past time that we had proper funding and resourcing for the Child and Young Person's Visitor in our state. We have known for a long time that the situation is dire.

I think this was clearly demonstrated by the former Child and Young Person's Visitor, Penny Wright, whom we thank for her hard work and dedication, who resigned from being the Child and Young Person's Visitor due to a lack of government funding under the previous government. It begs the question: why are we legislating to create these important roles and powers but then failing to resource them adequately?

It is a deeply concerning situation where we have had someone in the role who is eminently qualified, who wants to do the job properly but felt compelled to resign 'as a matter of good conscience and transparency' as she would not be able to meet the obligations of the role due to a lack of government funding and support. As Ms Wright said at the time, 'a role in name only, without resources, does not enable me to fulfil its functions even to a minimum standard'.

We have other legislation that establishes similar roles, and that legislation does stipulate that the role is adequately resourced. It hardly seems too much to ask. While this role was initially funded as a two-year trial, there have been ongoing calls since the end of 2019 to resource this role properly, particularly after the release of a damning report into the child protection department's handling of two sexual abuse cases involving 13-year-old girls in residential care.

At the time, the then shadow minister, now Minister Hildyard, from the opposition benches said that Penny Wright's resignation was 'devastating for South Australia's most vulnerable children and young people'. She also went on to say, 'Ms Wright has urged the minister to reinstate funding for the visitor scheme in her last annual report and the opposition has repeatedly called on the minister to do so.' I am wondering where that spirit and that sense of compassion is from the Malinauskas government right now.

We saw an announcement in April that the Malinauskas government would spend \$450,000 each year to reinstate the role, but Penny Wright has previously stated that her office put forward a business case that found that the minimum amount of funding needed to carry out the role properly is \$1.637 million a year.

The new Child and Young Person Visitor, Shona Reid, also has publicly stated that it is important that all legislation establishing independent oversight roles ensure a funding commitment clause and that, and I will quote her, 'It is unfortunate that this was missed in the initial drafting of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017.' That is our responsibility as legislators. We do have an opportunity now to address that oversight and ensure that this essential role is properly resourced to safeguard vulnerable children and young people in our state.

On that, I just want to say these are not criminals, these are children. For some reason, because they are placed in residential care, people seem to think that they have done something

wrong. They have done nothing wrong. They have been let down in their personal lives. We should not be letting them down in this parliament.

One thing I remember is that a previous minister visited these children in front of staff and asked the children what they would like in their residential care to make it feel more like home. One of them asked for a Netflix account. Any teenager, any child, in this state who asked their parents for a Netflix account would not be seen as audacious or greedy and would not be told to pay for it out of their own pocket, as these children were told. Again, this goes to the fundamental core problem here that we are treating these children as if they have done something wrong, not as if they need a home with compassion and care and oversight.

We also know that the child protection workers who work in this very important area have been chronically underfunded themselves. Indeed, in 2021 the PSA did a survey over some six weeks. In those six weeks there were 150 shifts that were uncovered. That is 150 times in a shift that workers were called in and required to do overtime just to ensure the minimum staffing in those facilities.

We know what happens when people cannot turn up for work because there are not enough workers to do the work that is required, and that is that the children get let down again—the children miss out, the children are punished, the children are not supported. The parliament made an error in the drafting of the legislation that supported this, and we can fix that error now. We have done so with other positions, and I commend the Hon. Sarah Game for bringing this to this place. With that, the Greens strongly support the bill, and we will be supporting any divisions to affirm that support.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (18:04): Young people in residential care deserve a legislative commitment to protect them. Supporting this amendment bill enshrines basic minimum resourcing levels for the Child and Young Person's Visitor role. Young people in residential care are children who cannot remain safely with a parent, do not have a foster home and cannot be placed in kinship care. They are amongst the most vulnerable in the state and they often do not have a single known adult on their side to advocate for them.

The amendment bill resources a caretaker role, responsible for looking after those children. The role was recommended by Margaret Nyland in the child protection system's royal commission report in 2016 and introduced in 2017, yet it has never had resourcing certainty.

I have consulted widely in the child protection space on this issue, meeting with the Commissioner for Children and Young People, the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People, the immediate former Guardian for Children and Young People, the Minister for Child Protection, the chief executive of the Department for Child Protection, multiple agencies and non-profits that work with people after leaving the state protection system as young adults and, most importantly, children and young people who have been through the residential care system.

Stakeholders do agree that the basic level of resourcing prescribed in the amendment should be enshrined in legislation, as is the current standard for other roles under the Guardian for Children and Young People which include the guardian role and the Training Centre Visitor role. The wording is the same. The wording makes the resourcing obligation consistent across the three roles.

I was spurred to this legislation by reading of the death of 13-year-old Zhane Chilcott, who died by suicide, having only been visited once a year by an officer from the Department for Child Protection. He hated residential care so much that having been told he would stay there until he was 18 years old he killed himself. He left behind a suicide note, stating, 'I don't want to be in care. I want to be with you, Mum.' Zhane was last visited in February 2016. He passed away that July. Had this resourcing been in place, he would have received a visit in May, three months after his prior visit. That visit may have saved his life and it could have acted as a crucial intervention point.

A number of young people have said they would rather spend time in Kurlana Tapa Youth Training Centre because they feel safer, heard and better supported in the youth prison system than in state residential care. That is damning. Between 2020 and 2021, there were a reported five pregnancies among girls in state care, two of them only 13 years old and two of them sexually abused by known paedophiles.

In a report commissioned for the Guardian for Children and Young People, one youth is quoted as saying:

I've got everything in Kurlana Tapa that I wish I had on the outside...this place is so much better than being on the outside in those houses. There is no proper support to get you back to school and all that stuff.

They report feeling let down and they report feeling overlooked. This amendment should not be about political pointscoring. It is too important for the major parties to be playing games at the expense of vulnerable children's lives. Four visits per year from the same, consistent adult who cares about their needs, will listen to their concerns and take their word seriously is the absolute minimum commitment. That is all this legislation is asking for.

Children are committing suicide. Young people are being abused. It is neglectful and abhorrent that there is currently only a commitment to visit them once per year. Our children and young people deserve better. In fact, the Minister for Child Protection herself yesterday said, and I quote from *Hansard*:

We have also—very, very importantly—provided funding for the Child and Young Person's Visitor. Members who were in the last parliament would be aware that there was much advocacy and questioning of the previous government and the previous minister about the refusal to provide any ongoing funding for the role of the Child and Young Person's Visitor. To link that to the question the member asked, having a funded Child and Young Person's Visitor to oversee children in care, oversight how they are going and be an advocate for them, is incredibly important in terms of our ongoing, continuous efforts to improve children's lives, to improve their safety.

It was really disappointing that the previous government simply refused to provide that ongoing funding.

As people would be aware, the previous guardian, as a result of the lack of funding, actually resigned from that role. One of the really clear actions that we have taken on coming to government is to fund that role for the Child and Young Person's Visitor. We have taken a number of other actions also on coming to government and we will continue to do so. Again, I reiterate that I thoroughly examined the systems and processes and made sure that I made really positive amendments to the procedures...

The minister has just highlighted the importance of legislating a commitment to resourcing. It is essential to ensuring recurrent resourcing into perpetuity, so it is interesting to note that Labor will in fact be voting against this amendment today.

This is not a major party tennis play at the expense of children in residential care, from the previous government for not providing any resourcing, to the current government for not providing anywhere near enough. I would like to thank the crossbench for their commitment. It is disappointing to hear the excuses made by major parties in not supporting this straightforward, long overdue amendment.

The council divided on the second reading:

Ayes5
Noes.....12
Majority7

AYES

Bonaros, C.
Pangallo, F.

Franks, T.A.
Simms, R.A.

Game, S.L. (teller)

NOES

Bourke, E.S.
Hanson, J.E.
Lensink, J.M.A.
Scriven, C.M. (teller)

Centofanti, N.J.
Hunter, I.K.
Maher, K.J.
Wade, S.G.

Curran, L.A.
Lee, J.S.
Ngo, T.T.
Wortley, R.P.

Second reading thus negatived.

At 18:15 the council adjourned until Thursday 8 September 2022 at 11:00.