

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 30 November 2022

The PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens) took the chair at 11:03 and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (11:04): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable petitions, the tabling of papers, question time, statements on matters of interest and giving notices of motion to be taken into consideration at 2.15pm.

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: I note the absolute majority.

Matter of Privilege

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

Notice of Motion: Matter of Privilege: The Hon. N.J. Centofanti to move:

That a Committee of Privileges be established to inquire into and report on whether the Parliamentary Secretary to the Premier misled the council while answering a question without notice on Thursday 8 September 2022.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (11:04): I rise to indicate that, given that the parliamentary secretary the Hon. Emily Bourke has corrected the record and apologised to the chamber, I will not proceed with the motion. In doing so I would like to state for the record that parliamentary privilege, whilst critical in allowing freedom of speech and freedom of reporting, is something that must be exercised responsibly. Members of the parliament, but in particular ministers and assistant ministers, have a responsibility to not mislead the house, and I note that the Hon. Ms Bourke has indicated that she will not make that mistake again. The opposition welcomes that statement, and consequently I again indicate that I will not be pursuing the motion.

Notice of motion withdrawn.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SERIOUS VEHICLE AND VESSEL OFFENCES) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (11:06): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, the Harbors and Navigation Act 1993, the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 and the Road Traffic Act 1961.

Read a first time.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: I acknowledge in the gallery Ms Pia Vogrin and Luke Naismith, the family of Sophia Naismith. Welcome.

*Bills***STATUTES AMENDMENT (SERIOUS VEHICLE AND VESSEL OFFENCES) BILL***Second Reading*

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (11:09): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, I rise to introduce the Statutes Amendment (Serious Vehicle and Vessel Offences) Bill 2022. This bill fulfils a commitment made by the government in the wake of the tragic death of Sophia Naismith in 2019, which highlighted a clear deficiency in the law in relation to driving offences. Sophia Naismith lost her life at the age of 15 when she was hit by a high-powered sports car and died at the scene of the crash.

Understandably, the Naismith family were left devastated by the loss of Sophia and have been frustrated and disheartened at the lack of serious penalties available to address the gravity of the crime which took Sophia's life. The court found that the available maximum penalty, when sentencing the driver, was only 12 months' imprisonment and a minimum six-month licence disqualification for aggravated driving without due care.

Sophia's family—her parents, Pia and Luke, her sisters and the rest of her relatives—have borne a loss that is difficult to comprehend. I have great admiration for their grace in the face of every parents' worst nightmare. It is a loss borne by too many families in South Australia and we, as a government, must do what we can to prevent another family from going through the same.

The need for legislative change has been echoed by voices across our community. The Commissioner for Victims' Rights has strongly advocated for changes in line with community expectations on behalf of many families who have endured similar tragedies and whose loss has been exacerbated by the inadequacies of the available penalties.

Current laws do not sufficiently cater for the range of circumstances that can lead to loss of life caused by driving. In August 2022, in response to the clear need for change, the Premier announced that the government would: one, make changes to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 concerning a new offence or other amendments to address driving-related deaths; two, strengthen laws banning drivers accused of killing a person from holding a licence until their case is resolved; three, ban the disabling of traction control in high-powered vehicles; and, four, introduce a new licensing scheme for motorists who want to drive elite, high-powered super sports cars.

The government has heard the pleas of Sophia's family and those of other families devastated in similar circumstances. We have heard those pleas and we commend families for their bravery and advocacy in championing changes to the law to see that justice is done.

This bill implements those commitments by creating a new indictable offence of causing death or serious harm by careless use of a vehicle or vessel in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, to bridge the gap between maximum penalties for existing driving offences; empowering police to immediately suspend or disqualify a person from driving if they are charged with or reasonably believed to have committed the new offence or serious driving offences, and closing a gap in the operation of the scheme; and creating a new offence in the Road Traffic Act 1961, prohibiting the driver of an ultra high-powered vehicle from disabling automated intervention systems, which implements the commitment to ban the disabling of traction control in high-powered vehicles.

The government's commitment to introduce a new licensing scheme for elite high-powered sports cars is also being carried through but is being progressed separately from the bill that is before the chamber, as it involves changes to regulations. This package of reforms was developed with the support of an across-government working group in relation to the licensing scheme, in consultation with other stakeholders.

Turning now to the details of the bill. The bill inserts a new mid-tier offence of causing death or serious harm by careless use of a vehicle or vessel at section 19AB(a) of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. The introduction of this new offence will allow for a more appropriate penalty

range for serious driving conduct linked to the death or serious harm of another, where the conduct has not met the higher threshold of dangerous driving.

Currently, the offence of dangerous driving causing death or serious harm in section 19A of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act carries a maximum penalty of 15 years' imprisonment for a basic offence or life imprisonment for aggravated or subsequent offences, in addition to a licence disqualification of at least 10 years. However, when the threshold for dangerous driving is not met, a driver will generally face a charge of aggravated driving without due care causing death under section 45 of the Road Traffic Act 1961, which has a maximum penalty of 12 months' imprisonment and six months' licence disqualification.

The difference between these two offences is significant and can result in disproportionate sentencing for serious offending. The new mid-tier offence introduced by this bill effectively raises the penalty for driving without due care when a person dies or is seriously injured, from a maximum of 12 months to five years' imprisonment for a basic offence and seven years' imprisonment for an aggravated offence.

Similarly, the minimum licence disqualification period is also raised from six months to one year for a basic offence and three years for an aggravated offence. Separate penalties are also provided for when a person commits the new offence of using a vehicle other than a motor vehicle. This would cover, for example, riding a bicycle, and is consistent with the structure of penalties in other serious driving offences in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

To ensure these changes fit within the scheme of existing driving offences, the bill amends section 45 of the Road Traffic Act so that the aggravating factors of causing death and serious harm are removed and the aggravating factor of causing harm is inserted. This will ensure there are appropriate penalties for the spectrum of consequences of harm caused by this sort of driving. The aggravating factors for the new offence cover circumstances which capture what is considered the most serious driving without due care behaviour. Aggravating factors include when the offender has committed the offence:

- knowing that they were disqualified from holding or obtaining a driver's licence;
- with a prescribed blood alcohol level of .08 grams or more;
- driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs in contravention of section 47 or 47BA of the Road Traffic Act;
- driving or using a motor vehicle knowing it had a material defect and that material defect contributed to the commission of the offence; and
- driving in contravention of section 44C of the Road Traffic Act.

Material defects are those which affect the safe operation of the vehicle. They could manifest in a number of ways; for example, by neglected tyre and vehicle maintenance. The aggravating factor of driving in contravention of section 44C of the Road Traffic Act refers to a new offence introduced by the bill at clause 12, which prohibits driving of an ultra high-powered vehicle where an automated intervention system has been disabled. The ultra high-powered vehicle is defined to mean a motor vehicle with a gross vehicle mass of 4.5 tonnes or less and a power ratio of 276 kilowatts per tonne or greater. The offence, therefore, does not cover things such as buses or motorbikes, but captures more powerful vehicles such as Bugattis, Ferraris and Lamborghinis.

The inclusion of these offences as an aggravating factor for the new mid-tier offence will capture, amongst other conduct, the driver of an ultra high-powered vehicle driving in sports mode who causes death or serious harm. Putting an ultra high-powered vehicle in sports mode or other similar mode makes the car more responsive to sensitive input and makes the engine more powerful and aggressive. It causes the vehicle to become more agile but reduces stability on surfaces, meaning that vehicle's tyres are more likely to lose traction and the vehicle is therefore more likely to lose control. It is not, we think, under any circumstances, a mode of driving that should be used in built-up areas for these types of cars. As we have seen, the consequences are too devastating.

A standalone offence of driving an ultra high-powered vehicle with a disabled automotive intervention system will now carry a penalty of up to \$5,000. The disabling of automated intervention

systems typically occurs when a driver changes the vehicle's mode to a more agile mode, such as sports mode or other racing-type mode. Automated intervention systems are systems which can intervene in the driving task and include embedded safety systems such as anti-lock braking, electronic stability control, traction control and automated emergency braking, and this is distinguished from simple and non-intervening warning systems, such as reverse warnings or lane drift warnings.

The bill also appropriately provides for a defence where the person did not disable the system and did not know or could have been expected to know it was disabled. It is also a defence if it was impractical to drive with the automated intervention system enabled, as there are some circumstances where such systems, we are informed, should legitimately be turned off, like when a car is bogged or being driven on loose surfaces.

Turning to other amendments in the bill, clause 8 of the bill amends section 19B of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 to provide for an appropriate alternative verdict provision for the new mid-tier offence so that:

- the new offence is available as an alternative verdict for certain more serious offences causing death, serious harm or harm; and
- less serious driving offences will be available for alternative verdicts where the new mid-tier offence is charged and cannot be established.

Clauses 3, 9 and 14 of the bill include amendments that are consequential to the creation of the new mid-tier offence. These changes are to ensure consistency of penalties across all relative offences, namely extreme speed in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, excessive speed in the Road Traffic Act, and careless operation of a vessel in the Harbors and Navigation Act.

In summary, the bill removes the aggravating factor of causing death or serious harm from these offences and inserts a new causing harm as an aggravating factor. For those offences, conduct causing death or serious harm will be captured by this new mid-tier offence, which carries an appropriately higher maximum penalty. As such, these changes remove unnecessary duplication and inconsistencies for driving offences.

To implement the government's commitment to strengthen laws banning drivers accused of causing death, clauses 6 and 7 of the bill amend the immediate licence disqualification or suspension provisions in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to extend to the circumstances in which police can issue an on-the-spot fine, licence suspension or disqualification so that it covers:

- firstly, the new mid-tier offence of causing death or harm by use of a vehicle of a vessel;
- secondly, leaving the accident scene after causing death, serious harm or harm by careless use of a vehicle or vessel in contravention of section 19AB of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act; and
- thirdly, dangerous driving causing serious harm or harm in section 19A of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

Currently, police can only issue an on-the-spot licence suspension or disqualification for the offence of extreme speed or dangerous driving where the offence resulted in death. Broadening the circumstances as proposed will ensure greater safety to the community. The changes also close a current loophole which may technically allow a person to lawfully drive between the period in which one notice ends and a new one is issued. As I mentioned earlier, the government's commitment to introduce a new licensing scheme for elite, high-powered sports cars is also being carried through but is being progressed separately from the bill as it involves changes to regulations.

Clause 10 of the bill amends the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 to support the introduction of this licence class through regulations. The amendment will ensure that a new class of licence for ultra high-powered vehicles, when ready, can be implemented effectively. Following the introduction of this bill today, there will be further consultation. Stakeholders will have an opportunity to provide comment on the bill, and it will be progressed early in the new year.

I would like to acknowledge the tireless work of Sophia's family and their thoughtful and considered advocacy in her memory. These reforms are a fitting tribute to Sophia's legacy. With these reforms, drivers will think twice before driving unacceptably on our roads and needlessly endangering other road users. In my view, this will be one of the most significant effects of this reform.

The families that will never have to go through the pain of losing a loved one on our roads will never know that they are the beneficiaries of these reforms. Every life that these reforms saves will justify this bill 100 times over. I commend the bill to the chamber and seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*

3—Amendment of section 5AA—Aggravated offences

This clause inserts aggravating circumstances for the proposed new offence of causing death or serious harm by careless use of a vehicle or vessel and makes related amendments.

4—Amendment of section 19A—Causing death or harm by use of vehicle or vessel

This clause amends the heading of section 19A to distinguish that offence from the proposed new offence.

5—Insertion of section 19ABA

This clause inserts a new offence as follows:

19ABA—Causing death or serious harm by careless use of vehicle or vessel

A person who drives a vehicle or operates a vessel without due care or attention or without reasonable consideration for any person and thereby causes the death of, or serious harm to, another is guilty of an offence under this provision. The penalty for a basic offence involving a motor vehicle or motor vessel is imprisonment for 5 years and, if the offence involved a motor vehicle, disqualification from holding or obtaining a driver's licence for at least 1 year. The penalty for an aggravated offence involving a motor vehicle or motor vessel is imprisonment for 7 years and, if the offence involved the use of a motor vehicle, disqualification from holding or obtaining a driver's licence for at least 3 years. The penalty for an offence not involving a motor vehicle or motor vessel is 3 years imprisonment if the offence causes death and 2 years imprisonment if the offence causes serious harm. A defence to an offence against the section is provided for emergency workers (mirroring the defence in the current section 19A).

6—Amendment of section 19AE—Commissioner of Police to impose immediate licence disqualification or suspension following certain charges against section 19A(1)

This clause amends section 19AE to extend the application of the section to all offences against sections 19A, 19AB and 19ABA where a motor vehicle was used in the offence and the offence resulted in the death of, or serious harm to, a person.

7—Amendment of section 19AF—Power of police to impose immediate licence disqualification or suspension where offence against section 19A(1) or 19ADA(1)

This clause amends section 19AF to extend the application of the section to section 19A(3) and the offences in section 19AB and section 19ABA.

8—Amendment of section 19B—Alternative verdicts

This clause amends the alternative verdicts provision to extend the application of the section to the offences in section 19ABA.

Part 3—Amendment of *Harbors and Navigation Act 1993*

9—Amendment of section 69—Careless operation of a vessel

This clause amends section 69 to replace the reference to causing death or serious harm in the provision setting out circumstances of aggravation to a reference to causing 'harm'.

Part 4—Amendment of *Motor Vehicles Act 1959*

10—Amendment of section 145—Regulations and fee notices

This clause clarifies that regulations made under section 145(1)(gc) or (gd) may require a person who holds a particular class of licence to obtain a different class of licence in order to drive a class of motor vehicle that they had previously been authorised to drive.

Part 5—Amendment of *Road Traffic Act 1961*

11—Amendment of heading to Part 3 Division 4

This clause makes a minor consequential change to a heading.

12—Insertion of section 44C

This clause inserts a new section as follows:

44C—Driving ultra high powered vehicle with disabled automated intervention system

It is an offence for a person to drive an ultra high powered vehicle on a road if an automated intervention system of the vehicle is disabled. The penalty for the offence is a fine of \$5000. Certain defences are specified.

13—Amendment of section 45—Careless driving

This clause amends section 45 to replace the reference to causing death or serious harm in the provision setting out circumstances of aggravation to a reference to causing 'harm'.

14—Amendment of section 45A—Excessive speed

This clause amends section 45A to replace the reference to causing death or serious harm in the provision setting out circumstances of aggravation to a reference to causing 'harm'.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. L.A. Curran.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ANIMAL WELFARE REFORMS) BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (11:23): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Animal Welfare Act 1985 and the Dog and Cat Management Act 1995. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (11:24): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Indeed, I rise today to reintroduce this bill for a third time. While I move a second reading speech today, it will be familiar to those of you who have been in this parliament for some time that this is an issue that I have pursued for many years. I wish to pay tribute to the hard work, advocacy and campaigning by organisations and constituents alike. I particularly wish to note the hard work of an ICU nurse who is passionate about this issue, Mia Auckland, as well as the leadership of those such as Paul Stevenson, the current CEO of the RSPCA in South Australia, and the previous CE of the Animal Welfare League, Richard Mussell.

This bill is a result of public demand for the humane treatment of animals, particularly companion animals and cats and dogs, as well as greyhounds. It seeks to reverse the inadequate minimum welfare standards we currently have in this state when it comes to the treatment and care of those animals. Unfortunately, the cruelty and mistreatment of those animals is something that we are still seeing uncovered and continuing. We are capable with our laws, I believe, of ensuring that we have standards and codes of practice that ensure that those animals we believe are in the care of a rescue or a shelter, or are subject to use by an industry—often for profit—should actually have minimum standards of care and compassion.

South Australia, unfortunately, still has some of the weakest animal welfare laws in the country. I do look forward to that trend being reversed in coming years. It is, yet again, why I introduce this particular bill that seeks to amend the Animal Welfare Act and the Dog and Cat Management Act. This bill would bring our laws in South Australia into the 21st century and meet community expectations for animal welfare standards. I do believe our laws in South Australia are out of date. The longer we delay, the longer and more these animals that we purport to love will suffer.

This bill reflects the recommendations from the joint committee that I previously chaired and that reported back to the previous parliament in September 2021. I thank the members of that committee at the time. It was a joint house committee, and while I chaired it it had two members of the upper house and two members of the lower house, who are all still in the parliament, so I look forward to those continued conversations.

I thank the Hon. Dr Nicola Centofanti; the Hon. Dr Susan Close (now minister), member for Port Adelaide; and Dr Richard Harvey, member for Newland, who was previously on this committee. He is no longer with the parliament but I know he would certainly be someone who I would hope would support this quite eminently sensible proposition. That committee received 18 written submissions and heard evidence from 25 different witnesses. The report of that committee made 21 recommendations to improve the previous bill that I had introduced to this place.

The report supported the bill. It supported the aim of the bill, which primarily found favour with the committee in terms of its intention to reduce the number of dogs and cats needlessly euthanised by rescues and shelters; to create a code of practice and licensing requirements for animal rescues, shelters and rehousing organisations; and also to insert civil provisions to enable proactive actions that would better protect the welfare of companion animals, as well as greyhounds. It also creates special provisions in relation to the transparency around the reporting of data on greyhounds in our state, particularly through the auspices of Greyhound Racing SA.

While not everyone supported the bill, the overwhelming majority of those submissions and witnesses did. The committee worked hard to achieve what I would call some compromises to develop a consensus. I would not say that I got everything that I wanted out of that committee process in terms of requirements, for example, that Greyhound Racing SA comply with freedom of information laws in this state, but certainly a provision to ensure that they are more transparent with annual reporting of their statistics was that consensus compromise, which I think the community will be welcoming of.

This bill reflects those recommendations. The legislation will focus on preventing the number of euthanised cats and dogs that are suitable for rehousing from being destroyed and will create mandatory licensing and inspection requirements of certain animal shelters, as well as rehousing services and rescues, enabling better proactive action to be taken to prevent animal cruelty.

On that, I do note the input of the RSPCA, who are the key body in terms of the so-called prevention of cruelty to animals in this state. Unfortunately, the prevention aspect of it is not necessarily empowered by our laws, and often the cruelty has to already be well in train and occurring, and to have occurred, before the RSPCA can take action.

The bill also creates special provisions, as I noted, for reporting requirements relating to the greyhound industry. I note that those particular reporting requirements would, as I said, be in the form of an annual report lodged with the minister, which the minister would then need to table after a certain number of sitting days, I believe six days. That would detail the number of greyhounds raced, unraced, retired, imported, exported and adopted, as well as the number of registered greyhounds destroyed and the reasons for their destruction, including natural causes.

These transparency measures will ensure that we have the truth about how many greyhounds are killed in this industry each year and for what purposes they are killed—whether they die on track or whether they die of natural causes—and whether they are rehomed and how successful the rehoming and adoption program really is.

This actually requires the greyhound industry to make good on a promise that they made to this parliament many years ago now, in a press release in which they promised to provide this level of transparency. That press release, back under the Weatherill government, was in fact designed to stop a select committee of this council inquiring into those very figures. Those transparency measures however are, I believe, something that the community expects in this day and age and will strongly support.

I note and commend the good work of those who support greyhounds, in particular, and recognise their treatment, or in fact mistreatment, over a period of time, simply because they are deemed as profitable for some to participate in what is essentially an industry based on gambling. It

is certainly a sad outcome, both for the dogs and often for those who suffer from gambling addictions and the like.

This bill, however, has its primary focus on shelters and rescues, and I do believe that it will reflect community standards as, time and time again, we have seen our laws fail to protect the very animals we believe are placed in care, the animals who are most vulnerable. In comparison to other states we have a long way to go, and this bill will hopefully get us there.

Many shelters do begin with good intentions. They intend to help the animals that come into their care, they intend to rehome them and they intend to treat them, but sometimes this is not what happens. Unregulated shelters and rescues can get overwhelmed; they can take on too much. The result, unfortunately, is that the animals suffer and are unsafe, and some needlessly die. A mandatory licensing and inspection process would limit the chances of a shelter or rescue deteriorating to the point where those animals are left to suffer and in fact would minimise the amount of times that the people who run those shelters end up in our courts.

The bill focuses on prevention. It focuses on providing standards and expectations. It will ensure that we avoid cruelty and neglect and that those matters are able to be addressed before they get to the point of those unfortunate outcomes and court cases.

With that, I look forward to conversations with members. I note that the committee was well aware, as we undertook our deliberations, that the Dog and Cat Management Act is currently, I believe, under review. I am interested to know how public that review will be and how extensive it will be.

I have had animal welfare advocates contact me because they have sought to make submissions to this long-awaited and anticipated Dog and Cat Management Act in review, but they have not been able to find hide nor hair (to make a pun) of information about how to make a submission, about how they can participate and how they can give input into this very important area that, as I say, has been long awaited and anticipated by many who care for animals. Indeed, this state relies on their care and compassion because they do a job that certainly could not be provided by government and is done largely by volunteers with the best of intentions who deserve the best possible laws in this state.

I look forward to that Dog and Cat Management Act being a very transparent process indeed, providing the same level of transparency that this bill will provide in this sector. With that, I commend the bill.

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

Parliamentary Committees

SELECT COMMITTEE ON DOLPHINS IN ADELAIDE DOLPHIN SANCTUARY AND PORT RIVER

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (11:35): I move:

That the interim report of the select committee be noted.

I rise with some pleasure, but also some great anguish in fact, to speak to this report of the Select Committee on Dolphins in Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary and Port River. I thank members of the Legislative Council for the support in establishing this particular select committee to look, put simply, at why the quite unique and precious dolphins in our Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary are dying at the rates that they are, and whether or not the Dolphin Sanctuary Act is fulfilling its intended purpose.

I first wish to thank the members of the committee who have devoted their time and energy and intellect into investigating this matter, including the Hon. Sarah Game, the Hon. Michelle Lensink and the Hon. Reggie Martin. In fact, I will reflect that many select committees' members are there out of a sense of duty, but not necessarily out of a sense of desire. On this committee, in no way did any of the members seek to shirk their responsibilities. Indeed, they were all very passionate and enthusiastic in working together and collaboratively to seek to investigate this most concerning issue. I also wish to thank the committee secretary, Mr Anthony Beasley, and the research officer,

Dr Merry Brown, for their contribution and for supporting the very important work of parliament through our select committee process.

I note that this report is probably before this parliament much quicker than we would normally see a report come back from a select committee, but the reason for that is bleedingly obvious: the dolphins are dying, and there is some concern that they are dying because of things that we could be doing that are preventable. It is also of concern, and became absolutely patently obvious, that the original intentions of the act that established the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary are not currently being fulfilled.

The inquiry today has an interim report. It is a body of work that we believe will be useful for the minister in her deliberations. It will be something for the community to consider, but also a call to action to re-establish a central governance body to oversee the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary with haste. Under the whole scale, at the stroke of a pen, erasure of many boards and committees under the Weatherill government, the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary suffered with the loss of their advisory body.

Indeed, since then, there has not been, if you like, somebody or a body with oversight of the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary able to get through the myriad levels of government, elements in the community, elements in industry of concern to provide a strong voice for the protection of these dolphins. Our very first recommendation is that either a body or an individual be charged with that power and that job of oversight.

The committee received 24 submissions. It heard from 30 witnesses, and it also conducted a site visit that traversed the St Kilda mangroves, Garden Island, Torrens Island and Outer Harbor, including a visit to AMWRRO. I note that this committee continues beyond this report today. I also note it was incredibly telling that the issues that have been raised for, in some cases, over four or five years suddenly were addressed.

For example, the Royal South Australian Yacht Squadron's concern about pollution suddenly got attention and was addressed because this select committee asked a few questions and took some submissions and the media put pressure on for a response. This is the importance of having an oversight body that will have the power to ensure that it is not seen as something that is everyone else's responsibility where concerns are raised. Indeed, somebody will have that 'buck stops here' role when it comes to the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary.

The heightened public awareness of the matters also assisted, and I think that is again a case in point why the important work of this select committee should continue. Regarding the report, as I say, we are hopeful of a response from the minister and the department. I note that the department, in their submission to the select committee, presented us with a PowerPoint presentation with many aspirational intentions, none of which had commenced. We look forward as a select committee to those aspirational intentions turning into actions and hearing regular updates from the Department for Environment and Water on those intentions actually happening.

I believe the select committee has played an important role in reviewing what I suspect was very much a simple oversight when we removed many of those boards and committees. I do not think it was anticipated that the removal of this particular Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary committee would have the impact of leaving this very precious icon of the port without the appropriate regulatory response, the ability for action to be taken on behalf of the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary where it was needed or just simply the accountability to the parliament of regular reporting or somebody who was able to be that one-stop shop to ensure that these issues were not being overlooked.

There are many recommendations here, and I am not going to go through them all today; in fact, I am going to revisit this in the next sitting week of parliament. I am hopeful that by then we will have had some responses also from Renewal SA, who, similarly to the Department for Environment and Water, have promised us regular updates.

There are many questions raised by this select committee report. I hope that in the future, through the continuation of the work alongside the Labor and Liberal members of this committee as well as One Nation, we will see the parliament's interest spark active engagement and turn what is

currently quite a sad story around to one where South Australians can be proud that the parliament intervened and ensured that these dolphins were treated in the way that they should be.

The committee has traversed a number of areas. While we do not purport to have all the answers, certainly we have made some recommendations that reflect many things that the community has called for for some time. I look forward to receiving responses in a timely way, which I hope to reflect upon come the sitting week next year when we resume. I do not know the date of it yet, but on the next Wednesday of sitting, I hope to conclude my remarks with an update for the parliament that we have seen some action, not just simply those aspirational PowerPoint presentations. With that, I seek leave to conclude my comments.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Bills

FAIR TRADING (LIFESPAN OF ELECTRICAL PRODUCTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (11:45): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Fair Trading Act 1987. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (11:46): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

In the 1920s, the makers of light bulbs wanted to find a competitive edge. They worked in Geneva in January 1925 to create an alliance to work together to find solutions. They were called the Phoebus Cartel, and they discovered that, if you reduce the life span of your product, you can sell more of them. They reduced the life expectancy of light bulbs from 2,500 hours to 1,000 hours to generate higher sales. By creating an inferior bulb, they could save on manufacturing costs and force customers to buy more. It worked: the cartel increased their sales by more than one million units in four years.

This became known as planned obsolescence; marketers soon realised that shortening life spans was a way to activate commerce. During the Great Depression planned obsolescence was seen as a way of stimulating the economy, so in the United States there was even a push by citizens to legislate for limited life spans so that products were reproduced.

The idea of limiting life spans was quickly picked up by other industries, and in 2022 we now see it employed in cars, in smartphones, in batteries, in ink cartridges, vacuum cleaners, kitchen appliances and more. I have often experienced this in my own home in my quest to find a vacuum cleaner that seems to go the distance. Planned obsolescence is often blamed for the increased waste in electric goods, and in 2016 Australia generated 23.6 kilograms of e-waste per inhabitant—that is a lot of material ending up in landfill, 65 per cent, in fact.

By reducing the life span of products, manufacturers are contributing to the throwaway economy, where consumers are encouraged to simply throw away products and buy a new one earlier than is necessary. It is unfair to consumers to expect them to continually purchase items that could have been built with longevity in mind. This bill, which provides for an advertised life span of electrical products, has been introduced at this time to coincide with the Christmas sales, because I know during this economic crisis a lot of South Australians will be considering how they can get bang for their buck, and many will be concerned about purchasing items that may have a much shorter life span than intended.

In recent years, there have been several legal cases against manufacturers who are intentionally shortening the life span of their products. In 2018, for instance, Apple had to pay \$27 million under the European Parliament for intentionally shortening the life span of their products after it was discovered that software updates were being used to slow down their phones. Cases have also been brought in other jurisdictions against printer companies for building ink cartridges with smart chips that disable the device when the ink is low.

Any item with a non-removable lithium ion battery in rechargeable devices is naturally going to have a shorter life span as the battery degrades over time. Of course, we accept that—that is covered by the bill. We see it in many items we use daily, such as battery-operated headphones, handheld blenders, handheld vacuum cleaners and children's toys.

Other jurisdictions have begun to stop this wasteful practice. In 2014, France passed legislation making it an offence to deliberately reduce the life span to increase replacement rates. The bill I am introducing today takes a consumer awareness approach. The Fair Trading (Lifespan of Electrical Products) Amendment Bill requires that the shortest life span of an electrical product is advertised at the point of sale. Retailers would provide a label with that information made available to the consumer. This would allow consumers to make an informed choice in terms of the products they select, reducing the cost for the consumer and reducing the material that ends up in landfill.

A report tabled in the European Parliament states that 92 per cent of consumers would prefer for their products to be labelled with their life span or useful life. People feel cheated, understandably so, when they find out that a product they have bought was meant to only last for a few years. When purchasing a dishwasher, consumers should know if the components will last for five years or if they will last for 15 years. Most would rather pay a little bit more at the point of initial sale rather than having to continually replace a product, generating more waste and, of course, more cost for the consumer.

The bill ensures that consumers will have accurate information about the durability of their product at the time of purchase, measured in years, months, days, cycles or kilometres. Further, it ensures that the product is treated as a whole, with the component with the shortest life span being the one that is disclosed. These measures would ensure that consumers are given the most accurate information available about the life span of their product.

Next time, Mr President, when you are considering an electrical item, I urge you to consider whether you would know how long it is going to last before you buy it, and would you still buy it if you knew that it was only going to last for one year or maybe two, or would you choose a different product? By ensuring that we are giving consumers choice we can solve two problems in one: we can halt the unreasonable practice of planned obsolescence and reduce the enormous amounts of e-waste generated.

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

Motions

GIG ECONOMY

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (11:52): I move:

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on the gig economy with particular reference to:
 - (a) the prevalence of gig economy work within South Australia;
 - (b) the various forms of gig economy work;
 - (c) the current legislative and regulatory regime and the extent of compliance within that regime;
 - (d) the impacts of the gig economy on workers inside and outside of the gig economy and the impact of gig economy work on families, communities and businesses;
 - (e) the individual, business, community and statewide economic impacts of the gig economy;
 - (f) the impact of the prevalence and practices of the gig economy in relation to government procurement and expenditure;
 - (g) the intersection of slavery and slavery-like practices;
 - (h) current supports available to workers and employers;
 - (i) other jurisdictions' legislative, regulatory and policy solutions to address issues within the gig economy;
 - (j) the implications of the gig economy in respect of compliance with treaties and obligations;

- (k) legislative, regulatory and policy and legislative implications in South Australia; and
 - (l) any other related matter.
2. That this council permits the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it sees fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being presented to the council.

Today, I rise to speak about the need to address one of the fastest growing sectors in South Australia's workforce, and that is the gig economy. The gig economy is also known as the platform economy or the app economy. In the gig economy, services are provided to consumers for a fee via an online platform. The workers who provide the service include drivers for rideshare companies like Uber, couriers for food delivery companies like Menulog and Uber Eats, and tradies who provide their skills through apps like Airtasker.

Recently, the gig economy has been expanding into new areas such as disability and care work. The jobs are flexible, temporary and on demand. For workers, the gig economy is said to reward entrepreneurship and provide benefits such as flexibility, autonomy and choice. It is sold as giving a worker the opportunity to fit their job around their life rather than fitting their life around their job.

Many are drawn to the work as a form of supplementary income, or by the lure of being your own boss. The flexibility of the gig economy is often promoted as modernising and positive to both workers and businesses. In reality, the gig economy works by undercutting the traditional model of employment upon which many of our rules for worker protection are based.

By restructuring these labour relations, platforms have opened a window to bypass the existing regulatory framework, and profit enormously in the process. Someone working a job for a company that operates in the gig economy is not necessarily an employee of that company; rather, they are classified as an independent contractor. A lot depends on that classification. It will impact a worker's superannuation and their ability to access workers compensation and sick leave. In essence, it represents an attempt to contract out of existing wage and legal frameworks.

Judicial case law on contracts of employment has, over time, defined an employee as a question of whether one engages in a contract of service or a contract for service. This definition of a worker is based on consideration of various indicia to determine whether an employment relationship fits categorisation as a worker relationship or that of an independent contractor.

If an employee is a worker, they may be afforded a number of protections as well as rights. By the same token, employers have certain obligations and responsibilities for their workforce. Normally, an independent contractor will enjoy the benefits that make up for the loss of these things. The Fair Work Ombudsman provides some indicators to determine whether someone can be classified as an independent contractor. They state that, amongst others, an independent contractor will:

- hold a high level of control over their working hours, work location and methods of work;
- negotiate their own fees;
- bear full responsibility and risk for workplace injuries, profits or losses on tasks and poor quality work;
- use their own tools and equipment;
- pay their own tax to the ATO;
- have no leave entitlements; and
- can delegate their work to another.

Gig workers may meet some of the above indicators, but it is clear they experience few of the benefits outlined. An independent contractor is understood to have some autonomy and control and equality in negotiation, which is not reflected in the reality of gig work. We can look to Uber as an example, as each Uber driver will take a commission, usually ranging between 20 and 30 per cent, along with

booking fees. Uber has the authority to modify these commissions and fees at any point, for any reason.

There is little transparency surrounding the function of the algorithms that operate these platforms, with the company maintaining control and ownership of all data. This results in a massive power imbalance between worker and Uber, demonstrated through the practice of blind ride acceptance where drivers are not shown the destination or fare information but must accept or reject the job without knowing the profit potential.

Workers on Uber and other platforms are also subject to rating mechanisms, which have no managerial oversight from the company and yet will be used to determine whether or not a driver gets work or even has their contract suspended or terminated. Uber drivers may control when they choose to get in the car and where they work, but that would appear to be about all they control. This classification as independent contractor allows companies to artificially separate themselves from their workers by placing themselves as facilitators of a contract.

Uber states that they are a 'technology services provider that does not provide a transportation service'. By using this definition, Uber maintains the illusion of the driver's total independence and does not provide accessible or effective avenues for gig workers to seek support or remediation if they encounter harassment or mistreatment in the performance of their work. The difference between whether an employee is a worker or a contractor is the difference between working in a regulated or unregulated industrial environment.

A survey from the Transport Workers' Union in 2018 found that more than one in three delivery drivers had been injured in the job, with 80 per cent receiving no support from that platform. Out of 1,153 rideshare drivers surveyed, there were 969 reports of harassment and/or assault.

In addition to the risk of exposure, the payment that workers receive is not truly reflective of the work they perform. Payment is provided upon the completion of the task for which a worker is contracted, rather than the hours worked. Time spent getting to a job or waiting for customers is not covered by payment. A national survey commissioned by the Victorian government in 2019 found that, when asked, many could not say how much they earned per hour.

Gig workers will often have to work across many different platforms, as very rarely can a single platform provide a livable wage. The Senate committee into job insecurity reported last year that, as there is no contractual obligation for permanence or working hours, gig workers may be underemployed or terminated without warning, leaving them with no safety net.

This is exactly what happened to Diego Franco, a courier for Deliveroo in New South Wales in 2020. After having worked for the platform for close to three years, he was emailed by Deliveroo and notified that his contract would be terminated in a week's time, as he had been too slow delivering orders and had been notified previously about his poor performance. Mr Franco argued that he had received no such notification nor guidance as to what a 'proper delivery time' constituted. His contract was subsequently terminated, leaving him without his primary source of income in the middle of the first COVID lockdown, with no way to support his family.

The termination was automated and did not offer any opportunity to respond or human contact point for Mr Franco to engage with. The notice of termination did not show cause, nor did it show the information or specific complaints relied upon by Deliveroo. Mr Franco made an unfair dismissal case to the Fair Work Commission, represented by the TWU. Not only was this case successful but the commission found that Mr Franco had engaged in delivery work as an employee of Deliveroo, not as an independent contractor. Deliveroo chose to appeal the decision.

In the face of a test case over the employment status of one of its couriers, the food company Foodora left Australia in 2018. Deliveroo has now done the same. On 15 November, the Deliveroo app stopped working when their British parent company made the decision to withdraw from the Australian market. The abrupt closure has left up to 15,000 couriers in the lurch. When faced with a future that might require them to provide humane conditions to the people that make their profits possible, these companies would rather run.

The reality is that the profitability of these companies often depends upon the exploitation of contracted workers. Vulnerable groups are over-represented in precarious job situations. Feeling as

if they can go nowhere else, they will accept the conditions that no-one else will accept. This makes the function of the gig economy all the more insidious. The national survey found that platform workers were more likely to be younger, be students, identify as living with a disability and speak a language other than English at home. A permanent resident is 1.7 times more likely to participate in the gig economy when compared with those who hold Australian citizenship.

This is a system that is not only an affront to workers' rights but one that undermines principles of competitive neutrality. For businesses to grow, competition must be fair. This cannot be the case where a business is permitted to cut costs at their workers' expense in order to achieve greater profit. It is fundamentally a non-competitive model.

It is clear that the gig economy is here to stay. Already, it is difficult for many people to imagine their lives without it. With a growing cost-of-living crisis, we are likely to see more people turn to the gig economy as they find themselves out of work or needing to supplement their income to afford skyrocketing prices.

To let the issues of this unregulated labour market go unaddressed would be to abandon an increasing number of the workforce to the possibility of mistreatment and exploitation. A semantic and technical difference in classification should not be allowed to deprive people of their rights. I hope that through the establishment of this committee we can begin to understand the dimensions of the South Australian gig economy and the needs of its workers better, and begin the journey towards ensuring that the most vulnerable workers in our society receive the protection they rightly deserve.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. L.A. Curran.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (LOSS OF FETUS) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. S.L. GAME (12:05): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, the Sentencing Act 2017 and the Victims of Crime Act 2001. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. S.L. GAME (12:06): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

It is a privilege to introduce this important bill to the chamber. The Statutes Amendment (Loss of Fetus) Bill 2022 is about justice for those who suffer the loss of an in-utero baby and about recognition of the grief and death that has resulted—a death not through choice or illness or disease but through malice, recklessness or the negligence of others.

I want to note that it is an important and appropriate day to raise this bill, as it relates to the previous bill raised by the Attorney-General this morning. Many instances of fetal loss by a criminal act have occurred through traffic collisions, and it is important to recognise all life lost through such acts.

Let me be clear: this bill does not impact a woman's right to choose an abortion. What this bill does is acknowledge the death of a baby when that baby, while still in utero, dies as a result of a prescribed criminal offence as outlined in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Those offences include crimes such as rape, criminal neglect and causing death by dangerous driving. At present, the loss of an in-utero baby due to a criminal act is legally recognised only as an injury to the mother. There is no validation for the profound loss and grief for the mother, father and extended family and friends. A dead baby becomes part of an itemised list of injuries recorded.

New South Wales already has similar legislation in place, passed last year with bipartisan support. The 2021 New South Wales legislation known as Zoe's Law finally passed both houses of parliament after 12 years of campaigning. I would like to record my respect for the Donegan family and their fellow advocates who saw such a personally important piece of legislation repeatedly raised and shut down for over a decade.

I recommend that everyone in this chamber familiarise themselves with Brodie Donegan's story and the loss of her baby daughter Zoe. Zoe passed away in utero after a collision caused by a drug-affected driver. Brodie was walking in her neighbourhood before she was struck by an out-of-control van and pinned against a tree.

Let us acknowledge that this sudden and traumatic loss could happen to any pregnant woman and her family. Earlier this year, charges were dropped against a South Australian man accused of kicking his pregnant wife in the stomach with steelcap boots. It was alleged he did so with intent to kill her unborn baby, according to court documents. He was also accused of administering poison upon another person in order to procure a miscarriage and was charged with causing harm and two counts of aggravated assault. Would these charges have been dropped if this bill had been enacted?

As stated earlier, this bill is based on enacted interstate legislation which received bipartisan support. A key difference is that the New South Wales legislation recognises fetuses over 20 weeks of gestation or weighing over 400 grams. The legislation presented today encompasses all fetuses of any gestation period or weight, and this is an important decision I reached after careful legal consultations.

Where do we draw the line? Is a 19-week-old in-utero baby of less significance to their family than a 20-week-old one? Is the person who deliberately and violently assaults their partner in the stomach to cause a miscarriage any less guilty of doing so at 14 weeks than at 20 weeks? I would like to draw attention to part 2, new division 19, of the bill:

- (a) the prosecution is not required to allege which act or omission caused the loss of the fetus...

I have an important example for the chamber of why this is so critical. If a woman is assaulted and struck in the stomach and then deliberately stepped on six to seven times, resulting in the loss of a fetus, the prosecution does not need to establish which of the multiple punches or steps caused the loss of that fetus. That fetus was to be named Jonathon. He was at 24 weeks' gestation when his 17-year-old mother-to-be, Kylie Flick, was assaulted by her 112-kilogram boyfriend. Under current South Australian law, only the assault on Kylie would have been an offence, not Jonathon's death. That is wrong.

In another example, using compound injuries and trauma, a woman loses her fetus in a traffic collision caused by a reckless, drug-affected driver. The prosecution would not have to determine that the fetus was lost specifically due to the blunt impact of a car part hitting her belly, the catastrophic rupture of her womb, blood loss from injuries incurred waiting for extraction from a wreckage or the stress and psychological trauma of the accident. That woman was Jacqueline Sparks, and she lost her baby, Mia, who had been growing inside her for 32 to 34 weeks at the time of the car collision.

By this proposed new South Australian law, if the driver was found guilty of reckless driving and drug driving causing grievous bodily harm to the pregnant woman, the prosecution may proceed to also seek a guilty verdict for causing that pregnant woman's loss of fetus. The purpose and strength of new subsection (2)(a) in this bill is to simplify the prosecution's case and to bring strong consequences to the perpetrator. It is consistent practice with other established areas of South Australian law.

Another distinction between the bill presented today and the existing New South Wales legislation is the expansion of prescribed offences. I am going to quote now from campaigner Brodie Donegan. She says:

Births, Deaths and Marriages say you need to have a funeral for your [stillborn] baby. We received a stillbirth/death certificate. We named our daughter. We received the baby bonus paid as the bereavement bonus, as happens after you lose a baby. I received six weeks parental leave from Newcastle University as is also customary if you lose a baby.

There is all this legislation recognising the existence of Zoe, yet when it came to the driver being charged with what happened, she was charged with Dangerous Driving causing Grievous Bodily Harm to me—Zoe was listed with my injuries. To me, she was more important than my injuries. The loss of her was harder to recover from than my injuries.

...Any baby lost in any horrific or violent way due to someone committing a criminal act should count, should be included, and should be recognised.

Parts 3 and 4 of this bill are important to acknowledge the loss endured by families. It is important that a formerly pregnant woman who has lost her fetus due to a criminal act be allowed to give a victim impact statement on that loss, and that statement should affect the sentencing of a perpetrator found guilty. It is also important and equally appropriate for other members to do so as well. If a partner loses the person they were preparing to have a baby with, and that baby also dies in the criminal act, the trauma is twofold. The insertion of new subsection 14(6a) in the Sentencing Act 2017 ensures this right.

Part 4 of this bill, amending section 17 of the Victims of Crime Act 2001, ensures that the loss of a fetus is valued as a death of a family member, not as part of an injury list of the pregnant woman. It honours the fetus as a separate victim of a prescribed criminal act in its own right, and it allows some compensation from the Victims of Crime Fund to be applied for.

This bill is presented in honour of Zoe, Brodie Donegan's baby, and of all the other babies who have been lost to criminal offences. At this point it is unknown how many fetuses have been killed due to domestic violence or died due to various criminal acts as they are currently unlisted and unrecognised victims.

The Pregnancy Outcome Unit of Wellbeing SA does not list the causes of traumatic in-utero deaths in either its Maternal and Perinatal Mortality in South Australia annual report or their Pregnancy Outcome in South Australia annual report, and I have initiated investigations with that unit to see if there is currently any process for recording these incidences. Even so, they will remain anonymous numbers in a government document.

As previously mentioned, this bill does not impact healthcare teams associated with the pregnant woman, such as doctors and midwives, from providing medical assistance, care and advice. This is about a woman and family's right to recognise by law the loss of life taken by criminal acts beyond their control. This is about acknowledging the loss and trauma of a life stopped short, not by choice, but by intrusion. It is about justice and recognition of grief.

I put this bill forward with much respect to women such as Brodie Donegan who have campaigned for 12 years for this bill. To women such as Jacqueline Sparks, who not only lost their baby, but will never be able to have a child naturally due to their injuries. And women such as Kylie Flick, who suffered the mental trauma of domestic abuse along with their loss, and I put this forward with empathy to all the unnamed children and unknown pregnant women who never met their expected child.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. L.A. Curran.

Motions

FEDERAL BUDGET

The Hon. S.L. GAME (12:16): I move:

That this council notes the following measures announced in the October 2022-2023 Federal Budget—

1. \$23.5 million over four years to expand the Headspace network, yet excludes a centre for the Yorke Peninsula Local Health Network;
2. \$203.7 million over two years to support student wellbeing and mental health, which to be effective must be evidence-based, include program evaluations and have its outcomes monitored;
3. \$310.4 million over nine years to attract and retain high-quality teachers, which to produce intended outcomes ought to be highly targeted based on both teacher and student performance, as well as students' wellbeing;
4. \$22.1 billion of initiatives towards renewable energies, \$20 billion for grid modernisation and \$15 billion of capital to help industries transition to net zero, most of which is wasted in pursuit of ambitious and damaging renewable energy targets;
5. Up to \$845 million to reduce transport emissions and subsidise electric vehicle purchases, which is a transfer of wealth from low to high socio-economic people;

6. \$10 billion of investment in a housing Australia fund supporting 30,000 affordable and social homes, which ought to be prioritised for our most vulnerable Australian citizens;
7. An increase in Australia's migration program from 160,000 to 195,000, with inadequate investment and planning into housing and health that could accommodate this growth;
8. \$7 billion of investment to drive gender equality and \$1.7 billion to address gender-based violence, which fails to recognise the one-quarter of domestic violence victims who are male; and
9. \$75.1 million to prepare for a referendum to enshrine an Indigenous Voice to Parliament and \$1.5 million to commemorate the 15th anniversary of the apology to stolen generations—measures with unknown tangible outcomes for Aboriginal Australians.

Cost-of-living concerns are rightly front and centre of South Australians' minds right now and this October federal budget provides mixed results at best. Spiralling debt and deficits remain unaddressed and, despite tinkering around the edges, \$1 trillion of gross debt will be reached in just a few years' time. One Nation has long advocated for stronger measures to allow us to reap the benefits provided by our resources industry, which has delivered windfall gains of \$164 billion to the bottom line, thanks to unexpectedly high commodity prices. However, foreign-owned multinationals are still not paying their fair share of tax.

It is very concerning that the fastest-growing payment in the federal budget is that of interest payments. On average, they are set to increase by 14.4 per cent each and every year over the next decade, resulting in almost \$19 billion in interest payments alone next year. It is easy to think of a multitude of ways this money could be spent better.

It is simply unacceptable that in a resource and knowledge rich country like ours that we should be subjected to energy price rises of 56 per cent. This is not becoming of an advanced country like Australia, and sheeting blame to Russia is simply federal Labor looking to justify their own incompetence. One Nation has long called for measures to increase the supply of gas and for the removal of the prohibition on nuclear power.

There is an irony in the Australian government's approach of being so stridently anti fossil fuels yet relying on our exports of these precious minerals to prop up our own federal budget. One Nation believes that rather than shipping our coal and gas overseas we ought to apply a national plan that guarantees low-cost, reliable, dispatchable power by building low-emission coal-fired power stations. By processing and using our own fossil fuel deposits for energy production we can reduce transportation costs and preside over high-efficiency, low-emission power generation that provides us with national energy security.

Ongoing subsidies and investments in our electricity grid, thanks to renewable energies, are unsustainable and add distortions into our energy market. Initiatives of \$22.1 billion are earmarked for this Labor government's ambitious pre-election commitment to the Powering Australia plan, \$20 billion is for grid modernisation as part of its Rewiring the Nation scheme, and \$15 billion of capital has gone into a fund to help industries transition to net zero. These are the sorts of government spending measures that form the hidden cost of renewables that are not often spoken about. One Nation believes it is high time that these extravagant subsidies and investments for renewables are cast aside in favour of investigating nuclear power generation, which will set Australia up for a long-term future of cheap, reliable and secure energy.

The insanity of this commonwealth government's relentless exercise in virtue signalling its green credentials is borne out by the Minister for Climate Change and Energy's very own analysis. In order for us to meet our government-imposed emissions reduction targets of 43 per cent by 2030, Australia must install more than 22,000 500-watt solar panels every single day for the next eight years. Furthermore, we must build 40 seven-megawatt wind turbines every month, connected by a minimum of 10,000 kilometres of additional transmission lines.

It is folly to think that this is either achievable or desirable. It is equally foolish to impose on our farmers devastating methane emissions targets, like what is occurring in New Zealand and the Netherlands. Thankfully, it appears that the pledge to cut methane emissions in Australia by 30 per cent by 2030 is voluntary. Assurances have been given to the National Farmers' Federation that our agriculture sector will not be slugged with new taxes or regulation to achieve it.

Compliance with this pledge cannot occur at the expense of our farmers, who across the ditch are being hit with a burp tax that will result in 20 per cent of cattle and sheep farmers and 5 per cent of dairy farmers being forced out of business, according to New Zealand's own modelling. Food security is inextricably linked to national security. One Nation will always stand side by side with our farmers, who are the lifeblood of our great country.

I am similarly concerned by the wasteful subsidisation of electric vehicles, which the federal government has sought to bankroll to the tune of \$845 million. This is just another example of governments using taxes paid by hardworking Australian families to subsidise the playthings of our most privileged residents who are in a position to afford expensive electric vehicles. EV battery warranties on average last only eight years, which means some owners could be faced with battery replacement costs that can be as much as half the value of the car or over \$40,000.

Additionally, serious concerns have been raised by Australian firefighters about the ferocious nature of EV fires, which require up to 20 times more water to extinguish, and the contaminated water must then be captured and treated. Some of our firefighters have suffered lifelong injuries as a result of attending electric vehicle fires, which can remain a serious risk of reignition for over four weeks post extinguishment.

While I welcome in principle increased support for mental health and wellbeing measures, I have questions regarding some of this funding. A major concern for me and those who I have spoken with on Yorke Peninsula is that they are the only local health network without a Headspace centre. I welcome expanding the Headspace network, but I am concerned that this regional community is missing out from this \$23.5 million announcement.

Similarly, I question the usefulness and the expected positive outcomes of the \$203.7 million budgeted over two years to support student wellbeing and mental health. Our children and young people are telling us that they are depressed, anxious and lonelier than ever, whether due to factors such as COVID-19 lockdowns, climate change anxiety or a feeling of social isolation due to social media. I am concerned that this is just more money going down the drain without tangible outcomes for our children.

In addition to this, I share concerns with many parents who have spoken with me about a lack of transparency with what is being taught in our schools regarding gender issues and relationship-making. I believe we are not teaching our children to be as resilient as they could be, which forms the building blocks of our kids' mental wellbeing.

To address shortages, \$310.4 million over nine years has been allocated to attract and retain high-quality teachers. In principle, I welcome additional funding to obtain the best quality teachers possible. I believe that our teachers should be remunerated according to their performance and based on their students' wellbeing and academic achievement. I support our best teachers being paid accordingly and therefore oppose blanket pay rises for our teachers that do not take into consideration these factors. I want high-quality teachers to teach, stay in the profession and remove from their duties the extraneous roles of being social workers and administration staff.

Much has been made of the federal government's aspirational goal of building one million new homes, and I share concerns about this ambitious target, which has little to no detail. I do, however, welcome measures to increase the supply of affordable and social housing, and I understand \$10 billion is set aside for a Housing Australia Future Fund to provide 30,000 new social and affordable housing options. This housing must be prioritised for our vulnerable residents.

I note that at the end of the 2022 financial year as many as 33,646 people were on the social housing waiting list in South Australia and that it would take 10 years for them eventually to be housed. An increase in the migration program from 160,000 to 195,000 will only lengthen the wait for South Australians, and I raise these concerns with our state human services minister.

The principle of achieving gender equality is one that is worthy of support, but not at the expense of men. Over \$7 billion will go towards driving gender equality and \$1.7 billion will fund measures to address gender-based violence. What concerns me is the fact that 25 per cent of victims appear to be excluded from this suite of policies because one in four victims of domestic violence are men. I have spoken in this place about the need to address a Family Court system that is broken

and a concerning lack of recognition of parental alienating behaviours by both governments and our court system.

I and One Nation will continue advocacy in this space and urge for a fairer legal system that discourages expensive adversarial court action. I support the goal of achieving equitable outcomes for men and women, but we need to ensure there is a merit-based system that will put forward the best candidate rather than one that favours one group of people over another.

Similarly, I have strong concerns about the favouritism inserted into the federal budget that benefits supporters of the case for an Indigenous Voice to parliament. Over \$75 million will go towards preparations for a referendum on the Voice, and \$1.5 million specifically for commemoration activities associated with Kevin Rudd's apology to the stolen generations. These are just two aspects of a much larger \$1 billion-plus spend on measures to close the gap and assist Aboriginal Australians.

I question the tangible benefits that will be derived for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders with this funding. I am particularly concerned that an income tax deduction will only be extended to those who support the 'yes' case. Federal governments are supposed to provide equally for both the yes and no cases in referendums, and I see this as favouritism by the Albanese government that seeks to bankroll support for the Voice.

I want to see tangible beneficial outcomes for First Nations Australians, which is why I am stridently pursuing amended vaping laws. We know that Aboriginal smoking rates are as much as four times higher than that of non-Aboriginal populations and that two out of three continuing smokers will die from smoking. By regulating vapes as a consumer product and providing for greater access for adult smokers wishing to quit, many First Nations lives will be saved.

I welcome an announcement that the age eligibility for Australians wishing to downsize their home has been lowered from 60 to 55. One Nation had a pre-election policy to reduce stamp duty, and I have pushed for a review into this outdated tax that has not been revised for 15 years. South Australians pay amongst the highest stamp duty rates in the country, which is why I seek a review and want concessions introduced for first-home buyers and even greater incentives for those wishing to downsize.

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

Parliamentary Committees

BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (12:28): On behalf of the honourable member concerned, I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until the next Wednesday of sitting.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC AND ACTIVE TRANSPORT

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (12:29): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until the next Wednesday of sitting.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON DOLPHINS IN ADELAIDE DOLPHIN SANCTUARY AND PORT RIVER

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (12:29): On behalf of the honourable member concerned, I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until the next Wednesday of sitting.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE RETURN TO WORK SA SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (12:29): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until the next Wednesday of sitting.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON HEALTH SERVICES IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. C. BONAROS (12:30): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until the next Wednesday of sitting.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON PROHIBITION OF NEO-NAZI SYMBOLS

The Hon. C. BONAROS (12:30): On behalf of the honourable member concerned, I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until the next Wednesday of sitting.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE TIMBER INDUSTRY IN THE LIMESTONE COAST

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (12:30): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until the next Wednesday of sitting.

Motion carried.

ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE: INQUIRY INTO ABORIGINAL GOVERNANCE

The Hon. T.T. NGO (12:31): I move:

That the final report of the committee's inquiry into Aboriginal governance be noted.

The inquiry into Aboriginal governance was referred to the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee by the former Premier in February 2021. The committee received 48 written submissions and the inquiry had 27 witnesses providing oral evidence. The committee tabled an interim report on 26 October 2021 which summarised the bulk of the evidence received in the inquiry. Throughout this evidence, the committee received consistent submissions detailing concerns about the way in which Aboriginal corporations are currently functioning. Stakeholders submitted that, unless you were a director on the board, it could be difficult to ascertain where money received by those corporations was ending up.

The committee heard evidence from community members across a wide range of Aboriginal communities, who made similar allegations regarding favouritism and closed dealings within board memberships. The committee received sufficient concerns across many communities in the state to warrant it making nine recommendations in its interim report, and a further four recommendations in the final report.

One important recommendation is in relation to updating the state's trustee legislation. The committee considers this as vital to providing increased accountability and transparency about public moneys making its way into separate trusts established by Aboriginal corporations. These trusts may fall outside the scope of the federal regulator. It is also to ensure that Aboriginal communities can receive and have access to the monetary support they are entitled to.

The committee recently heard from the Western Australian Attorney-General in relation to how their jurisdiction is dealing with this issue. The Western Australian parliament has just passed a new Charitable Trusts Act, and the committee has asked that our Attorney-General consider that act as a potential guide for reforms in our jurisdiction.

Similarly, the federal government last week released its response to the commonwealth parliamentary committee's report into the destruction of Indigenous heritage sites at Juukan Gorge. This response noted governance as an issue currently being considered by the co-designed partnership which has been established to reform First Nations cultural heritage protection. It arises from a recommendation made by the commonwealth parliamentary committee that transparency and accountability requirements on native title prescribed body corporates be increased so that adequate consultation occurs between an Aboriginal corporation and the local Aboriginal community.

In relation to incorporated associations at the state level, the committee encourages the Attorney-General to introduce the proposed amendments to the Associations Incorporation Act 1985, which was before the House of Assembly prior to the 2022 state election. These amendments are crucial for increasing oversights and dispute intervention powers for the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs.

The committee has also recommended an increase in resources for the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs to provide regular governance training and education to Aboriginal community-controlled associations around their obligations under the Associations Incorporation Act 1985 (SA). It was made very clear to the committee that self-determination can be maintained by Aboriginal community-controlled organisations with improved governance practices and greater transparency. The committee heard that it is when this transparency to the community is lost that the majority of disputes may arise.

The committee is sincerely grateful to the individuals and organisations who made submissions to the committee in this inquiry. The committee also thanks the federal regulator, ORIC, and the state Commissioner for Corporate Affairs for providing it with detailed submissions in this inquiry. All submissions received in the inquiry added substantial value to the conduct of the inquiry.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the former members of the committee for their contributions to this inquiry, who received the majority of the evidence prior to the 2022 state election, including the Hon. Terry Stephens MLC; the Hon. Kyam Maher MLC; the Hon. Tammy Franks MLC; the member for Giles, Mr Eddie Hughes; the member for Hammond, Mr Adrian Pederick; and the former member for Davenport, Mr Steve Murray MP.

I also thank the current members of the committee, including the Hon. Tammy Franks MLC; the Hon. Stephen Wade MLC; the member for Giles, Mr Eddie Hughes MP; the member for Newland, Ms Olivia Savvas MP; and the member for Heysen, Mr Josh Teague MP. I would like to especially thank the executive research officer of the committee, Mrs Lisa Baxter, for her continued support, professionalism and expertise. Mrs Baxter's input is greatly appreciated. I commend the report to the council.

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

COVID-19 DIRECTION ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (12:38): I move:

That the report of the committee be noted.

Just very briefly, I want to thank all of the members of the committee. Members may recall that this committee was established in response to a bill that the government introduced some time ago that was to deal with COVID as part of the Public Health Act.

A committee was established that comprised of members of this place as well as the House of Assembly. The committee met several times and heard evidence from a range of people, including the Chief Medical Officer, Nicola Spurrier; the police commissioner, Grant Stevens; and some epidemiologists with significant experience in terms of modelling the implications of the COVID-19 pandemic.

I wish to thank the members of the committee: the Hon. Ms Bourke and the Hon. Stephen Wade, Mrs Ashton Hurn, Ms Sarah Andrews and the secretariat of the committee, Mr Guy Dickson. The only recommendation of the committee was that there should be a committee of the parliament that considers management of COVID going forward and reviews any potential changes that may occur. That is a matter that I intend to progress in the new year and talk to members across the political divide about to see if there is an appetite to establish such a committee in 2023. With that, I conclude my remarks.

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

*Motions***INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION INVESTIGATIONS**

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. F. Pangallo:

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on—
 - (a) any damage, harm, or adverse outcomes to any party/ies resulting from investigations undertaken pursuant to the ICAC Act (other than adverse findings resulting from the conduct of persons investigated);
 - (b) any damage, harm or adverse outcomes to any party/ies resulting from prosecutions which follow investigations undertaken pursuant to the ICAC Act (other than adverse findings resulting from the conduct of persons prosecuted);
 - (c) options that may prevent or reduce the likelihood of, or any harm or damage resulting from, such outcomes and whether exoneration protocols need to be developed; and
 - (d) any other related matter; however, the committee shall not receive submissions or evidence in relation to any current investigation, or current prosecution arising from such an investigation, or any matter that is currently the subject of referral by the ICAC for further investigation and potential prosecution.
2. That the committee consist of six members and that the quorum of members necessary to be present at all meetings of the committee be fixed at four members.
3. That the minutes of evidence presented to the select committee of the Fifty-Fourth Parliament on damage, harm or adverse outcomes resulting from ICAC investigations, tabled in the council on 30 November 2021, together with minutes of evidence received in camera and documents received by that committee but not tabled nor resolved to be published, be referred to this select committee.
4. That this council permits the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it sees fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being presented to the council.

(Continued from 16 November 2022.)

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (12:41): I rise on behalf of the government to make some brief remarks on this motion that seeks to re-establish the Select Committee on Damage, Harm or Adverse Outcomes Resulting from ICAC Investigations. I indicate that the government will not oppose the re-establishment of this committee, which operated during the previous parliament.

As Labor members indicated at the time of establishing the original select committee, the Hon. Frank Pangallo has highlighted a number of matters which deserve consideration. We acknowledge the work of this committee in the past and particularly note that this motion would refer its minutes and documents to the re-established committee. On that basis, the government does not oppose this motion to re-establish the committee.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (12:42): I rise today as the lead speaker for the opposition on the motion from the Hon. Frank Pangallo and note the opposition's support for the motion. The decision by the Director of Public Prosecutions to drop its case against former Renewal SA boss John Hanlon has once again placed a blowtorch on the transparency, integrity and power of ICAC.

This motion, if successful, will examine damage, harm or adverse outcomes to any party resulting from investigations undertaken pursuant to the ICAC Act and any prosecutions which follow those investigations.

ICAC has now been operating for almost a decade and is charged with responsibility to investigate and prevent corruption in South Australian public administration. The prevention, minimising and prosecution of corruption are critical functions to ensuring government agencies and officials adopt practices, policies and behaviours commensurate with public expectation and in the public interest. But it is an agency with enormous power—some may say absolute power.

The treatment of Mr Hanlon is not the first example to raise concerns about the conduct and standard of investigations by ICAC. This raises an important question: who holds ICAC to account for matters from poor performance and incompetence right through to potential corruption? No-one,

no business, no organisation is infallible. Mistakes are made, but no-one should be untouchable for those mistakes. There should always be an opportunity to hold them to account.

ICAC should be transparent, it should be fair, and it should be accountable. Given recent matters that have been ventilated by the Hon. Frank Pangallo in this chamber, the opposition considers that they deserve a proper and thorough investigation. But I will caution that there are always two sides to every story.

I hope the select committee will provide all parties with an opportunity to put forward their positions and it is not solely used as a vehicle for aggrieved parties to ventilate their concerns. It is important that we ensure a purposeful investigation and debate with the goal of tangible and sensible reforms that benefit the investigation and prevention of corruption in South Australian public administration.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (12:44): I thank the Hon. Nicola Centofanti for her contribution to this, and I am looking forward to the reconvening of this committee.

Motion carried.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (12:45): I move:

That the select committee consist of the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Hon. Russell Wortley, the Hon. Reggie Martin, the Hon. Nicola Centofanti, the Hon. Heidi Girolamo and the mover.

Motion carried.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I move:

That the select committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from place to place and to report on the next Wednesday of sitting.

Motion carried.

ITALIAN COMMUNITY

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. C.M. Scriven:

That this council—

1. Recognises the contribution of the Italian community to South Australia and the role of the South Australian Italian Association which has served the Italian community in South Australia for more than 70 years;
2. Congratulates the recipients of the inaugural SAIA Awards on 12 November, including Rosa Matto (Culture and Art Award), Enzo Lombi (Research & Development and Innovation Award), the Romeo family (Business Award), Joyce and Joseph Ceravolo (Young Achiever Award); and
3. Congratulates Antonietta Cocchiario on receiving the Italian Honour of Cavalier of the Italian Republic and acknowledges her contribution to Italian radio and her role with the South Australian Multicultural Commission.

(Continued from 16 November 2022.)

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:46): It is a great privilege to rise today on behalf of the Liberal Party and as shadow minister for multicultural South Australia to speak on this motion to recognise the outstanding contributions of the South Australian Italian Association and the Italian community in South Australia.

While recognising the valuable reference in the motion moved by the Hon. Clare Scriven, I wish to indicate that I am seeking to amend the motion in order to make the terms of reference more inclusive and provide a better reflection of all South Australians who have received honours awarded by the Italian government for their meritorious service to the Italian community. I move to amend the motion as follows:

Delete paragraph 3 and insert the following two new paragraphs:

3. Congratulates Antonietta Cocchiario OAM and Dr Phillip Donato OAM on receiving the Italian Honour of Cavalier of the Italian Republic and acknowledges their contributions to the Italian community and the broader multicultural community; and

4. Congratulates all South Australians who have received the Orders of Merit of the Italian Republic and thanks them for their contributions in South Australia.

While recognising the valuable reference in the motion moved by the Hon. Clare Scriven, I am moving the amendments in order to make the terms of reference more inclusive and provide a better reflection for all South Australians who have received honours awarded by the Italian government.

The mover of this motion, the Hon. Clare Scriven, may not have realised that Dr Phillip Donato OAM was also awarded the Italian Honour of Cavalier of the Italian Republic on the same day as Mrs Toni Cocchiari OAM. Therefore, it is most justified that the terms of this motion be corrected on the public record to provide a true reflection to recognise the two outstanding Italian community leaders who have been awarded Cavalier this year, namely Mrs Toni Cocchiari OAM and Dr Phillip Donato OAM, who is the President of the SA Italian Association.

I ask respectfully for the mover and all honourable members here in this chamber to accept these amendments so that all of us have the opportunity to highlight the significant contributions of the respective Italian community leaders in South Australia and the vital role of the South Australian Italian Association.

Through outstanding leadership and amazing work from generations of presidents, committees and volunteers, the SA Italian Association has been serving the Italian community in our state for more than 70 years. In fact, I wish to reiterate some of the comments I made in this place last year when the Hon. Frank Pangallo introduced a motion to acknowledge and congratulate the SA Italian Association on celebrating its 70th anniversary in 2019.

Over the last seven decades, the SA Italian Association has been the centre of a range of community services for the Italian Australian community. Its establishment was inspired by very passionate and community-minded individuals who were determined to deliver social and welfare services to the Italian community, as well as maintaining rich cultural traditions and values. Today, the South Australian Italian Association shares the Italian Centre with the Italian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Dante Alighieri Society and Com.It.Es South Australia, which is the Committee for Italians Abroad.

The rich history of the association was captured in a book published to mark the 70th anniversary celebrations, called *La Seconda Casa* (The Second Home) to reflect how the South Australian Italian Association have been a second home and community hub for many members of the South Australian Italian community over the decades.

I wish to take this opportunity to honour the outstanding hard work and significant contributions of the current South Australian Italian Association President Dr Phillip Donato OAM, past presidents and current and past committee members, volunteers and supporters who have carried on the legacy of the founding members in serving the Italian community and enriching the multicultural society in South Australia.

Honourable members would be aware that we have just celebrated the Adelaide Italian Festival between 11 to 20 November 2022. The reformatted Italian Festival featured an astounding number of events, almost 60 events over 10 days this year. Congratulations to the festival chair, committee and everyone involved in putting together this amazing program of events.

As part of the festival, the SAIA held the inaugural awards gala evening that showcased the extraordinary achievements of individuals and organisations who, through their distinguished service, helped to strengthen the Italian culture and multiculturalism in South Australia. I understand that there were almost 40 applications and 12 fantastic finalists across four award categories.

On behalf of the Liberal Party, I would like to convey our heartfelt congratulations to the well-deserving 2022 SAIA inaugural award recipients in the following four categories. In the Culture and Art Award category, which includes education, music, language, sport and cuisine, I would like to congratulate Ms Rosa Matto on receiving the inaugural Culture and Art Award for her longstanding service to the Italian community across this field. Rosa is passionate about promoting food and her proud Italian heritage and uses her exceptional culinary skills to connect with people from all walks of life.

In the Research and Development and Innovation Award category, which includes higher education, research, startups and innovative entrepreneurs, Professor Enzo Lombi is the Research Professor and Barbara Hardy Chair in Environmental Science and Engineering in the Future Industries Institute of the University of South Australia. Enzo was awarded the Research and Development and Innovation Award.

In the Business Award category, which includes the primary sector, secondary sector and tertiary sector, the award was presented to the Romeo family, an icon of the supermarket industry in South Australia—it is a household name in South Australia. What began as a small convenience store in 1987 has progressively become Australia's largest family-owned independent supermarket business.

The Romeo family has always remained focused on setting the benchmark in the industry for their innovation, leadership and staff development. It is always a pleasure to see the Romeo family's longstanding support for so many Italian events all year round. Their hearts are not only in expanding their business success, they are such generous contributors to our community, and we are very grateful.

In the Young Achiever Award category, which includes young people who have achieved excellence in their field of work or study and have achieved a noteworthy personal accomplishment or developed a creative or innovative project or initiative, the award was presented to Joyce and Joseph Ceravolo, the sister and brother team who took over the family's Ashton Valley Fresh juicing business in 2013. Under their leadership the business has become synonymous with innovation and sustainability. I was at the Food SA awards gala, and it was such a joy to see both of them up on stage receiving the Innovation in Business Award at the SA Premier's Food and Beverage Industry Awards.

Congratulations to all the wonderful winners. It was very well-deserved indeed. I am delighted that my parliamentary colleagues the Hon. John Gardner, member for Morialta, and Mr Vincent Tarzia, member for Hartley, attended the SAIA Awards gala, to witness the accomplishments of these outstanding individuals and organisations.

Mr President, please allow me to turn my attention to community leaders who have been included in the Italian Honour of Cavalier of the Italian Republic. In October of this year, I was honoured to attend a welcome reception hosted by Com.It.Es to introduce a new Ambassador of Italy in Australia, His Excellency Mr Paolo Crudele. It was a wonderful opportunity to meet the new ambassador during his first official to Adelaide after being appointed in August this year.

It was also a privilege to witness a very special recognition of two outstanding South Australian Italian community leaders, and wonderful friends, during the reception. Ms Antonietta Cocchiara OAM and Dr Phillip Donato OAM were awarded the honour of Cavalier by the ambassador for their exceptional contributions and meritorious service to society.

The title of Cavalier—or Knight or Dame—is a formal recognition awarded by the Italian government to those who have distinguished themselves for their social work and dedication to the Italian community and the diaspora. I am immensely proud that both Toni and Phillip have now been recognised by the Australian government as well as the Italian government by being awarded the Order of Australia and the Italian Order of Merit in this momentous way.

Antonietta, or Toni, was the Deputy Chair of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission from 2018 to 2021 and is currently the Deputy Chair of the Australia Day Council of South Australia. Toni has been a member of the Ethnic Schools board, the Multicultural Education Coordinating Committee and the Coordinating Italian Committee education subcommittee. She was awarded the Order of Australia for ongoing contributions to Italian radio in South Australia.

As mentioned earlier, Dr Phillip Donato OAM is the President of the SA Italian Association and board member of the Adelaide Italian Festival. Phillip is a healthcare professional and chiropractic consultant who has co-owned a multidisciplinary practice for over 35 years. He has chaired a diverse range of professional, government and community boards and organisations, and has long-standing involvement with the Hutt St Centre for the homeless, the Lions Medical Research Foundation and a number of international charities.

On behalf of the South Australian Liberal Party, I wish to extend my heartfelt congratulations to Toni and Phillip on these incredible achievements and thank them for their wonderful services to strengthening the bilateral relationship between Italy and South Australia.

Finally, I wish to further extend congratulations to all the South Australians who have received meritorious honours from the Italian government. There are so many, such a long list, so I will not be mentioning them all. We are just very fortunate to have a large, passionate, and dynamic Italian community in South Australia, and have so many highly regarded and decorated community leaders in our midst.

I understand the member for Hartley intends to go into further detail in the other place about all these individuals, and I look forward to reading his contribution on a similar motion in the other place. Congratulations once again. I thank the Hon. Clare Scriven for moving this motion and recognising the Italian community. Grazie mille.

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

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:16.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the President—

Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Report, Evaluation of targeted aspects of the Central Adelaide Local Health Network (Paper No. 5E) [Ordered to be published]

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

Reports, 2021-22—

Compulsory Third Party Insurance Regulator
Department of Treasury and Finance
Distribution Lessor Corporation
Essential Services Commission of South Australia
Funds SA
Generation Lessor Corporation
HomeStart Finance
Industry Advocate
Lifetime Support Authority
Local Government Finance Authority
Motor Accident Commission
South Australian Government Financing Authority
Transmission Lessor Corporation Annual Report

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

South Australian Housing Trust- Report, 2020-21—Addendum
State Government Response to Coronial Inquest relating to the deaths of Amber Rigney and Korey Mitchell Prepared by the Department for Child Protection—
November 2022

*Parliamentary Committees***LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:17): I bring up the 20th report of the committee.

Report received.

*Question Time***WINE INDUSTRY**

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development a question about winery support programs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: On 21 October, the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development assigned an answer to a question on notice which was tabled in this place on 2 November. It was in response to the question:

What programs that supported the wine industry has the government ceased since March 2022?

The minister answered that:

The government has not ceased any wine industry support programs.

My question to the minister is: is she confident that the response provided is accurate and does she stand by the response tabled in this parliament?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:21): I thank the honourable member for her question. I answer all questions in this place to the best of my ability and based on the advice that am provided.

WINE INDUSTRY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development a question about winery support programs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: On 15 November 2022, in answer to the examination of the Auditor-General's Report, the Minister for Trade and Investment stated:

As part of the 2022-23 budget savings targets, we decided to wind up early the following time-limited programs: the Export Fundamentals Program, the virtual business matchings program and the National Trade Program, and we have also wound up the South Australia Export Accelerator Program.

My question to the minister is: in light of the response provided by the Minister for Trade and Investment, does the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development still stand by her response tabled in this place on 2 November and is it accurate?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:22): I thank the honourable member for her question. As I answered in response to the previous question, I answer the questions in this place to the best of my ability and based on the advice that I have been provided.

I will certainly go back and have a look at the *Hansard* to which the honourable member refers, to check whether there is anything that is inadvertently inaccurate in that, or indeed it may turn out that the response from the Minister for Trade and Investment, as mentioned, that was quoted just a moment ago, referred to time-limited programs, which implies to me that perhaps those were time-limited from the previous government. Certainly, I will make some inquiries and see if anything is—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I will certainly go back and have a look at the *Hansard* and see whether there is anything that needs to be corrected.

SCHOOLS, SPECIALIST SUPPORT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the parliamentary secretary regarding wellbeing specialists.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Yesterday, the parliamentary secretary apologised to the council for providing inaccurate information to the council and said that she would never have knowingly done so. In her statement, she admitted that 55 wellbeing specialists were funded by the former government and that the government's new package was funded from existing Department for Education resources. She said that she was advised of this yesterday.

My question to the parliamentary secretary is: was the notice of motion on the matter of privilege the first time that the parliamentary secretary had this information drawn to her attention? If not, when was the parliamentary secretary first advised that she had provided incorrect information to the council?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:24): I thank the member for her question. I put my response on the record yesterday, and I put forward that I apologised to the parliament yesterday and made my statement clear yesterday.

SCHOOLS, SPECIALIST SUPPORT

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (14:24): Supplementary: if the parliamentary secretary is indicating that yesterday was the first time that she realised that she had misled the council, will she be seeking an explanation from the education minister as to why he did not draw to her attention that the chief executive had pointed out her error several weeks earlier, or why her colleagues who sit on the Budget and Finance Committee did not address this with her?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Point of order, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: You don't need a point of order. That is not arising from the answer. You can choose to answer it, if you wish.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:25): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Can the minister update the council on progress made in delivering the government's Aboriginal Affairs election commitments?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:25): I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this area, and his stewardship over many years, with breaks on occasion, of the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee.

I am pleased that we have delivered on a number of commitments in Aboriginal affairs. I thank the members of this chamber, in particular, for their consideration of the Nunga Court bill that has now passed this chamber and will become law, as I believe it has passed the other chamber as well. But today I particularly want to talk about the election commitment in terms of the state-based implementation of the Uluru Statement from the Heart. I know there have been questions on aspects of this from a number of members, substantive questions and supplementaries.

The three key elements of the Uluru Statement are Voice, Treaty, Truth, and this government had set out to implement that in a sequenced approach. In the South Australian context we have approached these areas of reform, as many of those who were involved in the dialogues that led up to the Uluru Statement were involved in the convention at Uluru and have written and thought about this matter very substantively since.

Of the three elements of the Uluru Statement, the sequencing that has most commonly been suggested is to start with Voice. Since our election, we have appointed the South Australian

Commissioner for First Nations Voice, Mr Dale Agius, who has led an extensive first round of consultation with First Nations communities right throughout South Australia between August and October of this year. I am informed that there were in excess of 30 community consultation sessions, with many hundreds of individual Aboriginal people engaged in those consultation sessions.

The commissioner went as far north as the APY, as far west as Ceduna, as far south as Mount Gambier, and to many points in between. The commissioner has since released his engagement report, on 9 November, outlining key insights and feedback, and this report has been publicly released and is available on the internet. The commissioner's engagement and findings have informed the development of a draft bill, the First Nations Voice bill, which has been publicly released for further consultation. Commissioner Agius has now commenced a second round of face-to-face engagements with communities on the draft bill, and will be continuing that up until mid-December.

The commissioner has visited many places already to consult on the draft bill, including Murray Bridge, Mount Gambier, Port Augusta, Whyalla, Leigh Creek and, I believe just in the last couple of days, Coober Pedy. People from right around South Australia can also have their views heard via the YourSAy website. That feedback is open until 6 January—for feedback on the YourSAy website. Once that has happened, we will work to look at the submissions that have been received and the views that have been put forward during the consultation, to make changes as necessary to the bill, and I can inform the chamber that it is intended that there will be a bill before parliament very early in the next sitting year.

VAPING ACTION PLAN

The Hon. S.L. GAME (14:29): I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to addressing a question to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Education, Training and Skills, on vaping in South Australia.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.L. GAME: Recall that under the current state and federal governments' vaping regulations, which includes prohibiting them for all but the tiny minority of those who go to the onerous lengths of obtaining a doctor's prescription, youth vaping has skyrocketed whilst lawful access for adults is severely restricted.

The Vaping Action Plan for schools was announced by the state education minister on 7 November 2022, and this includes \$2.29 million to fund Life Education SA and Encounter Youth to deliver preventative education programs to students. However, the remainder of the plan's costings have not been announced, so it's unclear from the minister's media release on that day what the total cost of the action plan is. For example, the following uncosted items are listed in the action plan:

- updating the health and physical education curriculum;
- a new public health campaign, including fact sheets, posters and updating the education department website;
- a partnership with Drug and Alcohol Services Australia, Quitline, the Cancer Council, and the Commissioner for Children and Young People to develop new training for school staff; and
- incorporating wellbeing supports and working with families when students are found to be vaping to assist them in breaking the addiction.

I understand that the installation of a vape detectors in school bathrooms is also under consideration. My questions to the minister are:

1. How much will the overall Vaping Action Plan content and delivery cost?
2. Does the minister believe it is appropriate to spend significant taxpayer funds on programs to reduce youth vaping, when it could instead amend our state's laws, which would starve

the black market and introduce a regulatory model that has successfully reduced youth vaping in other Western countries?

3. Does the minister agree with concerns that installing vape detectors in students' bathrooms is a breach of privacy, human rights and trust between teachers and students?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:32): I thank the honourable member for her questions and will refer them to the minister in another place and bring back a reply.

WELLBEING SPECIALISTS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): My question is directed to the parliamentary secretary about inaccurate information.

The PRESIDENT: You haven't sought leave; just ask the question.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: From the comment from the parliamentary secretary earlier, if this was the first time the parliamentary secretary was advised that she had misled the council, as per her statement, will she be seeking an explanation from the education minister as to why he did not draw to her attention that his chief executive had pointed out her error several weeks ago, or from her colleagues who sit on the Budget and Finance Committee as to why they did not do so either? The public need to know the answers.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:33): Thank you for your question. As I have said earlier today, and as I said yesterday, I have put on the record my apology. These matters have now been clarified with the minister's office. To be honest, I am really proud that we are going ahead with this program. It's a program that should be put in place to support our schools and our students and it's something I acknowledge was also a policy that was seen as important by the previous government. I am proud that as a government we have been able to expand on that program. I think it's a fantastic initiative and one that we should be glad that is happening in our schools.

FRUIT FLY

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:33): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister update the chamber on the partnership between the District Council of Loxton Waikerie and the Department of Primary Industries and Regions on the ongoing eradication of fruit fly in the Riverland.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:34): I thank the honourable member for his question and his ongoing interest in the Riverland. I know he has spent quite a large amount of time there over the years. As Minister for Primary Industries, I am constantly looking for ways to ensure that South Australia is best prepared to deal with any biosecurity threats that the state faces. We have seen many challenges relating to biosecurity risks over the past 12 months, and responding to fruit fly outbreaks has, of course, been one of the key challenges.

In this year's state budget, the government announced \$13 million in additional funding to respond to fruit fly outbreaks in the Riverland. Since August this year, more than 171 million sterile fruit flies have been released throughout the Riverland. We know, however, that responding to fruit fly outbreaks requires a range of different responses. That is why the District Council of Loxton Waikerie and the Department of Primary Industries and Regions have partnered to cover the cost of 700 Cera Traps. These traps will provide additional coverage in the ongoing fight against fruit fly and in support of eradication efforts in the Riverland.

These traps will be available for residents who live in Loxton and Waikerie in the red outbreak zone and the yellow suspension fruit fly areas. The traps are free. All residents need to do is put them in their yards and they will attract and kill, potentially, fruit flies that are in the area and will help protect any homegrown produce that residents might be growing in their backyards. I strongly encourage residents who live in either Waikerie or Loxton, in either the red or yellow zones, to consider engaging with the council and taking advantage of this initiative.

I'm advised that residents who live in the yellow suspension zone areas can collect traps from the Loxton council office or the Waikerie Library and Visitor Information Centre. Residents who live in the red outbreak area can call PIRSA and request the traps, and they will be delivered to their house and installed by PIRSA staff. Waikerie and Loxton residents living in the yellow zone will receive advice about how to use the traps, along with information about how to scan and register the location in the event that fruit fly is caught in the traps.

Six of the 16 current fruit fly outbreaks are based in the Loxton Waikerie council area, and this is why it is critical that as many residents as possible take up the opportunity to participate in this initiative. I want to thank the Loxton Waikerie council and its CEO, David Beaton, for once again showing outstanding leadership in working with the Department of Primary Industries in the ongoing battle to ensure that our state remains fruit fly free. We know that retaining the pest-free area provides enormous advantages in the export market for the Riverland growers, who have the ability to trade throughout the world.

ADELAIDE OVAL LIQUOR LICENCE

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:36): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the police minister, a question about the sale of beer cans at the Adelaide Oval.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: In July, SAPOL and the Adelaide Oval Stadium Management Authority struck a deal for a variation to the Adelaide Oval's liquor licence to allow the sale of alcohol in cans. Senior police initially opposed the variation on public safety grounds. Recently, a disturbing report prepared by Professor Ann Roche from the College of Medicine and Public Health at Flinders University now predicts the controversial move to allow beer cans at the Adelaide Oval will result in more antisocial behaviour, drink-driving and domestic violence. I seek leave to table that document for the interest of members who may want to read it.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: The report makes 10 recommendations, including that the use of plastic cups be continued, that spirits in cans should not be sold, that alcohol in cans should only be sold in the first half of any event, and that there be a limit of two cans per customer. The Police Association of South Australia is asking the liquor licensing commissioner to review his decision. The association president, Mr Carroll, said the report—which it commissioned—shows, and I quote:

...an intrinsic, undeniable link between the consumption of alcohol at sporting events and family violence.

This makes the decision by SAPOL, which is a white ribbon ambassador, to agree to vary Adelaide Oval's liquor licence without conducting any proper research and consultation even more puzzling.

My questions to the police minister are:

1. Are you disturbed by the findings of the Flinders University report?
2. Do you believe the report's recommendations are justified and need to be implemented?
3. Will you seek advice from the liquor licensing commissioner about the report's recommendations?
4. Which government agency will be to blame—and open to legal action—when a beer can at the Adelaide Oval is thrown as a projectile in anger and frustration and maims an innocent bystander?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:39): I thank the honourable member for his questions. I will refer them to the minister responsible in the other place and bring back a reply.

SCHOOLS, SPECIALIST SUPPORT

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:39): My question is to the parliamentary secretary to the Premier, regarding autism. Can the assistant minister advise the council whether the government's \$28 million

autism plan for schools is new money to the budget, or is it funded out of existing education department resources?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:39): Thank you to the member for his question. The funding has been made available. It was highlighted in the budget papers. I have answered this question previously, and that is on the record, my answer to this question.

TULLAWON HEALTH SERVICE

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister inform the chamber about the 40th anniversary celebrations of the Tullawon Health Service?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:40): I am very pleased to be able to inform the member of the 40th anniversary celebrations of Tullawon Health, and I thank the member for the question. Recently, I was pleased to attend a celebration for the 40th anniversary of the Tullawon Health Service Incorporated. The Tullawon Health Service is an Aboriginal community-controlled health organisation that provides health care and chronic disease prevention information to the Yalata Aboriginal community on the Far West Coast of South Australia.

Tullawon provides a myriad of Aboriginal health-focused and wellbeing services, including primary health care, child and maternal health, aged care, alcohol and other drug services and much more. The Yalata clinic has a visiting GP and allied health as well as specialist services from, amongst others, the Royal Flying Doctor Service. Tullawon also serves as a 24/7 emergency response service to residents of Yalata.

Services from Tullawon Health have been running for the past 40 years, and so this celebration was a great opportunity to reflect on all that has been achieved by the service and to celebrate the wonderful work of past and present staff and members of the board who are continuing the good work.

It was a night to celebrate the past 40 years, with addresses made by the CEO of the national peak body NACCHO, Dr Dawn Casey, and by the South Australian peak body CEO Shane Mohor, from the body that Tullawon Health is a part of. There were several awards presented on the night, and I wish to offer my congratulations to all who were acknowledged in this way. In particular, two lifetime achievement awards were presented to Uncle Fabian Peel, in honour of the longest individual association with Tullawon Health Service, and also to Auntie Lauren Peel, in honour of being the longest serving employee. I congratulate both and thank Uncle Fabian and Auntie Lauren for their dedication, passion and commitment to Tullawon Health over the years.

It is people such as these that make a huge impact on local communities like Yalata, and I am sure Tullawon Health Service will continue to benefit from their contribution for years to come. I want to make a special note of, and thank you to, all the organisers of the evening, and especially to the event management company We Create Print Deliver, which is a 100 per cent Aboriginal owned and operated Supply Nation certified event organising business. It was a particularly good event to catch up with people in the sector and to catch up with local people from the Far West Coast of South Australia.

UNION ADVERTISING

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:43): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Industrial Relations on the topic of unions advertising themselves.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The Labor Party was formed out of the trade union movement to give working people their own political voice. Recently, a union has undertaken an advertising campaign to promote members to join them. There have been calls to have that union advertisement, seen on an Adelaide tram, removed. It has then been described as 'political advertising' by the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, that minister also stating, 'I don't know how the CFMEU got onto one of these trams, but I don't think controversial topics belong on our trams.'

As it currently stands, our trams are privately operated and the advertising that appears on them is managed by a third-party agency. I believe this agency has confirmed that the union advertising has complied with all the necessary codes and guidelines. I also note that media campaigns by unions are not new. Unions sponsor events and, in fact, this particular union even sponsors football teams. They are like any other advertiser when it comes to buying advertising space, so can the Minister for Industrial Relations explain how a union advertising itself to grow its membership is a controversial topic?

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. One of the things that the honourable member quite rightly pointed out in the question is the fact that the tram service has now been privatised. The former Liberal government in their rush to sell off every single thing that hadn't been sold off in their previous terms in government, like ETSA, privatised our tram and train services.

I am proud to be part of a government that is reversing that. It was one of our fundamental election commitments and, before the privatisation of the train and trams occurred, we made it very clear as a then Labor opposition that it would be a policy, should we win government, to reverse that privatisation. We put everyone on very clear notice that we would take them back as publicly run services.

I don't have a lot of information, and I will need to seek more information from the minister who is responsible for transport in another place, but I understand that external advertising on assets such as these is managed by a third-party agency. I understand there are policies in place about what advertising there can be and what constitutes certain classes of advertising. I do know that much of what groups who represent not just employees, like unions, but represent employers, a lot of what they do can be policy-based and political in nature, so the exact details of what constitutes political I will need to get some more information on and I'm happy to do so and bring back an answer for the member.

UNION ADVERTISING

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:46): Supplementary: should the Malinauskas Minister for Infrastructure and Transport decide to go ahead with his bid to ban such advertising, will that ban also apply to other bodies such as the AHA, the AMA, and all industrial bodies which seek to promote themselves in the public sphere of advertising?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:47): I thank the honourable member for her question, and I will have to clarify it but I think it is the case that it is not the minister's policy but the policy of the department or indeed the external third-party managing the advertising, but I will need to clarify that and bring the member back an answer.

UNION ADVERTISING

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (14:47): Supplementary: did the CFMEU use the money returned from the Labor Party to book this advertising?

The PRESIDENT: I am not quite sure how you could get that out of the original answer, but I would have to give you points for being a tryer.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

SCHOOLS, SPECIALIST SUPPORT

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (14:48): My question is to the parliamentary secretary to the Premier regarding autism. What programs within the education department and public schools have been cut or cancelled to fund the government's election commitments, and were any of these programs targeted at supporting students with a disability?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:48): I thank the member for her question. I am not the education minister, so I will take that question on notice.

CHERRY SEASON LAUNCH

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister please inform the chamber about the launch of the cherry season at the SA Produce Market this morning?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:48): I thank the honourable member for his question. I am absolutely delighted to be able to inform the chamber about the launch today. It was really an honour to be at the South Australian Produce Market early this morning to play a small part in the annual cherry season launch, which was headlined by the auctioning of the season's first box of cherries, with the winning bid going on to become cherry king or queen.

I am very pleased to say that this year's winning bidder, and our new cherry king, is Joe Giangregorio—also known sometimes as the lettuce king—of Rainbow Fresh, who won with an incredible \$50,000 bid, with the proceeds going to the Leukaemia Foundation. The winning bid works out to be \$10,000 per kilo of incredible Cotsaris cherries that Joe has purchased.

Tim Murphy, the Leukaemia Foundation's General Manager of Blood Cancer Partnerships, said that the auction and its winning \$50,000 bid will make a real difference to supporting the 135,000 Australians living with blood cancer today. On that, I would also like to give a big callout to the incredibly brave little Arlo and his mum and grandad, who I spoke with this morning.

Tim, from the Leukaemia Foundation, went on to keep us entertained with a pun masterclass, saying he was delighted that the SA Produce Market had made the Leukaemia Foundation their 'cherryty' of choice, thanked the bidders for their 'cherryosity', and on social media afterwards stated that the Leukaemia Foundation would 'cherryish' this moment—some light-hearted fun from Tim on what was truly a very significant occasion for the foundation.

The event really is such a great way of kicking off the cherry season and, by extension, the festive season, in which cherries have a special place in many South Australian households. South Australia's cherries are some of the best in the country and their production is an important contributor to our state's economy. I am advised that in 2020-21 cherry production contributed over \$27 million, and in that year cherry exports from the state doubled.

South Australia's growers have a significant part in Australia's fresh cherry production, contributing 16 per cent of the nation's fresh cherry production over the past five years. This year's season, albeit starting a little later due to the cold snaps the state has experienced recently, is hoped to be a bumper one, with a possible peak of the season being closer to when we enjoy our Christmas feasts, long holiday lunches and dinners, and time spent with our families. Many will look forward to centrepiece bowls of glossy local cherries that will no doubt be a favourite in many South Australian homes.

I also take this opportunity to encourage all South Australians to support locally grown produce, by looking for the Pick a Local, Pick SA! sign at their independent fruit and vegetable retailers right around the state so that we can all continue to support our own local businesses, which has never been more important.

It was a real pleasure to meet and speak with Joe, the new cherry king. I saw a wonderful post on the Rainbow Fresh Facebook page a little bit earlier that simply said, 'At 84 years old, and after decades of hard work in the fresh produce industry, Joe says, "It's time to give back."' What a wonderful sentiment from our new cherry king, leading us into the new season.

COMMERCIAL FISHERIES REVIEW

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:52): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development a question about an independent cost-recovery review for commercial fisheries in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: As part of the Labor government's election commitment, the Malinauskas Labor government undertook to review the cost-recovery processes for the state's

commercial fishing sector. That was a welcome commitment given following extensive industry collaboration, which I am told resulted in SA's entire commercial fishing sector requesting the review in a completely united front and highlighting the need for an independent review in that regard.

Several SA fishing sectors are operating in an environment of greater than 10 per cent of the gross value of production (GVP) and some, I am advised, have been operating with GVP as high as 25 per cent for several years now. World's best practice standards are below 5 per cent GVP. Yesterday, in question time the minister indicated that:

We have been having discussions with the commercial sector and have also been identifying the most appropriate way to do the review.

My questions to the minister are:

1. What appropriate ways to do the review have been identified to date?
2. When will the review actually commence?
3. Has it been modelled on similar reviews in other jurisdictions?
4. What is the scope of the review?
5. How long will it take to complete?
6. Will the fishing sector be given the opportunity to comment on findings before recommendations are made?
7. What is the minister planning to do for the next financial year, as the current economic climate is causing commercial fisheries enormous financial distress?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:54): I thank the honourable member for her question and again acknowledge her long-term interest in this and ongoing discussions that we have been having on various matters in regard to fisheries. The Department of Primary Industries and Regions has been operating a cost-recovery policy for approximately 20 years.

It's important to note what this policy emanates from. It operates from the premise that South Australia's aquatic resources are owned by the state. They are a community resource and they are simply managed by PIRSA on behalf of the South Australian community. Costs associated with government services that arise as a direct result of commercial access to the resources are recovered from commercial licence holders through regulated licence fees. These services include, though are not limited to, fisheries management, policy, scientific monitoring and stock assessment, compliance and licensing.

For the northern zone and southern zone rock lobster industry, a pre-election commitment was made to provide fee relief of 50 per cent to licence fees for 2022-23, which totalled \$2.6 million approximately. That fee relief was due to the impact of market disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and particularly the disruptions to the Chinese market.

Prior to the election, the Labor opposition, as we were then, made a commitment to review the current cost-recovery model, and some of the points that have been raised by the honourable member in her explanation prior to the question were points that led to that. Industry talked to me about the GVP situation and compared it to other jurisdictions and indeed other places in the world, and talked about the need to have an independent review. That was in contrast to the types of reviews that had happened I think several times previously, which were really about the way the process occurred in terms of cost recovery and the process of determining those.

So this is different. This is actually about whether there are alternative cost-recovery models. We know that there are other jurisdictions that do use different types of cost-recovery models, so it's a matter of looking at those—and indeed there may be others—and taking into account the feedback from industry and any other changes that might be identified either by industry or by PIRSA in the management of the current cost-recovery policy.

A big part of that will be engagement with industry and seeking comments and input from them. I look forward to being able to announce more in the not too distant future. I did think, though,

it was important to make it clear to the industry and indeed, as I did yesterday, to the chamber that this review will not be completed prior to the discussions that set the cost-recovery fees for the coming financial year.

It's important that the review is robust and thorough. There has been a lot of change within various fishery sectors, and it's important that if we are going to make a significant change, which is possible, by looking at an alternative cost-recovery model then not only does everyone have a chance to be heard, which is incredibly important, but also we have the opportunity to fully explore both benefits and any potential drawbacks from such a change. I will be able to make further announcements and comments in the not too distant future.

COMMERCIAL FISHERIES REVIEW

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:58): Supplementary: have we settled on an appropriate way to undertake the review, and do we have a completion date for that review process?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:58): That is still being finalised. Whilst I don't have an end date, I am certainly expecting that that would be sometime next year, hopefully sooner rather than later.

COMMERCIAL FISHERIES REVIEW

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:58): Further supplementary: just noting that we are six months into this term of government, are we expecting that review to be completed within the first six months of next year?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:59): The commitment to undertake the review was a commitment that it would happen in this term, but my intention is that it will be commencing relatively soon and that we will be able to have an outcome next year.

COMMERCIAL FISHERIES REVIEW

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:59): Further supplementary: has the model for the review been finalised to date, or is that something the government is still considering?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:59): The final details are still being determined.

COMMERCIAL FISHERIES REVIEW

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:59): Will there be input from those sectors referred to in relation to the final model before it is settled on?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:59): All of the commercial sector, and indeed any other interested parties, will have the opportunity to contribute to the review throughout the process.

COMMERCIAL FISHERIES REVIEW

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:59): Final supplementary.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Well, I can have several more, if you like, but I will settle on a final: will there be input into the final review model that is chosen before the review is actually commenced?

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: I don't think you mean 'commenced'; you said 'before the review is commenced'.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Can you just repeat the question, please?

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Will there be final input by industry sectors into the actual model, the appropriate ways that the minister has referred to that will form the basis of the review?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:00): Thank you for the clarification. I think I now understand the question; I had misunderstood what the honourable member was referring to. I have had a number of discussions, as indeed has my office, in regard to how it will be best set up. As I say, we are nearing completion of that, but I think it is important to make sure that the input is taken into account. I will certainly give some thought to the matters that the member has raised.

COMMERCIAL FISHERIES REVIEW

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:01): Supplementary: can the minister inform the chamber why her government's review of the cost-recovery model has been stalled, and will the industry be compensated for delays in the review?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:01): I thank the honourable member for her question, although it is yet another remarkable question. We are coming to expect remarkable questions from those opposite given that, in four years in government, they didn't instigate a cost-recovery review. They didn't instigate an independent review of the cost-recovery situation and the model.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Both sides, order! I can't hear the minister. Order, the two leaders, the Hon. Mr Wortley! Minister, please finish.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Thank you, I would be delighted to. We made a commitment prior to the election to undertake a review into the cost-recovery process. We are doing that, in contrast to the former government.

FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN (15:02): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs regarding the state First Nations Voice to Parliament.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN: On 17 November 2022, *The Advertiser* reported that there will be 40 members in the state First Nations Voice to Parliament. Out of those 40 members, 12 would be chosen by the 28 elected members from each region. My questions to the minister are:

1. Why are there 12 unelected members on the state First Nations Voice to Parliament and not only the 28 members who will be voted by the public?
2. Will the 40 members have an allowance or a salary, and how much will each member be paid per year?
3. How was the number 40 for the number of members on the state First Nations Voice to Parliament decided upon?
4. Who will vote for the state First Nations Voice to Parliament members, and will everyone get a ballot?
5. Will voters get a profile of each candidate, similar to council elections, so that they can get information about each candidate?
6. Will each candidate campaign at the same time as the state election campaign is occurring?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:03): I thank the honourable member for her question. I think I can answer most of the questions with a bit of an explanation about how the model that has been put forward works. I think the honourable member has misunderstood some of the elements of the model put forward, but I will be happy to explain that. I might preface this as well by saying that this is a draft bill to reflect the initial round of consultation but for a further round of consultation, so this is not necessarily what will be in a final bill.

Under the draft bill, what is proposed is a series of local First Nations Voices. I think I answered a question from the Hon. Stephen Wade where I went through this a couple of days ago, but I am happy to repeat it. Under the draft model put forward, there were a couple of different options about how boundaries might be drawn and how many regions there would be.

Under one model, there would be six regions, five across non-metropolitan South Australia and one region based on the Kaurna nation boundaries, the native title boundaries, to make six different electorates, if you like, altogether. Under that proposal, which is not in the bill but would be subject to regulation and subject to change over time if needed, there would be from each of the non-metropolitan regions three Aboriginal men and three Aboriginal women elected, who would form the local First Nations Voice.

The metropolitan region would have five First Nations men, including Torres Strait Islanders, and five First Nations women elected. That would give you six members in total from each of the five non-metropolitan areas, which would give you 30, and then 10 from the metropolitan, which creates a number of 40 in total, representing these six different local First Nations voices.

Each of these six local First Nations voices from within their three men and three women would elect chairs of the local First Nations Voice and one man and one woman as co-chairs, and those 12 would then form the statewide First Nations Voice. I think it is a misconception the honourable member has if there are 12 that are not elected.

Under this model, the 40 members of local First Nations voices will be directly elected by the Aboriginal community, by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples on the electoral roll in those areas, and then from those that are directly elected they would select two of their own, a man and a woman, to represent each of those different areas, who would then form the statewide First Nations Voice. The 12 on the statewide Voice would be directly elected from their own regions and then selected from those who are elected to each region, under this model.

The honourable member asked a question in relation to payment. I think, again, it wasn't this week it was the previous sitting week, the Hon. Stephen Wade asked a very similar question about costs of a model which will be developed once a final model is settled upon, after the second round of consultation. With other appointed areas for committees or boards that a government appoints, there are often either sitting fees and travel allowances or yearly fees for those on those boards and committees. Even elected bodies like local governments have local councillors receiving payments in recognition of the work that they do and the time that is involved.

I think clause 40-something of the draft bill actually proposes—and this is something that was similar to the Aboriginal representative body that was proposed by the former government—that resources necessary to allow this body to function would be provided. Yes, it is anticipated there would be some form of remuneration for people elected to these positions and performing this function, as there are for other locally elected bodies, or indeed appointed bodies.

FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN (15:08): Supplementary: could the minister please advise who will receive a ballot in this election?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:08): First Nations people throughout South Australia.

FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

The Hon. S.G. WADE (15:08): Supplementary: the honourable minister referred to Torres Strait Islanders within the regions. Considering that Torres Strait Islanders are likely to be much more dispersed across the state, has the government given consideration to designated representation for Torres Strait Islanders within the Voice?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:08): I thank the honourable member for his question. It is a good question, and he is right that there are significant Torres Strait Islander communities right across South Australia. The Riverland has a significant Torres Strait Islander community. There is a

significant population in metropolitan Adelaide and in many other regions throughout South Australia. It is something that has come up during consultations, the need for diversity of representation.

The one area of diversity that has been enshrined for protection in the draft bill is to ensure that there is an equal number of Aboriginal men and Aboriginal women who will be elected; as I said, three First Nations men and three First Nations women from each of the local areas, and five each from the metropolitan area.

During consultations I understand there were questions raised about how you would have representation, could there be reserved places for young people, for elders, for Aboriginal people living with a disability, from various diverse communities? I have myself had representations from members of the South Australian stolen generations community about whether it's appropriate that there be essentially reserved places for people from those sort of communities.

That is not envisaged in this bill. What is envisaged, though, is that each local First Nations Voice could create committees to be informed from different aspects in different areas. Whilst I understand and agree with the honourable member that there are various aspects of the First Nations community—including Torres Straight Islander people who are dispersed right around South Australia—all of those people have the opportunity to run in elections and certainly an opportunity to engage either through a committee structure or through local consultations with local or statewide Voices.

FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

The Hon. S.G. WADE (15:10): Further supplementary: the honourable minister's answer to the question from the Hon. Laura Curran highlighted that it is appropriate for members of the Voice to be remunerated for their time, and I agree with that. Is the need to limit the budget for the remuneration of members the reason why there has been a cap on meetings proposed in the draft bill? It seems somewhat peculiar to say, 'We are establishing a group but they shall not meet any more than X number of times.'

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:11): No, it's not a budgetary statement, it's more an administrative constraint. I just can't remember what the number is, but it is no fewer and no more than a certain number of meetings, both for local Voices and the statewide Voice. But it does provide for the ability for more to be held with the agreement of the local or the statewide Voice and the minister, so it doesn't exclude the possibility but just as a matter of reasonableness and also to give people who might consider standing some idea of what may be involved. I can't remember the number but it might be no fewer than four and no more than six in any given year, I think. But those are the reasons in the draft bill and, as I said, it is out for a second round of consultation now.

WOMEN LAWYERS ASSOCIATION

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:12): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the minister inform the chamber about the recent function with the judiciary event hosted by the Women Lawyers Association?

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 his question, and I certainly will inform the chamber about the recent function with the judiciary event hosted by the Women Lawyers Association of South Australia. I had the pleasure of attending that recent event. The Women Lawyers Association is comprised of members from all sectors of the legal profession, and does much good work through their aim of promoting justice and equality for all women in and out of the law, and their commitment to improving the career prospects for women within the legal profession.

Among many things, the association regularly prepares feedback and submissions on a myriad of legal issues relevant to women, representing the view of their members from women in the legal profession. It also creates a supportive and vibrant community for women lawyers practising in and working towards practising in the profession, and that strong network was certainly on display at the event a couple of weeks ago. I heard from some of the event organisers that this event was one

of the best ever attended that the association has held in recent years, which shows the strength of the community and that women lawyers in SA can enjoy the support of the association.

The function with the judiciary was an opportunity to be able to meet and celebrate some of South Australia's finest female lawyers and the judiciary, and it was especially pleasing to see so many female practitioners having the chance to talk to more senior practitioners and members of the judiciary at the event.

The annual Hon. Dr Robyn Layton AO QC Award was presented on the night and is presented to honour a practising female lawyer in South Australian in recognition of their outstanding efforts in the law. This year the award was presented to Michelle Barnes KC, a very highly respected barrister from Len King Chambers.

As a longstanding and valued member of the Women Lawyers Association, Michelle has a breadth of experience working in the law, having practised at the DPP and at the commonwealth, with a significant practice in migration law. Michelle is the chair of the Women at the Bar committee, which she was also previously a member of, and is a member of the SA Bar Association and the Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal.

She is an adjunct lecturer at the College of Law, which is a provider of legal practice education for law graduates, including the Graduate Diploma in Legal Practice, which law students must complete in order to become a practising lawyer. At the college, Michelle lectures in advocacy, criminal and family law, helping to teach the tricks of the trade to our future lawyers.

In her role as chair of Women at the Bar, Michelle has been a real driver for the committee's aims of greater inclusion, diversity and equality at the SA Bar, with a focus on increasing the number of women at the bar, and is currently putting together a working paper on issues attracting and retaining female barristers at the SA Bar.

On top of all this, Michelle continues to play a central role in the silks consultations, which in an historic first for SA saw an equal number of female silks being appointed as males this year. I personally, and on behalf of the government, congratulate Michelle on this fantastic achievement and to all others involved.

RIVER MURRAY FLOOD

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:15): 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 housing in flood-affected areas.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Yesterday, the Premier told the other place that over a thousand homes will be affected by the Murray River floods and those people will be requiring alternative accommodation. The Malinauskas government has committed to crisis and emergency accommodation in flood-affected areas to provide short-term solutions. Long-term solutions, however, will also be required, as demonstrated by the flood-affected areas in New South Wales.

In Lismore, in that state, authorities are still trying to find long-term solutions for flood-affected residents nine months after floods left thousands of people without homes. With vacancy rates of just 0.5 per cent in the Murray and Mallee regions and 0.73 per cent in the Riverland, the number of available homes is limited for people who need long-term accommodation while recovery efforts are being undertaken. My question to the minister, therefore, is:

1. Is the minister satisfied that there is sufficient availability of medium to long-term accommodation for flood-affected communities in South Australia?
2. What is the minister doing to ensure that there is an increase in housing stock in the affected regional areas?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:17): I thank the honourable member for his question. It certainly is a very pertinent topic in that we are aware of the immediacy of the approaching waters and what that will mean for people who do need to temporarily relocate. Of course, the Minister for Human

Services has been very active as part of the cross-government and cross-agency activities to address the kinds of emergency situations that people will find themselves in.

In terms of medium to long-term accommodation, this is well known to be a significant issue in regional South Australia, as indeed it is quite an issue in metropolitan Adelaide as well. They are very difficult circumstances for all regions, but then when we add to that something that has the kind of effects that we are expecting this flood event to have, it is simply an added difficulty and complexity.

The minister for housing in the other place and the Minister for Human Services in the other place, as well as the government, are working on medium and long-term strategies in terms of housing and I have no doubt that the Riverland and the situation that we are faced with because of the rising waters and the expected flood damage will form a big part of the thinking as we go forward.

In terms of response, there are national disaster funding arrangements that are in place when there are various natural disasters, and of course we have seen those in place in the other states. I am sure that we will be very active in working together to try to find solutions for residents in regional areas, particularly the Riverland and the Murraylands, who might be affected by this.

RIVER MURRAY FLOOD

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:19): Supplementary question: what is the time frame that the minister is working towards in terms of announcing solutions?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:19): In terms of housing and the options and solutions that the government will be putting forward, I expect there will be some announcements in the near future.

FRUIT FLY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:19): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding fruit fly.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Yes! I was hoping for this.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I'm glad you're excited, Leader.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: In December 2021, the Morrison Coalition government announced the \$30 million Building Resilience to Manage Fruit Fly funding package. In correspondence to you dated 4 August 2022, the federal Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry confirmed that \$20 million of this package allocated to South Australia by the former government would be honoured by his government. My questions to the minister are:

1. When will payments to South Australia commence under this agreement?
2. Is this funding dependent on a co-funding model?
3. How much funding is the state government committing to projects under the federal Building Resilience to Manage Fruit Fly programs to ensure we receive the full \$20 million?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:20): I thank the honourable member for her question. She is correct in that I wrote to the federal Minister for Agriculture, seeking to have confirmation—indeed, in conjunction with conversations that I had had with him, advocating for the importance of the fruit fly funding and our efforts in terms of eradicating fruit fly.

A process was established, through the federal government, to look at various options for projects that might be best placed to address the fruit fly issues, both here in South Australia as well as elsewhere. I am looking forward to having the outcomes of that process provided in the near future.

*Matters of Interest***MENTAL HEALTH**

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:21): I rise to speak about the massive investment the state Labor government is making in the mental health sector. We are pumping \$294 million into the sector to give those suffering—too often in silence and unnoticed—their best chance of recovery and the opportunity to lead happy, productive lives. The once-in-a-lifetime increase in funding will provide more hospital beds, expert care and family support that has been so sadly missing.

We all talk about mental health being a serious issue, but too often it is the poor relation of the health system, and despite a lot of lip service, media and suggestions to the contrary, it is just not taken seriously. I personally have heard of cases where too often patients in need of mental health care have been discharged from hospital. This should never happen. I trust this injection of money into the system will greatly reduce this sort of thing happening in future.

I used the word 'investment' quite intentionally earlier. The funds going into the mental health sector are a genuine investment, not only in the patient themselves but their families and loved ones who are often dealing with overwhelming stress and anxiety as they watch the person they love suffer. It is also an investment in the state's future, as we gain the benefit of having people otherwise lost in the mire of mental illness contributing in a very productive way.

These mental health patients, whether they are suffering from depression, anxiety, dysphoria, schizophrenia, a debilitating phobia, or any one of the range of disorders, are not able to be productive while they are in this situation. It means that, instead of contributing to our society and even the economy, they are too busy trying to get well just to get through the next day.

Of course, mental health is more important than simply budget bottom lines; the health of a state or a community relies on the health of its people. While we have people in our society who are not able to function because of their disorder, we must be concerned. Many are dealing with their mental health issues privately and are suffering in silence, but others have conditions that make them a serious threat to themselves and others. We are not a healthy community until everyone is healthy. Certain mental illnesses going untreated can make the sufferer straight-out dangerous to the community: they can be a suicide risk and they can be a threat to the people with whom they live.

We have heard about far too many cases of serious violent crimes being committed by people with mental health issues who simply should not be walking around without the right treatment. Too often, people are not being properly treated and are not getting better, simply because they have fallen through the cracks and are continuing on a downward spiral to the point where they feel hopeless and worthless.

This groundbreaking investment in mental health will be life-changing for many, and it could even be life-saving for some. Anecdotally or not, we cannot afford to hear of cases where someone with a severe mental disorder has been released from hospital, for any reason. It is not good for the community, it is not good for them and it is not good for anyone.

FAITH IN POLITICS

The Hon. S.G. WADE (15:25): I am a follower of Jesus. I am a Liberal. Christians and Liberals believe in the innate worth of every individual. For me and for many Liberals, the source of human worth is that God created us in His own image. But, like the prodigal son, God has given each of us the freedom to turn to or away from Him. That God-given freedom is the foundation of pluralism, the political philosophy that holds that people of different beliefs and world views can coexist in the same society and participate equally in the political process. Pluralism is a central pillar of Australia's liberal democratic society that is rooted in our Judaeo-Christian heritage.

In a pluralist society, the church and the state should interact at arm's length. People of faith should be free to bring their religious values and views to the marketplace of ideas. The government should not be used to force people by law to do what they cannot be persuaded to do by will. I am proud of the fact that the Christian pioneers of South Australia saw that the separation of church and state is vital to the health of the church, the state and society. Through their efforts in 1851,

South Australia was the first part of the British Empire to separate church and state and to end state aid to religion.

Pluralism is under challenge in Australia from a number of fronts. On the one hand, there are secularists who object to the very presence of religion in politics. The Greens' proposal to abolish parliamentary prayers is part of their broader efforts to airbrush faith out of public life. Pluralism is also challenged from some on the right, who seek to enforce their view of Christian values through wielding political power. A recent *60 Minutes* investigation highlighted the work of the ISAAC Network in Australia, a Christian religious movement that seeks to take control of government—as one of what they call 'the seven mountains of society'—through mainstream political parties.

Whilst I seek to see the values of Jesus reflected in Australian society, I know that political action cannot deliver utopia. History shows us that Christian theocratic polities have repeatedly perverted Christian values and failed to deliver the Kingdom of God. Christians are called to be salt and light: we season the body politic; we should not control it.

Abortion is a key focus of Christian political activism and a clear challenge to pluralism. Australians have a diverse range of understandings of conception, birth and abortion, yet for 50 years we have maintained a balanced approach that allows abortion within a constraining framework. Last term, this parliament modernised South Australia's abortion laws, delivering what my leader described as the most conservative abortion laws in Australia. At the state election, whilst conservatives targeted the Liberal Party on abortion, no House of Assembly seat was determined on the issue of abortion.

Similarly, following the overturning of the *Roe v Wade* decision earlier this year, the recent US mid-term elections were a litmus test on abortion: five statewide ballot measures were conducted and all favoured access to abortion, including the Republican states of Kentucky and Montana. In both the South Australian and the United States elections the broad community has affirmed pluralism on abortion. It is vital that our political parties foster and protect pluralism within Australian society, and of course the best place to start is within our own organisations, both parliamentary and lay.

Political parties need to be diverse, inclusive communities, which reflect the communities of which they are part. Parties need to allow free votes on issues where there is a diversity of views based on divergent world views. It is very concerning to see the Australian Labor Party leaving less and less scope for conscience votes. Conscience votes granted by political parties need to be respected by the organisational wing of the parties, particularly in preselections. Candidate review processes need to ensure that parliamentary candidates respect the pluralist values of the main parties.

The Labor Party and the Liberal Party are parties of government. We exist to express our values in a way which wins the confidence of 50 per cent plus one of the electorate. Religious groups who want to see less pluralism and a more theocratic approach would be better suited to pursue their goals through dedicated political parties such as Family First. In conclusion, I affirm that I look forward to the Kingdom of God, but I am not going to rely on politicians to achieve it.

PARTHENON SCULPTURES

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:30): After speaking at length in this chamber on my motion calling for the return of the Parthenon sculptures, one irritated member in a hurry to get home snapped at me, 'Who cares what happened thousands of miles away on the other side of the world?' I will tell you who cares: the Mayor of Athens, Kosta Bakoyiannis; Dr Christos Dimas, Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Development and Investments; and Professor Nikolaos Stampolidis, the director of the fabulous Acropolis Museum in Athens, a city which over their summer welcomed more than 40 million tourists. To put that into perspective: Australia gets around nine million. And then there is the powerful international movement advocating for the return of the sculptures.

During my absence in October, I visited Qatar, Madrid and Greece, where I had extremely valuable meetings with businesspeople and officials while helping promote our state. I will speak about Doha later, but I will also speak about my experience in Madrid when the topic of trains and rail arises, but back to Greece.

I delivered copies of the letter the President of this chamber wrote to the British Museum, the Prime Minister—it happened to be the unfortunate Liz Truss at the time—and the Mayor of London, urging Britain to engage with Greece and return the Parthenon sculptures, brazenly hacked and stolen from the Parthenon's Temple of Athena in the 19th century by English opportunist Lord Elgin. They now sit in a dingy room in the British Museum. Meanwhile, the remnants of that magnificent set of sculptures are lined up in the Acropolis Museum, with spaces representing the ones held by the British.

Professor Stampolidis, one of the world's most renowned archaeologists for his work excavating ancient civilisations in places like Crete, was quite moved by the contents of the President's letter and the will of this chamber. He was appreciative that I had taken the time to meet with him personally, and I am grateful he had the time for me in his own busy schedule.

Professor Stampolidis said what this council, what this parliament, has done in relation to the return of those ancient relics, should not be underestimated and he considered it extremely important on a global scale because Australia has cordial relations with Britain. He believes it will add significant political weight to the pressure being applied to Britain and the British Museum to return or reunify the sculptures to their rightful home. He prefers reunification, emphasising the heritage significance of these prized relics compared with countless other items stolen or sold off by plunderers over the centuries and in private collections.

He said the difference here is that the Parthenon is their rightful home, and that their home still stands on the Acropolis. Think about it. If someone came pinching a piece of this place, we would want it back, too. 'This is why they must be reunified,' he said. 'Their home is still here today but they are missing.' He said he wanted me to convey his sincere thanks to the Legislative Council and to the President for the initiative, as we are the first commonwealth parliament to make such a forceful demand on the British.

My visit coincided with the return to Greece of a small piece of the Parthenon by the Italian government. This is the first of the relics to be willingly and officially returned by a government. In recognition of that gesture, the Greek government and the Acropolis Museum presented the Italians with a valuable ancient statue of the God Athena, which would be housed on loan in Sicily.

As I have pointed out previously, many museums and institutions are now returning items stolen or taken by their countries in their period of colonisation. Both mayor Bakoyiannis and Dr Dimas expressed their appreciation for the support shown by South Australia, and recognise the strong cultural links between our two countries and our city, which I pointed out was also dubbed the 'Athens of the South' by the late Labor Premier, Don Dunstan. They are keen to strengthen ties further, particularly in view of the free trade agreement about to be finalised between Australia and the European Union.

Dr Dimas is extremely interested to learn more, and perhaps even come here to see the exciting and dynamic science and innovation environment at Lot Fourteen. There are certainly ample opportunities for trade, tourism and economic investment between the two nations. So, we should care about what others are doing and thinking thousands of miles away.

RENAL DIALYSIS SERVICES

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (15:35): I am going to speak about dialysis in the private hospital system. I have already addressed this chamber on the issue of renal dysfunction and kidney disease from a personal perspective. My own personal journey has allowed me to gain an insight into the dialysis services and treatments available to South Australians that I would not have gained otherwise.

During this process it has become apparent to me that an appreciation is lacking of the limited capacity of services when compared with the needs of patients. The number of people with kidney dysfunction and failure who receive dialysis has been doubling between 2000 and 2020 from 6,400 to 14,600, and this number continues to rise. We do not have either the bed or chair capacity to address current demand, let alone any increase in demand that is forecast, based on the current trends.

The main provider of dialysis services in the state is the public health system. This system is overburdened and financially constrained from providing services to reflect community needs. If we turn our eye to the private system we see a severe failure to meet these needs when it comes to dialysis. In metropolitan Adelaide there are two private Fresenius clinics operating in Payneham and Brighton. They each offer dialysis services for private patients. These two main facilities are the only ones that have a substantive capacity to provide dialysis. Each clinic provides 28 chairs. They not only provide to private patients but also manage a large public patient overflow upon referral from public hospitals and subsidised by the government.

Let us consider private hospitals. A very brief survey conducted by my office identified 18 private hospitals in metropolitan and regional South Australia. None of these hospitals provide dialysis for members of the public who have private health insurance. Only two of the private hospitals that we identified provide intensive care dialysis for those patients who are already hospitalised for elective surgery or urgent treatment that may be unrelated to their kidney dysfunction.

A patient experiencing renal dysfunction, however, requires dialysis regularly in order to stay alive. These hospitals all informed us that patients are referred to a tertiary hospital for ongoing dialysis services. Primarily, they are being referred to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. We have a cooperative arrangement that exists between private and public health systems in this state. Private hospitals are falling short of their duty of care to provide health services to the privately insured members of the community. The function of private hospitals has a direct impact on public ones. The failure of private hospitals has a direct impact on public ones.

I do not want to ignore the fact that private hospitals as organisations have a profit incentive and responsibility; however, they are still running a hospital, and a hospital exists to provide care. Health decisions and services to the community are of just as much importance to a private hospital as they are to a public one.

HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:39): I am delighted to rise today to speak about the *Adelaide Dining Magazine* and acknowledge the dynamic hospitality industry in South Australia. As the shadow minister for tourism and hospitality, I had the great honour to represent the Hon. David Speirs, the leader of the Liberal Party, to attend the *Adelaide Dining Magazine* 2023 edition launch on Sunday 27 November 2022.

Adelaide Dining Magazine was established in 2014 and has built a reputation for showcasing the best and most innovative restaurants and dining venues in the South Australian hospitality industry. Many businesses I spoke to on the day informed me that restaurants and eateries in the *Adelaide Dining Magazine* are given maximum exposure to thousands of local and international visitors coming into South Australia.

The mission of this magazine is simple: its focus is to help all people find the food they would like to eat. From a family meal to the fine dining gastronomic experience, the choice is entirely up to the customers. The annual magazine is an eco-friendly, high-gloss, beautifully presented print publication which is distributed in-room and at reception across SA's major hotels, visitor centres, business lounges and tourist hotspots. In addition, the publication also has a strong online presence, including a website that acts as a front desk supporting social media platforms showcasing restaurants, wineries and venues that visitors can explore, along with the latest news from the industry.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate *Adelaide Dining Magazine's* director, Shantal Hart, for launching the magazine and sharing her passion and connection with the hospitality industry. Shantal is a qualified journalist with over 15 years in the media industry. She mentioned in her welcome speech at the launch that she is passionate about two things: writing and food.

Her multicultural Eurasian background opened a world of diverse cultural experience for her from a young age, and food has continued to play a significant part in Shantal's life. Not only does she enjoy eating all kinds of food, from European, Asian and Middle Eastern to endless combinations of fusion foods, she absolutely enjoys writing about food, exploring every story behind the chef's

creation and taking the readers on a journey. Well done, Shantal, and her supporters for their wonderful work.

The front cover of the magazine featured Luigi's Legacy, and the restaurant that appeared on the cover became the host for the launch. I take this opportunity to express my special thanks to Luigi Di Costanzo and his team for hosting the launch and for their generous hospitality on the day. Luigi's friendly nature and larger than life personality complements his passion for the theatre of food. He is very proud of his Italian heritage, and bringing food, wine, family and people together comes naturally. It is truly a part of his Italian DNA.

First opening in 2014, Luigi's mamma would join him in the 5am starts, helping curate traditional meatballs, lasagne, parmigiana, sauces and soups. Sadly, three years from the opening, Luigi's beloved mamma passed away, but her warm and loving presence continues to be felt and resonate within the restaurant's walls. It is a heartwarming story to learn that Luigi will continue his mamma's legacy. I also totally agree with Luigi's philosophy that food is maybe the only universal thing that really has the power to bring everyone together. The launch event certainly brought everyone together. It was great to catch up with so many wonderful friends on the day.

I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the achievements and resilience of individuals and businesses in the hospitality industry. In consultation with the industry, people spoke highly in favour of the Great State Voucher program. The Great State Vouchers were introduced by the former Marshall Liberal government and generated \$147 million in economic activity for the state. It is such a shame that the Malinauskas Labor government cut the program in its first state budget.

The Liberal Party will continue to call on the Malinauskas Labor government to revive the Great State and Eats voucher schemes to help South Australian businesses to further recover from the pandemic as well as ease cost-of-living pressures on families. Let us all continue to support the local cafes, restaurants and our resilient hospitality industry in South Australia.

PILL TESTING

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:44): I rise to speak on the matter of pill testing. I travelled to the ACT back in October to visit Australia's first fixed-site pill testing service. The CanTEST Health and Drug Checking Service was initiated by the Labor-Greens government in the ACT as a six-month pilot. Drug testing and pill testing have long been seen as harm minimisation approaches. Supported by the South Australian Network of Drug and Alcohol Services and their interstate counterparts, drug checking services can prevent immediate harm, increase education and awareness and alert authorities to new substances.

Harm reduction has also been acknowledged at a federal level as a key component of the National Drug Strategy. According to the 2016 National Drug Strategy Household Survey, 3.1 million Australians had used illicit drugs at some point in their lives. Shifting to a health-based approach meets the reality that many in our community are already using drugs. This is not about trying to condone the use of illicit substances but it is recognising that people are already using these substances and we need to do what we can to save lives.

The Greens believe that harm minimisation is the most appropriate way to reduce the adverse health, social and economic consequences of drug and substance abuse. Drug testing and pill testing is used in over 20 countries across Europe, the Americas and New Zealand. It has been used as part of a harm reduction strategy for over five decades. Consecutive studies have also revealed widespread support for pill testing in the community. In 2019, 57 per cent of Australians supported pill testing but only 27 per cent were revealed to be directly opposed, according to opinion polls.

Drug testing is supported by a range of public health organisations, including the Public Health Association, the Australian Medical Association, the Pharmaceutical Society of Australia and the Royal Australasian College of Physicians. I know that the conservative media often try to paint pill testing as some sort of radical concept, but I would hardly describe the AMA as a radical left-wing organisation.

At the CanTEST site I visited in the ACT, people can access the service between 10am and 1pm on Thursdays and 6pm and 9pm on Fridays. It is a free, confidential service. No ID is required,

and all data is de-identified. Service users feel safe being anonymous, and they can seek advice in a non-threatening way. I must say I was really impressed with the level of service that is provided. It is an STI testing clinic as well, so someone can get themselves tested for STIs as well as ensure that any substances they have in their possession are tested.

They are also advised at this service that it is not safe to take any illicit substances. They are discouraged from doing so, and they are encouraged to think about a plan around what they might do if they are taking these substances. It is certainly not the case that, if a substance is tested and is confirmed to be what the visitor considers it to be, they are just told, 'Go on, have a great night. Off you go.' That is not the focus of this service.

The CanTEST trial has produced some really interesting results. In the six-month trial, they have tested 232 samples and provided 294 alcohol and other drug interventions. Of those who visited, 17 per cent chose to voluntarily discard their samples after the testing showed that there was already a minimisation of the risk of harm.

Some of the samples were found to be less pure than the client expected, and some of the substances contained none of the anticipated ingredients. One supposed sample of methamphetamine was found to contain no methamphetamine and only sugar, while a sample of cocaine was found to contain only methamphetamine. Purity of cocaine and heroin was between 5 per cent and 71 per cent in the samples tested at the site. Much of the MDMA contained caffeine, and 20 per cent of the MDMA samples were not even MDMA at all.

The statistics tell us a few important stories. Firstly, harm minimisation is already taking place as clients of the service were already surrendering their samples after testing. Secondly, people's expectations of their substances did not always match their samples. Finally, the data revealed that this is a really valuable service for health professionals and law enforcement agencies. By understanding what drugs are available on the market, we can better create strategies for managing and minimising risk to individuals and the community. I encourage the government to consider the trial and take action.

VALO ADELAIDE 500

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:49): I rise to speak today on a significant event gearing up in our city, the VALO Adelaide 500, an event that is creating travel delays for some and congestion on our streets that Adelaideans generally do not have to deal with. There is often a pay-off factor with most things in life, and the return of the Adelaide 500 may create a bit of inconvenience for a short while but the benefits of this race returning to our CBD will ripple down to us all in one way or another.

Today, in this chamber, I want to accentuate the positive aspects of the Adelaide 500. Some people may not be so enthusiastic about the return of this race; however, this is a great, vibrant city, with numerous festivals and events that benefit South Australia in many ways. People from all walks of life live in our state and we have the privilege of choosing from a smorgasbord of events we can attend, depending on our individual interests.

The historic agreement to secure the Adelaide 500 as the final race of the Supercars Championship for the next five years is a testament to the Malinauskas Labor government's steadfast commitment to ensuring that as many interests as possible are met within the South Australian community. Let us remember that the former Liberal government reported in 2019 that the Adelaide 500 generated over \$45 million in economic activity.

The COVID pandemic is still a recent lived experience for the entire world, which resulted in two years of virtually empty streets and the closing down of many small businesses on those streets. In the past, this race has attracted over 15,000 interstate and international visitors to our state, and in 2019 the Adelaide 500 attracted more than 250,000 people to the CBD. I am sure all South Australians share a common desire to make our state great. In bringing back this event, the Labor government has prioritised local businesses to be suppliers, as well as creating an opportunity for the variety of local businesses we have in South Australia to showcase their products and talents.

This is not simply the return of what some are calling a noisy car race that blocks off our city streets, it is an opportunity for small business to increase their weekly turnover, it is an opportunity for people to engage in casual work, it is an opportunity for the tourism and hospitality industries to

promote our beautiful state, and it is an opportunity for musicians and artists to engage with newer and bigger audiences. Importantly, it brings another opportunity for our hospitality venues and our retail sector to recover and to rejoice in the greater numbers of customers as Adelaide's population gets out and about and our visitor numbers increase.

A total of 15,000 people attended the recent Harvest Rock event, despite the wet and windy weather. According to our Minister for Multicultural Affairs in the other place, booking data from the South Australian Tourism Commission shows spikes in CBD hotel bookings for major events. Adelaide can look forward to a vibrant summer, with the Santos Tour Down Under returning to its traditional format, international tennis, and our usual mad March events. Thanks to our Premier, we have the VALO Adelaide 500, along with Adelaide's own Jimmy Barnes, to launch us into a summer filled with further festivals and events that will most certainly keep Adelaide very much alive.

Motions

INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTEER DAY

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:54): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes that 5 December is International Volunteer Day;
2. Recognises the tireless work of volunteers across South Australia; and
3. Encourages all South Australians to thank our volunteers and show their appreciation for the contributions volunteers make to our state.

As the shadow minister for communities, I would like to take this opportunity to express my thanks and to recognise the remarkable contributions that South Australian volunteers make to our state every single day. International Volunteer Day is fast approaching on 5 December, and it is an international day of observance that was mandated by the United Nations General Assembly in 1985. Its full title is actually International Volunteer Day for Economic and Social Development, recognising how volunteers contribute to the achievements of the United Nations' sustainable development goals at local, national and international levels.

It is a wonderful opportunity for volunteer-involving organisations and individual volunteers to promote volunteerism and encourage governments to support volunteer efforts and strategies. International Volunteer Day is also marked and supported by the United Nations volunteer program, which contributes to peace and development through volunteerism worldwide. There are currently over 10,900 UN volunteers deployed in the field, both in development programs and peacekeeping operations around the world.

This year, the theme of International Volunteer Day is 'solidarity through volunteering'. We know that volunteering brings a sense of belonging and community to individuals, increasing their wellbeing and helping them feel more supported and involved in their community. The theme of solidarity through volunteering takes this another step further and encourages us all to come together through volunteering to find common solutions to challenges, to work together for the common good and for the future of our society and our planet. Volunteering is where compassion meets solidarity. Both share the same values, supporting each other from a position of trust, humility, respect and equality. Volunteers are role models in their communities and personify inspiration in action.

As shadow minister for communities and multicultural South Australia, I am immensely proud of the efforts and contributions of all the amazing volunteers across South Australia, no matter what organisation, sector or activity they are involved in. I have spoken about the incredible work of volunteers throughout our not-for-profit sector and in our multicultural communities in this place on numerous occasions this year and, indeed, every year since I was elected to parliament.

I would like to take this opportunity to make special mention of the outstanding service and sacrifices made by volunteers involved in our emergency services, especially over the last few weeks, with extreme weather events causing havoc and devastation across the state. Thank you to all of those volunteers assisting our State Emergency Service, South Australian Country Fire Service, Metropolitan Fire Service and the South Australian Ambulance Service respond to urgent requests for assistance caused by the horrendous weather events.

Volunteers were involved in removing fallen trees, fixing up broken infrastructure and cleaning up to help keep our community safe. Of course, thank you to everyone who is currently volunteering their time to assist with flood preparations in the Riverland regional communities at the moment. Whether it is as part of an organisation or on an individual basis, your assistance and selfless efforts are making an enormous difference as we work to mitigate the impact of the ongoing high flow events.

Just last week, I was delighted to represent the leader of the opposition, the Hon. David Speirs, at the 40th anniversary celebration of Volunteering SA&NT hosted at Government House on 23 November. It was wonderful to hear from Mr Hamilton Calder, CEO of Volunteering SA&NT, about the incredible story and achievements of the organisation over its four decades of service in the community. Volunteering SA&NT is the peak body for volunteering and volunteer support services, leading the sector in South Australia and the Northern Territory since 1982.

While I will not speak at length about its entire history again, honourable members may wish to refer to my contribution on National Volunteer Week that I made in this place in May. I would like to make special mention of the two dynamic women who first opened the SA Volunteer Centre in 1982. Mavis Reynolds and the late Joy Noble shared the same vision and defended the value of volunteering, pushing the boundaries of what a volunteer matching service could be. They also helped change the face of volunteers from a hobby for well-off retirees and churchgoers to anyone at all with diverse skills and passions looking to help sustain communities.

Ms Calder read out a lovely letter from Mavis, who was unfortunately unable to attend the anniversary reception due to ill health; however, even now, in her 90s, Mavis is still dedicated to the volunteering sector and passed on her kind thoughts and wise words of advice on the 40th anniversary of this wonderful organisation.

We all know that we are in a particularly challenging time for volunteering involving organisations, with around two thirds of volunteers stopping their work during the height of the COVID pandemic. While this situation has certainly improved and many of these volunteers have now come back and resumed their efforts, not all volunteers have yet done so, and we are continuing to see a decline in rates of formal volunteering. It is essential that governments, organisations and communities work together to find new and innovative ways of engaging a sustained volunteer participation and reach out to those populations who have not generally been active in volunteering in the past.

I have spoken before in this place about the innovative approach that the former Marshall Liberal government took to encouraging volunteers by abolishing the fees for volunteer screening checks, making it easier for people in South Australia to volunteer and removing the cost barrier to participation. This policy was a great success, injecting approximately \$8 million back into the volunteer sector and deserves recognition again today.

I would like to briefly highlight, once again, the fabulous 2021-2027 volunteering strategy for South Australia, released by the former Marshall Liberal government. This strategy aims at increasing participation of young people through the capacity of organisations to upskill, retain volunteers and help more people enjoy the rewarding experience of giving their time and strongly aligned with the strategic priorities of Volunteering SA and NT.

Once again, I would like to express my thanks to the former minister for human services, my wonderful colleague, the Hon. Michelle Lensink, for her outstanding work and dedication supporting the volunteering sector and for bringing together a shared vision for volunteering in SA.

I encourage everyone in our community to consider giving volunteering ago, whether by joining an organisation, getting more involved in your local sporting clubs like the Hon. Nicola Centofanti often does, and giving your time to help out others or an individual on a formal or informal basis. On this note, congratulations once again to Volunteering SA and NT on their milestone 40th anniversary and I wish everybody a very happy International Volunteer Day on 5 December. I commend the motion.

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

ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION AND TRANSMISSION NETWORK

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

That this council—

1. Notes that the commonwealth budget released last week forecast:
 - (a) a 56 per cent increase in electricity prices over the next 18 months; and
 - (b) a 44 per cent increase in gas prices over the next 18 months.
2. Notes that Adelaide recorded the highest quarterly rise in CPI in the country with a 2.6 per cent rise for the September 2022 quarter and an annual rise of 8.4 per cent.
3. Recognises that cost-of-living pressures are continuing to increase for South Australians.
4. Acknowledges that the privatisation of ETSA was a failure of market regulation and contributed to an increase in electricity prices.
5. Calls on the Malinauskas government to establish a commission of inquiry to examine reviving ETSA and returning South Australia's electricity distribution and transmission network to public ownership.

(Continued from 2 November 2022.)

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (16:03): I thank the honourable member for bringing this very important matter to the attention of the council. The government did, indeed, note in the federal budget delivered on 25 October 2022 that commonwealth Treasury expects a sharp increase in energy prices. The budget records the commonwealth Treasury's assumption that electricity prices will have increased by 20 per cent by the end of this year and that, given forward wholesale contract prices for electricity remain elevated, retail electricity prices are expected to rise by a further 30 per cent in 2023-24.

The budget papers added that domestic wholesale gas prices remain more than double their average prior to the Russian invasion of Ukraine. Retail gas prices are expected to increase less than wholesale prices, by up to 20 per cent in both 2022-23 and 2023-24 as major gas retailers are somewhat insulated from spot prices, either through long-term contracts or investment in gas supplies. Nevertheless, sharply higher spot and forward prices suggest a sizeable increase in wholesale costs. The government regards these forecast prices as completely unacceptable.

The government has also noted the consumer price index data and other economic indicators from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, business organisations and academic researchers. The government agrees with the honourable member that these forecasts and datasets show that cost-of-living pressures are escalating. This is occurring in South Australia, across the nation and across the world.

The illegal invasion of Ukraine by Russia has harmed energy market systems globally, and South Australia is not immune to the impact. The government has not been idle in providing immediate relief for the most vulnerable households. In the June budget, this government moved to assist these households with measures that include:

- doubling the Cost of Living Concession for eligible households in 2022-23, increasing from \$112.30 to \$224.60 for tenants and commonwealth senior health cardholders at a cost of \$39.3 million;
- providing \$24 million over two years to provide a \$100 subsidy to government school parents, caregivers and independent students for the school materials and service charges for each of the 2022-23 years; and
- allocating \$5.2 million over four years to grant free public transport for eligible seniors on Adelaide Metro services, 24 hours a day, seven days a week, expanding from previous arrangements where free travel was only available to seniors outside the peak periods.

Nor will this government rest at those points in tackling the rising cost of living. More measures are being considered by a range of agencies.

The honourable member calls on the council to acknowledge that the privatisation of ETSA was a failure that has contributed to rising energy costs. The government wholeheartedly agrees with the honourable member's view. This side of politics opposed the privatisation from the start and has had to spend years ameliorating the worst effects of that move by former Treasurer Robert Lucas and his Liberal colleagues.

However, where the government parts way with the honourable member is his call for a commission of inquiry into returning South Australia's electricity distribution and transmission network to public ownership. We part ways not because there is no merit in the call but rather because such an inquiry is unnecessary at this point in time.

The government has established a National Energy Crisis Committee of cabinet, chaired by the Premier, the Hon. Peter Malinauskas. The cabinet committee will be supported by a task force co-chaired by the Minister for Energy and Mining, Tom Koutsantonis, and DEM chief executive, Paul Heithersay. The cabinet committee has an open mandate to examine all aspects of the electricity and gas systems, and make recommendations to ensure SA consumers and businesses receive cleaner, affordable, reliable energy. Any consideration of reclaiming government-owned electricity assets, including the former ETSA and Optima assets, will already be covered as a subset of the committee's work.

Council members will be aware that the government is already investing in new generation, which will be operated by a government business enterprise—the clean fuel generator being built through the \$593 million investment in the Hydrogen Jobs Plan. Previously, when the ALP was in government, it invested in two sets of generators that were specifically in place to cover supply shortfalls and put downward pressure on prices. Unfortunately, the Marshall government chose to lease these generators to the private sector under long-term contracts, thereby weakening the electricity system by losing government control of these key assets.

The council should also recall other aspects of the former Labor government's energy plan. Initiatives included incentivising construction of the big battery at Jamestown, known as the Hornsdale Power Reserve. It was a revolutionary concept to build a grid-scale battery to stabilise supply. Uninformed critics—the people who should have been informed but were not—misunderstood the purpose of the battery. They labelled it the Big Banana. They said it would be useless because it could only supply energy for a very brief period. But time proved the critics wrong.

Hornsdale Power Reserve, owned and operated by Neoen using Tesla equipment, saved South Australians tens of millions of dollars in ancillary support costs. It has been so successful that it has increased in size from 100 megawatts/129 megawatt-hours to 150 megawatts/193.5 megawatt-hours. The range of support services it provides has been broadened and, significantly, big batteries have been installed across Australia and in many other countries.

The former ALP government introduced the Tesla Virtual Power Plant scheme, which has benefited thousands of low income households. We support broadening schemes providing the benefits of solar and batteries to more lower income families, and we will have more to say on that in the months ahead. The government has the appetite for considering further public ownership in the energy market. It has initiated a green paper/white paper process to co-design with industry, interest groups and the public a more holistic policy, covering all aspects of the transition to a decarbonised future.

As I said earlier, the government welcomes this motion and a spotlight being shone on these pressing matters. However, the government is taking a bigger picture approach to deal with the problems in a more comprehensive way and in a deeper collaboration with the South Australian people. We urge the honourable member and other members of the council to turn their attention to making a considered contribution when the green paper on the energy transition and decarbonisation of the economy opens for submissions early next year. That is why we will vote against the narrow focus of establishing a commission of inquiry.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (16:11): I rise to speak on this motion on behalf of the opposition and indicate that we have amendments to the motion but do support parts 1 through to 3 of the motion. It is a great opportunity set the record straight on a few things. The former Liberal government

inherited an electricity system on its knees from the previous Labor government after the statewide blackout, and who could forget that, and being reliant on dirty diesel generators to keep the lights on and the risk of blackouts ever present.

Previously, South Australia was regarded as a world-leading energy jurisdiction, with over 60 per cent renewable energy and cheaper electricity and no insufficient supply or grid stability impacts on consumers when we were in government over the previous four years. Other policy initiatives included the largest rollout of home batteries per capita in the world, virtual power plants, voluntary demand management, four additional grid-scale batteries and the soon to be completed SA-New South Wales interconnector—these were all driving down prices.

Electricity prices for South Australian families went down by \$421 under the former Liberal government. The electricity savings also flowed through to all businesses, with businesses receiving an on average 16.8 per cent saving since the change of government in 2018. Independent modelling has also shown that the former Liberal government's signature energy policy, the \$2.4 billion SA-New South Wales interconnector, Project EnergyConnect, will deliver another \$100 of savings, on average, for South Australian families once it is up and running.

Under the previous Labor government, electricity prices skyrocketed by \$551 from June 2015 to June 2017. Additionally, seven million customer hours were lost due to load shedding during the last four years of the previous Labor government, compared to zero customer hours lost over the four years of the previous Liberal government. That bears repeating: for the last four years of the Labor government, there were seven million hours lost, compared to zero customer hours lost due to load shedding under the entire term of the former Liberal government. This is an extraordinary comparison.

Now, with the Labor government in place, electricity prices are again rising off the back of rising gas prices, especially on the east coast, which is where the majority of the National Energy Market to which South Australia is connected is. The current Labor government are blaming the war in Ukraine and privatisation, rather than taking any responsibility. While the war in Ukraine has caused international gas prices to rise dramatically, and this has flowed through to domestic prices, it is not the only reason for the energy crisis on the east coast. Wet weather and floods, coupled with maintenance delays caused by supply chain issues, has resulted in coal-fired power stations on the east coast being unavailable. This shortfall in baseload generation led to a large increase in demand for gas-fired electricity generation. This increase has seen a large, uncontracted demand for gas at a time when gas prices are already increasing.

I would like to take members back to a time in 1991 that cannot soon be forgotten. The collapse of the State Bank in 1991 was one of the largest economic disasters in South Australia's history. As a result of being legally underwritten by the government of South Australia, the state was saddled with a massive debt, thanks to the failings of the Bannon Labor government. The Brown Liberal government was elected in 1997 to clean up the mess the Bannon and Arnold Labor governments had left this state in.

Due to the dire financial situation the state found itself in, and based on information provided by the Auditor-General and the advent of the National Electricity Market, the Olsen Liberal government made the decision to disaggregate ETSA to combat the massive state debt. The state's fiscal situation was improved due to these difficult decisions, rectifying somewhat the situation the former Labor government left the state in.

The Hon. Robert Simms has claimed that privatisation of ETSA delivered higher energy prices; however, that simply is not the case. A report in 2013 undertaken by Ernst and Young examined electricity prices in South Australia from 1998-99 through to 2010-11 compared to New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland between 1996-97 through to 2012-13. It found that since privatisation electricity bills have increased less in the privatised states of Victoria and South Australia compared to the same period in the non-privatised states of New South Wales and Queensland.

ABC Fact Check has claimed that the ABS index of electricity prices across Australia, showing movement of electricity prices over time, also does not demonstrate a link between privatisation and price rises. Blaming the privatisation of ETSA is a convenient excuse for rising electricity prices, without taking responsibility for the costs associated with the energy transition,

which has seen the exit of reliable baseload power from the system before a relevant equivalent was in place.

The disorderly nature of the energy transition in South Australia, where baseload power exited the system before a reliable equivalent was in place, has led to higher prices and lower grid reliability. This transition occurred under the former Labor government. The former Liberal government had a comprehensive energy solution to maintain power system security and underpin an orderly transition to more clean, affordable and reliable power.

Between June 2018 and December 2021, electricity prices for South Australian families went down by \$421 under the former Liberal government. These measures included the SA-NSW interconnector, the Home Battery Scheme, grid-scale storage, voluntary demand management, Switch for Solar and the Electric Vehicle Action Plan.

The recent storm damage to the Victorian interconnector, causing South Australia to be disconnected from the National Electricity Market, or 'islanded', further highlighted the importance of having a second interconnector between South Australia and New South Wales. AEMO declared that the SA-NSW interconnector is absolutely critical for the ongoing secure operation of the South Australian power system.

The \$2.4 billion SA-NSW interconnector will allow for renewable energy to be exported to NSW when SA is producing an excess and also means that SA can have access to energy from NSW in times of shortfall. The Labor Party actually promised a NSW-SA interconnector 20 years ago but never delivered on this program. If Labor had acted, then we would not be in this situation now.

In its first budget, the current Labor government cut the Home Battery Scheme and the grid-scale storage fund and did not replace them with any alternative other than a \$593 million experimental hydrogen power plant, which their own policy documents claimed to only target electricity costs for business and will not be in place until the end of 2025. That is too far away for those in the midst of an energy crisis right now.

Labor has removed two important pillars that not only help reduce household electricity prices but also increase fast frequency control to assist with maintaining power system security in situations threatened by negative demand that is heightened by interstate islanding. If this motion was to pit the energy policies of the two parties of government against each other, Labor's record falls woefully short on delivering cheaper energy for South Australians.

South Australians are tired of the blame games. South Australian families and businesses deserve a focused government, a focused parliament, on finding practical solutions to lessen the increases in power prices. South Australia cannot wait. We need an energy policy that will support South Australian families and businesses during this energy crisis. The Labor Party must stand up and take responsibility. I therefore move:

Leave out paragraphs 4 and 5 and insert new paragraph as follows:

4. Calls on the Malinauskas Labor government to develop an energy policy that will support South Australian families and businesses during this energy crisis.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:20): First off the bat, the Greens will not support the Liberal Party's amendment, which I submit is designed to rob the motion of its veracity, and is in keeping with the Liberal Party's revisionist view of South Australian history, this idea that they cannot take any responsibility for the original sin that has bedevilled our electricity network in this state, that is, of course, the disastrous decision of the Olsen government to sell off ETSA, to dud South Australians and to negotiate a totally dud deal for our state, one that has resulted in higher electricity prices and an insecure electricity network.

There is something seriously wrong in our state when we have an electricity network that cannot weather a storm. It is unacceptable that we had thousands and thousands of South Australians being denied power for days and days on end following the storm that occurred the other week. On the one hand, some will say, 'Well, acts of God happen, we are going to see freak weather events, that's part of life'. Certainly, as the climate continues to change, we will see more freak weather events, but that is why it is so vitally important that we have an energy system that is fit for purpose.

The private sector has not been delivering on the energy needs for South Australia because there has not been the appropriate investment in resources in the workforce over time so that we can be prepared for these sort of events. The Greens certainly stand with the union movement in its critique of the approach that has been taken to electricity in our state.

I must say that I am a little perplexed by the position that has been taken by the Labor government because, on the one hand, they purport to support many of the elements of this motion, yet they do not intend to vote for it. With all due respect to the Hon. Russell Wortley, who made a contribution on behalf of the Labor Party, it is not what people say in this chamber, it is what they do with their feet, it is how they vote that is the important test. If the Labor Party is really serious about looking into bringing back ETSA, if the Labor Party is really fulsome in its condemnation of the appalling record of the Olsen government, they will support my motion. The proposition is very simple.

I flag with honourable members that I intend to test that proposition by calling a division on this matter. In summing-up, I also want to read into *Hansard* an excerpt of a public letter that has been sent from Dale Beasley, the Secretary of SA Unions, to the Hon. Peter Malinauskas MP, and it is a letter that has been published publicly. He says in this letter:

Privatisation of the South Australian electricity system by the Olsen Liberal government has been a boon for foreign owned corporations but has been a disaster for South Australian electricity users.

Clearly it is not in the best interests of South Australians that the natural monopoly of public electricity supply is run by private corporations to create huge profits. This model has seen under investment in maintenance and replacement of electricity distribution infrastructure and a failure to build the renewable energy generation and grid scale energy storage that we require to maintain security of supply and price stability.

We in the Greens agree. The letter goes on to say:

SA Unions respectfully suggests that your Government consider establishing a public trust (ETSA may be a good name) to plan, build and operate electricity generation and storage assets for the benefit of all South Australians.

We agree with those sentiments. Many will say that this cannot be done, that we cannot bring back ETSA, we cannot unscramble the egg. I urge those who make that claim to consider the remarkable success of the Andrews Labor government in Victoria last weekend, a remarkable achievement given the appalling fear and smear campaign that was run by some in the right wing media and the appalling misinformation campaign spread by the Liberal Party in that state.

One of the really exciting elements of the platform of the Labor Party in Victoria is their commitment to revive the State Electricity Commission with a majority share owned by the state. They are wanting to bring back public ownership of their electricity. Why can we not do it here in South Australia?

When the Labor Party came to government here in this state, they promised a commission of inquiring into bringing back public ownership of the trains and trams. The transport minister has announced more recently that that is not necessary because the government is going to progress with it and we welcome that, but why not take the same approach when it comes to electricity? If it is good enough for our public transport network, why not do it for our electricity network? That is why the Greens are testing that proposition with this motion today.

Amendment negatived.

The council divided on the motion:

Ayes	4
Noes.....	13
Majority	9

AYES

Bonaros, C.
Simms, R.A. (teller)

Franks, T.A.

Pangallo, F.

NOES

Bourke, E.S.	Centofanti, N.J.	Curran, L.A.
Game, S.L.	Girolamo, H.M.	Hunter, I.K.
Lee, J.S.	Maher, K.J.	Martin, R.B.
Ngo, T.T.	Pnevmatikos, I.	Wade, S.G.
Wortley, R.P. (teller)		

Motion thus negatived.

ISRAEL-PALESTINE CONFLICT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. I. Pnevmatikos:

That this council—

1. Notes:
 - (a) the Israel-Palestine conflict continues to be unresolved;
 - (b) Israel's occupation of Palestine has lasted over 50 years;
 - (c) Israel continues to build settlements on occupied territory, which undermines a two-state solution;
 - (d) the ongoing conflict continues to result in the loss of life and human rights violations and abuses;
 - (e) the recognition of Palestine by the Vatican and 138 nation states; and
 - (f) Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations adopts the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples.
2. Supports the right of both Israelis and Palestinians to live in equality, peace and security within internationally recognised borders.
3. Endorses the principles (1-8) stated in the Sydney Statement on Anti-Palestinianism.
4. Calls on the Australian government to:
 - (a) acknowledge the right of Palestinians to self-determination as provided for by international law;
 - (b) acknowledge the Palestinians' right to statehood; and
 - (c) actively promote measures to end the conflict between Israel and Palestine on the basis of relevant UN resolutions and international law.

(Continued from 2 November 2022.)

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:32): I am speaking today on behalf of the Greens in support for the motion for the Australian government to address the unresolved Israel-Palestine conflict. The Palestinian war, which culminated in the establishment of the state of Israel, saw the displacement of hundreds of thousands of Palestinian Arabs and the destruction of most of their urban areas. These displaced Palestinians and now their descendants are estimated to number over four million.

Palestinian people, for decades, have been some of the most oppressed people in the world. Justice for the people of Palestine is critical to achieving just and equitable peace in the region for Palestinians and Israelis. This includes ending the over 50-year Israeli military occupation of Palestine. The ongoing escalation in violence in this region is nothing less than horrific. Defending the rights of Palestinians is not antisemitic: this is a discussion of human rights abuses, and attempts to silence this discussion seek to continue the injustices of settler colonialism.

The Greens have long worked, inside and outside the parliament, to oppose Israel's illegal occupation of the Palestinian territories and recognise the historic and ongoing injustice suffered by Palestinians. There is no doubt that this is a longstanding human rights violation. In 2021, a report by the US-based Human Rights Watch found:

...in most aspects of life, Israeli authorities methodically privilege Jewish Israelis and discriminate against Palestinians. Laws, policies and statements by leading Israeli officials make plain that the objective of maintaining Jewish Israeli control over demographics, political power and land has long guided government policy. In pursuit of

this goal, authorities have dispossessed, confined, forcibly separated and subjugated Palestinians by virtue of their identity to varying degrees of intensity.

Additionally, in February this year Amnesty International released a comprehensive report titled 'Israel's apartheid against Palestinians: a cruel system of domination and a crime against humanity'. This report detailed Israel's cruel policy of segregation, dispossession and exclusion across all territories under its control, which amounts to apartheid under international law.

Amnesty calls on the international community's obligation to act. Both Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International, I believe, are to be heeded in this debate. To facilitate this end to the conflict, the Greens believe all sides must respect and abide by United Nations resolutions and step up to its obligations and act in line with international law and historic commitments, including the two-state solution for peace based on the pre-1967 borders and the relevant United Nations resolutions, as well as the Madrid Principles and the Arab Peace initiative.

There is no peace without justice, and there is no two-state solution without the recognition of those two states. With that, I conclude my remarks and commend the mover for bringing the motion to this place, and indicate I will not be supporting the amendment that is anticipated.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:35): I also rise to put on the public record my support for this very important motion, and I thank the honourable member for putting it forward. I certainly reiterate the comments made by my colleague, the Hon. Tammy Franks. Yesterday marked the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People. The Greens stand in solidarity alongside the people of Palestine and have continually called for an end to Israeli occupation. There are over 600,000 Israelis living in illegal settlements on occupied Palestinian land, and, as the motion states, this occupation has occurred over 50 years.

According to Amnesty International, over a hundred thousand hectares of land have been occupied by Israel, with over 4.9 million Palestinians facing daily restrictions on their movement. The Greens believe that human rights need to be at the forefront of foreign policy. Palestinians are being denied their basic rights, as they are unable to move freely to work, to be educated or to protest, and in some cases they are unable to even access clean water and electricity.

Violent attacks on the people of Palestine, their places and their cultural sites are devastating. Over the last 50 years, we have seen surges of violence related to the occupation. Last year saw the highest number of Palestinian deaths resulting from confrontations with Israel since 2014. The Greens oppose violence in any form and we call for an end to all violence in Palestine. We demand an immediate end to the occupation and call on Israel to withdraw its military presence.

Both Israelis and Palestinians should be able to live in peace and security. Just as Israelis are entitled to their own state and to live in peace and security, so too are Palestinians. The United Nations Secretary-General has recommended that Israel immediately cease all settlements in occupied Palestinian territory, and the Greens support that. The Greens will be supporting this motion, to add our voice to the calls to end the conflict in Palestine, and, as indicated by my colleague, we will not be supporting One Nation's amendments.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:38): I rise too to speak on this important motion, which again draws our attention to the continued human rights abuses being inflicted on the Palestinian people, and I also echo the sentiments of our colleagues, the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. Robert Simms, and commend the mover of this motion.

I think, like many people, I had hoped that the events that we have spoken of before in this place of May 2021 would have been a catalyst for change, but from all accounts we know that life is becoming deadlier in the occupied West Bank. According to the United Nations, it is becoming unlivable for Palestinians.

In 2018, we know one in five Palestinians were food insecure. In 2021, that number doubled to two in five. The destruction of essential infrastructure, which I have spoken of before in this place, has caused serious health consequences for Palestinian people. Limits on water access are discriminatory. Whereas Israeli settlers have access to 320 litres per capita per day, Palestinians can only access 75 to 100 litres per capita per day in areas A and B and as little as 30 to 50 litres in area C. Following those attacks that I referred to in May 2021, the rate of poverty was predicted to rise to

59.3 per cent. Many of these people, of course, were women who face social barriers and lack of employment opportunities.

Violence against women and girls, sadly, continues to be rife and, as the recent report of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem and Israel, highlights—and I quote:

Reports have emphasised that women and girls continue to be subjected to excessive use of force and abuse by the Israeli security forces and settlers, including physical, psychological and verbal abuse and sexual harassment and violation of their right to life.

Harassment and abuse of Palestinian women and girls by the Israeli security forces in the Occupied Palestinian Territory has been reported at checkpoints and on the way to and from school and work.

Sexual and gender-based violence has also been reported in detention and during night raids.

Reports indicate that women and girls have been particularly targeted by settlers in the West Bank, including when the male members of their family are absent.

The systemic denial of medical permits is yet another human rights abuse being inflicted on the Palestinian people. Travel permits are repeatedly rejected for months at a time, including for those seeking vital life-saving medical treatment. When they are finally issued, companion permits are routinely denied meaning that cancer patients, for instance, must undergo therapy alone—that is if they are even fit enough to travel by the time that a permit arrives. There are reports that medical permits are being used as a bargaining chip in exchange for cooperation with intelligence services.

Another worrying development is the increased reliance on remotely-controlled weapons by the Israeli military. Israel has been manufacturing and using drone technology for years. It is now becoming commonplace for soldiers to sit inside a guard tower and fire weapons with tear gas at targets remotely. In the last 12 hours it has been reported that a number of killings have occurred overnight, and this is a daily occurrence, and life is absolutely unliveable for the Palestinian people. Who knows what is next?

I could talk for hours in terms of highlighting the inequalities and issues, as we all could, that the Palestinian face, but I think it is important that we show our solidarity for this motion today. On Sunday I attended the Run for Palestine event, an annual event that takes place across the nation each year. It was nice to attend and participate after a forced break because of COVID. I spoke at that event and reflected on a motion that we all supported unanimously in this place during the last sitting week. That motion was moved by the Hon. Tung Ngo and it concerned the recent detention and tragic death of Jinna Amini and the disproportionate attacks on ethnic minorities under the Iranian regime.

I reflected on that motion specifically because at its heart was the very same sentiment that we paused to reflect on at that Run for Palestine, and the very same sentiment that we pause to reflect on here today with this motion: freedom, human rights, civil liberties and justice. I spoke of being both humbled and honoured to stand shoulder to shoulder with all my brothers and sisters who fight every day for these principles, and to stand shoulder to shoulder with all of Sunday's participants in support of our Palestinian brothers and sisters here and in Palestine, and to use the platform we all have, the very special privilege of using in this place, to do whatever we can to further this important cause.

It is my sincere hope that one day soon, hopefully sooner rather than later, we as members of this place will come together as one, unanimously and with the same conviction, supporting the rights of the Palestinian people to exercise their inalienable rights to self-determination, to national independence, statehood and sovereignty, to the right to return to their homes from which they have been displaced, to enjoy the same liberties and freedoms we all enjoy, to equal rights for all regardless of their nationality, their religion or race, and supporting, again unequivocally, the right of both Israelis and Palestinians to live in equality, peace and security equally.

We do really good work in this place, I think, when we stand united on issues as important as the motion that the Hon. Tung Ngo moved in this place that we all spoke on the other week, and we would do amazingly good work if we all stood shoulder to shoulder and united in supporting the motion that the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos has brought to this place.

I will end by saying that I do not think we should ever underestimate just how important a platform we have in terms of speaking on these issues and in progressing the plight of the Palestinian people and issues just as important as this one.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:45): While I share some of the views espoused in the original motion moved by honourable member, I cannot in good conscience support it in full. It reads as divisive and I query with whom the mover has consulted and based her research on. I, therefore, seek to amend the motion, which has been circulated. I move:

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

1. Notes that the Australian government is committed to a two-state solution to the Israel-Palestine conflict;
2. Calls on both sides to resume direct negotiations in good faith;
3. Calls on the commonwealth government to recognise the state of Palestine once the two sides have successfully negotiated a two-state solution, as required by international law as set out in the Oslo Accords; and
4. Expresses support to members of the South Australian Palestinian community who have been part of our rich cultural and religious tapestry for at least 70 years and acknowledge the pain and grief of all South Australian Palestinians arising from conflict, recognising that this grief affects Palestinians of all faiths and those not religious.

My amendment seeks to strike a balance between what are often characterised as competing and conflicting interests in this debate. At the heart of this matter, and what I do not believe is a conflicting interest here, is that whether you identify as Israeli, Palestinian, Arab or otherwise, peace and security is our ultimate goal.

As a One Nation member of the South Australian Legislative Council, I am realistic about what can be achieved in this chamber through my contribution and wish to contain my remarks as much as possible to the impacts of this ongoing conflict to South Australians. I want to acknowledge at the outset that I, like I believe most in this place, do not profess to be an expert in this long-running and challenging international dispute. I am instead reliant on those who I have consulted with and the readings that have helped me be informed on this issue.

I would particularly like to thank Mr Ahmed Zreika, President of the Islamic Society of South Australia and a respected Muslim leader, who I have had ongoing discussions with over the last few months. His biography is a shining example of the sorts of positive contributions our society is richer for thanks to his deep involvement in the community, sport and in business, following his arrival to Australia in 2003 from Lebanon.

Members who have sat longer in this place than I may be familiar with my amended motion. Then Legislative Councillor Andrew McLachlan CSC sought to pursue a compromise in the Fifty-Third Parliament of South Australia, which is substantially the same as the amendment I have put here. Now Senator McLachlan was successful in passing his motion, and I am hoping to replicate that in our Fifty-Fifth Parliament with the addition of paragraph 4. This paragraph bears repeating:

4. Expresses support to members of the South Australian Palestinian community who have been part of our rich cultural and religious tapestry for at least 70 years and acknowledge the pain and grief of all South Australian Palestinians arising from conflict, recognising that this grief affects Palestinians of all faiths and those not religious.

One Nation does not discriminate on the basis of race or ethnic background, nor faith or lack of. We welcome those who wish to call Australia home and seek to contribute positively to our society. The migration of Palestinians to our shores is not only as a result of conflicts abroad. Palestinian migrants have a long history in South Australia, with an immigrant named Hassam Bushara believed to be one of our earliest arrivals. He arrived in Port Adelaide as a young man in 1908. People of Palestinian birth have continued to arrive in South Australia ever since.

Contemporary Palestinian immigrants come here for education and career opportunities as much as for our democratic and peaceful way of life. They are members of our Muslim constituency and have established a close-knit community for those of the Orthodox Church of Antioch. Palestinian South Australians have settled throughout metropolitan Adelaide and are also seeking to

take advantage of the skills shortage in our regions, seizing skilled and professional opportunities and contributing positively to our country communities.

There is perhaps no better recognised contemporary Palestinian migrant than Fred Shahin, whose journey began here in 1984 with a humble service station in Woodville Park. This has grown to become an entity that is now South Australia's largest private company, employing over 3,500 people. I admire his work ethic and share the ideals of empathy and opportunity for all without discrimination, as espoused in the company's values statement.

One Nation believes that everyone who moves to Australia has the right to exist in peace, cohesively and with shared values of democracy and equality. My amendment seeks to remove divisiveness and insert relevance for our South Australian Palestinian community, without wading into the confronting, contentious and complex issues in the Middle East.

Israel is not a perfect democracy. It is, however, one that is vibrant, innovative, prosperous and operates under the rule of law. I echo the beliefs of Senator McLachlan when he said in this place over five years ago:

...for Israel to have security, it needs a viable Palestinian state—a Palestinian state that recognises Israel and rejects violence against the Jewish people, where trust exists between the two peoples.

I share his dream of seeing a Palestinian state that is cooperative and collaborative with its neighbour Israel—a state that has democratically elected leaders, respects the rule of law, rejects terrorism and promotes religious tolerance.

It is for the commonwealth government to dictate foreign policy and there has been a longstanding agreement, both within and outside of Australia, that the two-state solution ought to be pursued. My wish, as it is, for all members here is for the peaceful coexistence of Israel and Palestine in the Middle East. I support the imperative to remove the daily toll of grief and despair arising from witnessing these events from afar. As a community, we must do everything in our power to create the conditions for a just resolution and ultimately replace that suffering with hope.

With those words, I ask that you consider favourably my amendment, which I believe can be supported in this chamber.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:52): I rise on behalf of the Liberal Party to speak on the motion moved by the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos regarding the Israel and Palestine conflict. The unresolved Israel-Palestine conflict continues to be a major concern and is very upsetting for those who are directly or indirectly affected. It is important to, firstly, acknowledge that all honourable members in this place will respectfully express our support to advocate for the right of both Israelis and Palestinians to live in equality, peace and security within internationally recognised borders.

After much consideration and discussion with my parliamentary colleagues, I wish to indicate that the Liberal Party will be supporting the amended motion moved by the Hon. Sarah Game MLC. We believe the amendments by the honourable member should be considered in good faith, in the spirit of goodwill and respect to the many diverse communities in South Australia who are deeply impacted in different ways by the ongoing conflict between Israel and Palestine.

The longstanding position of the federal government has been to support a two-state solution to the conflict and to strongly call on both sides to cease any hostilities and violence and to resume direct negotiations in good faith. The South Australian Liberal Party firmly believes that all parties must focus on direct and genuine peace negotiations, with a view to defining a mutually workable, just, durable and resilient peace agreement. It is important to remind honourable members that despite the recent change of federal government, the Albanese Labor government remains committed to a two-state solution in which Israel and a future Palestinian state coexist in peace and security within internationally recognised borders.

Over the years, I have spoken to many constituents and community leaders from diverse multicultural groups about this complex issue. I believe the most important thing that we can do as South Australian parliamentarians is to continue to understand the concerns and continue to work with local community members, as well as the international community, to support programs that will encourage peace in the region.

With this in mind, on this side of the chamber we commend the Hon. Sarah Game for including the final clause in her amendment to support members of the South Australian Palestinian community. We would like to confirm our support of members of the South Australian Palestinian community, to recognise the pain, frustration and grief that they feel as a result of the ongoing conflict. We want to acknowledge that the Palestinian community has been an important part of our rich cultural and religious tapestry for at least 70 years, and we also acknowledge their significant contribution to our society in all aspects of our diverse society.

We extend our sympathies to all those families and loved ones who are traumatised and affected by the conflict and acknowledge their grave concerns about the frequent reports of violence and human rights abuses in the region. I wish to acknowledge and thank all the community leaders and organisations who persistently advocate for peace, respect and dignity for the Palestinian people, and I want to assure the community of the goodwill expressed by all honourable members in the chamber today.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (16:55): I would like to thank members who contributed to the discussion on this motion: the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Hon. Robert Simms, the Hon. Connie Bonaros, the Hon. Sarah Game and the Hon. Jing Lee.

This motion focuses on conflict in the region of Israel and Palestine. It has been raging since before our lifetimes and, unfortunately, I fear it will continue until after some of our lifetimes. The occupation of Palestine by Israel has been in the international public eye for the better part of 50 years and continues to date, with disastrous casualties to civilians and fighters alike. Israel continues to build settlements on occupied territory, further undermining any endeavours for a solution.

International law dictates that occupation of this territory is illegal and against agreed United Nations conventions and articles. Numerous United Nations Security Council resolutions and the prevailing international opinion hold that Israel's settlements in the West Bank, East Jerusalem and Golan Heights are a violation of international law. Further, they are a violation of article 49 of the fourth Geneva Convention, the law of occupation. International bodies working on the ground in these areas, including the Red Cross and the International Court of Justice, have all affirmed that article 49 applies to the Israeli-occupied territories.

As with most conflicts, repeated attacks on civilians that violate not only human rights but human decency and ethics appear to be a feature of this conflict. This conflict has been going on long enough for us to recognise the injustice unfolding. The reports of human rights violations and abuse keep piling up. It is time that we stand up for what is right and, as a chamber, call on the federal government to do the same. As I have said before, this motion is not about antisemitism, it is not about anti-Israel. This motion is about recognising two peoples' rights to coexist and prosper.

In relation to the amendment by the Hon. Sarah Game, I will not be supporting it because to support that amendment is to erase my motion. I am not prepared to do that.

The PRESIDENT: The question is that paragraphs 1 to 4 as proposed to be struck out by the Hon. Ms Game stand as part of the motion. If you support the Hon. Ms Game you will vote no to that proposition. If you are against the amendment you will vote yes.

The council divided on the question:

Ayes11
Noes.....6
Majority5

AYES

Bonaros, C.
Hunter, I.K.
Ngo, T.T.
Simms, R.A.

Bourke, E.S.
Maher, K.J.
Pangallo, F.
Wortley, R.P.

Franks, T.A.
Martin, R.B.
Pnevmatikos, I. (teller)

NOES

Centofanti, N.J.
Girolamo, H.M.

Curran, L.A.
Lee, J.S.

Game, S.L. (teller)
Wade, S.G.

PAIRS

Hanson, J.E.
Hood, D.G.E.

Lensink, J.M.A.

Scriven, C.M.

Question thus agreed to; motion carried.

*Bills***TOBACCO AND E-CIGARETTE PRODUCTS (TOBACCO PRODUCT PROHIBITIONS)
AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 November 2022.)

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (17:05): I rise as the lead speaker for the government on the bill introduced by the Hon. Connie Bonaros, and indicate that the government will support the bill subject to some minor amendments. I would like to thank the Hon. Connie Bonaros for her ongoing advocacy, on addressing illicit tobacco in South Australia and for bringing this bill to this house.

The illicit tobacco market presents a public health problem locally, nationally and internationally as it increases the availability of low price and unregulated tobacco, which more often than not does not have plain packaging and the required health warnings. Australia led the way with plain packaging and health warnings on cigarette packaging, and we must ensure that these actions are not undermined by illegal tobacco products.

Health warnings on cigarette packaging have had an enormous benefit to health outcomes of Australians, driving down rates of smoking. Illegal tobacco skirts around this health messaging, with consumers of illegal tobacco not exposed to the health warnings. This has the capacity to undermine the downward trend in smoking prevalence and increase smoking-related harm.

In a 2020-21 report by KPMG, they found that, while overall consumption of tobacco has fallen, the consumption of illegal tobacco has grown, creating a greater percentage of illegal tobacco within the overall consumption. The estimated 2,242 tonnes of illegal tobacco imported into Australia sees a massive \$3.4 billion in lost revenue from the tobacco excise, and this is only expected to grow. That is money not being spent on prevention, health and education.

Existing South Australian laws do not allow for South Australian authorised officers to enforce compliance with the commonwealth laws around the packaging and labelling of tobacco products, and therefore requires them to refer cases of possible non-compliance to the relevant commonwealth government enforcement authority. In response to this limitation, the bill proposes to regulate illicit tobacco at a state level by:

- prohibiting the supply or sale of tobacco products in South Australia that do not meet the requirements of the commonwealth's Tobacco Plain Packaging Act 2011;
- prohibiting the packaging and sale of tobacco products that do not contain an approved health warning; and
- prohibiting the supply or sale of tobacco products that are prohibited goods or have not had the required excise duty paid as per the commonwealth Customs Act 1901 and Excise Act 1901.

This bill will give the police extra powers and incentive to enforce the law, with increased penalties hopefully driving people out of the illegal industry of importing and selling unexcised tobacco.

The government has obtained advice to determine whether there are any adjustments that should be considered to strengthen the bill's application. In accordance with that advice, the government will lodge amendments to this bill:

- to allow for future adjustments to the commonwealth legislation without the need to further amend the Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products Act of 1997;
- will provide further clarity in the scope of the definition of 'health warning' to strengthen enforceability;
- will reduce overlap between some of the new offence provisions that may have the potential to undermine the enforcement and prosecution of these offences in some circumstances; and
- will amend the regulation-making power in section 87 of the Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products Act 1997 to reflect the proposed amendments contained in this bill.

A request has been made to parliamentary counsel to make these amendments to the bill to strengthen the enforceability of these laws. However, given the complex nature of this bill, with its interaction of state and commonwealth legislation, parliamentary counsel have advised us that there are a few drafting issues that need to be considered and resolved.

Therefore the amendments are unfortunately not ready for lodging at this time, but are expected to be finalised early in the next sitting year. The government is committed to addressing harmful tobacco use in all its forms, and I again thank the Hon. Connie Bonaros for her continued advocacy on this issue. I look forward to working with the honourable member to address illicit tobacco in South Australia.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:09): I rise today to speak very briefly in support of the Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products (Tobacco Product Prohibitions) Amendment Bill 2022. This bill, introduced by the Hon. Connie Bonaros, is a simple one. It increases the penalties for people who illegally import or pack tobacco in South Australia. These increased penalties are in close alignment with other jurisdictions, such as New South Wales and Victoria.

As with other drug reform, the Greens regard this as a health issue and believe that we should be guided by a harm minimisation approach. According to the Cancer Council, tobacco smoking is the largest preventable cause of cancer and the single greatest cause of preventable death. In Australia, smoking is estimated to kill almost 20,500 people per year. Dr Caroline Miller, from SAHMRI, in relation to plain packaging of cigarettes has stated: 'Implementing strong tobacco control policy measures like this ultimately makes profound differences for public health and our health system.'

I understand, in a separate bill, we will be considering the nature of packaging in more detail, but the fundamental principle here is the same: the regulation of the tobacco industry will give us beneficial health outcomes. The Hon. Connie Bonaros has brought to our attention the practice of illegally importing and packing tobacco products and described for us in detail how this system works. Illicit tobacco products are unregulated and, as such, we have no understanding of whether or not they are safe for sale within our country or whether or not they meet Australian standards. We do not know how much extra harm they cause beyond the harm that is already caused by tobacco products.

The intended outcome of this bill, and the increased penalties, is to deter people from illegally selling illicit cigarettes, and the Greens certainly support that objective. We hope that this is what will happen in practice, and that a reduction in illegal tobacco products will result in less harm for South Australians.

We will need to wait and see whether these increased penalties have the desired effect in terms of reducing the illegal packaging and import of cigarettes and tobacco products. I hope that, should this bill become law, the government will closely monitor its effectiveness. It may be some time before we have appropriate evidence to show us if these increased penalties have worked, and I look forward to looking at the outcomes.

As I indicated from the outset, the Greens are supportive of the honourable member's bill. I put on the public record our appreciation to the Hon. Connie Bonaros for putting this on the agenda of the parliament.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:12): I rise to speak briefly on the Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products (Tobacco Product Prohibitions) Amendment Bill 2022 and indicate that I will be the lead speaker for the opposition. This bill aims to strengthen the packaging, sale and supply requirements of tobacco in South Australia by aligning health warning requirements with commonwealth law and increasing maximum penalties and expiation fees for breaches of health warning, sale and supply offences. The bill is modelled on similar legislation that has been enacted in Western Australia and New South Wales to better align state laws with commonwealth law.

KPMG's 'Illicit tobacco in Australia' 2021 full-year report, which was released in June 2022, highlights a series of issues surrounding the illicit tobacco market in Australia. The 2021 report found that Australians consumed 2,242 tonnes of illicit tobacco, representing an estimated excise value of \$3.4 billion. It has also found that unbranded tobacco usage has seen an increase of 36 per cent and that illicit tobacco consumption accounted for 19.3 per cent of total tobacco usage, an increase of 2.4 per cent since 2020. However, despite a marked increase in the consumption of illicit tobacco, there has only been one conviction following 1,723 investigations into the illegal sale of tobacco in Australia since 2012.

The opposition supports the bill and the measures it proposes to restrict the packaging, sale and supply of tobacco products that are not marked with labelling and health warning requirements. The bill will also increase the maximum penalties from \$10,000 to \$50,000 and the expiation fee from \$500 to \$1,250. These increases are proportionate given the huge profits being made in the black market for illicit tobacco.

Finally, the bill will bring South Australian legislation into line with the commonwealth's Tobacco Plain Packaging Act 2011 with respect to packaging, appearance of products and health warnings. I thank the Hon. Connie Bonaros for identifying this opportunity to strengthen health laws in South Australia and for bringing this bill before the council.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:14): Nothing pleases me more than when we have agreement across the floor in this place. I am very thankful to all honourable members for their support of this important bill. Can I thank the speakers for their contributions today: the Hon. Mr Martin, the Hon. Mr Simms and the Hon. Ms Centofanti. I think everyone has articulated very well why we are here.

I want to say that I think the Hon. Mr Simms has made a very good point that the proof will be in the pudding. I do not think this is a magic solution or the silver bullet in terms of addressing this problem, but I am hoping that it will deter people from selling illegal tobacco for all the reasons that the honourable members have outlined today. I also acknowledge that it is one of several tools that we need to look at further to further strengthen those rules to deter people even more.

I would say also that I probably would have increased those penalties a lot more if we could have, but obviously we have to be consistent in terms of our drafting and the penalties that we can apply. This bill, as the Hon. Mr Martin has outlined, is complicated by the fact that we are traversing the commonwealth jurisdiction as well. We are doing what we can within the ambits of what is allowed, and I am very grateful to all honourable members for their support.

I will note that, in terms of one of the issues I flagged during my second reading explanation when I introduced this bill, there is an amendment on file that members will have in relation to possession. That was an issue that came up post the introduction of the bill and should have been addressed earlier. There was some concern flagged with us about a provision specifically in relation to possession to make it crystal clear that, if you are in possession of illegal tobacco for the purposes of sale, that would be enough in order for our authorities to be able to enter a premises and take further action.

We just wanted to make that absolutely clear. That was the intent of parliament, and that is what that amendment seeks to do. In relation to ongoing discussions that have taken place with the relevant minister and the government, I have flagged my support for further amendments. I think the

Hon. Mr Martin outlined quite succinctly why we have not got those now but also the reasons for those. All the amendments that we have discussed with the minister are aimed at further strengthening the provisions of this bill and not having to come back for future adjustments also in relation to future further changes that may be needed in due course.

With those words, I indicate that, based on those discussions with the minister, we have certainly agreed between us—and I am asking members to be mindful of this when we consider the bill—that the quickest way to do this would be to pass the bill through this chamber with the amendment that relates to possession, and then the minister will have carriage of the bill in the other place and be in a position to file amendments to deal with those issues that have already been outlined.

That is certainly the discussion that we have had, and that is my understanding of how we will progress today. Those amendments will obviously come back to this place for consideration once we have had the opportunity to have them dealt with in the other place. With those words, I thank everybody again, all honourable members, for their support of this bill, and I look forward to its swift passage through this chamber.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Bonaros-1]—

Page 3, after line 28—insert:

33—Possession of certain tobacco products

- (1) A person must not, without lawful excuse, have possession of prescribed tobacco products for the purpose of sale.

Maximum penalty: \$50,000.

- (2) In this section—

prescribed tobacco product means tobacco products that—

- (a) are prohibited goods within the meaning of the *Customs Act 1901* of the Commonwealth; or
- (b) do not comply with the requirements of the *Tobacco Plain Packaging Act 2011* of the Commonwealth.

I have already explained what this amendment does. It seeks to make it abundantly clear and explicit in the bill that possession of certain tobacco products for the purposes of sale will also be captured by the bill. I think it is important to note for the benefit of members also that it is possession for the purposes of sale. We are not suggesting that these penalties apply to someone walking out of a shop with a packet of cigarettes, even though it is illegal tobacco. They apply to the individuals who are actually selling the tobacco. This amendment makes it clear that if a person without lawful excuse has possession of prescribed tobacco for the purposes of sale then that will become an offence under this bill.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:21): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Motions

AUSTRALIAN RED CROSS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.S. Lee:

That this council—

1. Recognises that the Australian Red Cross has been supporting communities in need through its humanitarian work and community support services since 1914;
2. Acknowledges the significant contributions that the Australian Red Cross makes in providing a wide range of programs and support to refugees, asylum seekers, immigration detainees, and migrant communities; and
3. Notes the success of the Australian Red Cross' partnership with the Multicultural Centre for Women's Health in delivering the Health in My Language program to support bilingual health education for vulnerable women from culturally and linguistically diverse communities in South Australia.

(Continued from 16 November 2022.)

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (17:22): I rise to support the motion introduced by the Hon. Jing Lee, which recognises the significant contributions made by the Australian Red Cross to the South Australian community. One of the first meetings I had when I was elected to this house was with the South Australian branch of the Red Cross. I had the privilege of touring the Red Cross offices here and meeting with their South Australian director, Jai O'Toole.

The thing that he said that stuck with me is that everyone knows the Red Cross for bloods and floods, but there is actually so much more that they do. I must admit that before I met with them I, too, was under the misapprehension that the scope of their work was quite narrow. What surprised and impressed me the most was the sheer breadth of work not related to bloods and floods that the Red Cross undertakes in South Australia.

During the pandemic and with COVID, the Red Cross had a significant part to play. In response to the pandemic in Australia, the Red Cross significantly expanded their remit to include assisting at COVID testing clinics by providing over 18,000 care packages to people waiting for COVID tests. They provided community support and translation services to vulnerable people and delivered over 60,000 wellbeing calls to South Australians in mandatory self-isolation or quarantine.

They delivered food and hygiene items and health information to young people experiencing homelessness, and they provided emergency relief funds and helped with complex casework, food parcel delivery and service referrals to 131,000 migrants and CALD communities. They also had a big role in disseminating daily community health and hygiene information to refugee and asylum seeker communities in 18 different languages.

Importantly, during the pandemic the Australian Red Cross also partnered with the Multicultural Centre for Women's Health to deliver a bilingual health education program to South Australians. These health education sessions, which were conducted in over 20 languages and dialects to migrant and refugee communities, were critical in helping our culturally and linguistically diverse communities feel more confident in understanding vaccine information in a supportive environment, leading to a greater uptake of COVID-19 vaccinations within these communities. I have no doubt that the valuable work of the Red Cross greatly assisted a number of people during the COVID-19 pandemic.

One of the other roles that the Red Cross is involved in is community justice. The Red Cross has committed to reducing the over-representation of vulnerable people in the criminal justice system in South Australia. They run some amazing targeted support programs such as community-based health first aid, Sisters Alongside Sisters, the prison transport program, and Working it Out to Step Out.

The Red Cross is working to reduce recidivism, help people in custody better manage their safety, health and wellbeing, increase the connection between at-risk people, their families and the broader community, and help at-risk individuals gain improved opportunities and greater resilience

and access to positive social connections. These fantastic programs, which are conducted across metropolitan, rural and regional South Australia, work to increase the safety of individuals and the community as a whole.

The Red Cross is also involved in a number of community programs. Some of the community programs in South Australia are designed to support older people to be more independent and to improve their social and emotional wellbeing. Over one in four adults, or 4.5 million Australians, say that they experience social isolation. Many of these people are older and vulnerable. Sadly, it is widely understood that older people who experience isolation and disconnection are more likely to experience negative health and wellbeing outcomes.

The Red Cross in South Australia are working to assist our older committee members by conducting a Telecross program which provides older people with a daily phone call to check on their wellbeing. This program is run every day of the year, and in 2021 over 200,000 Telecross phone calls were made to South Australian participants.

The Red Cross is also assisting with transport through the transport support program which provides a door-to-door service for members of the community who have difficulties getting to their non-urgent medical or social appointments. This service is available across metropolitan, rural and regional South Australia, and in 2021 a team of over 300 dedicated volunteer drivers made 28,000 trips to support older South Australians.

In the past decade, the number of people displaced from their homes worldwide has almost doubled from 41 million to 79.5 million. The Australian Red Cross has been working with recently arrived immigrants for over 30 years, including people seeking asylum, refugees, people in detention or separated from family, those on temporary visas and people experiencing or at risk of modern-day slavery. In South Australia in 2021 the Red Cross provided 10,401 individuals with food relief, made 4,625 payments through their COVID response program, reached 3,677 participants through community conversations, and supported over 100 individuals in gaining employment and employment-related roles.

One of the amazing things about the Red Cross is that so much of their work is done by volunteers. The Red Cross is supported by over 100 million volunteers worldwide who are guided by the organisation's fundamental principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality, independence, voluntary service, unity and universality.

The Red Cross encourages diversity in their volunteer network, including people of varying ages, cultural backgrounds, and many people who speak different languages, have different skills and are differently abled. I was able to meet a number of these people while I was visiting the Red Cross, and I put on the record my appreciation for every one of them who commits their time to helping other members of the community.

I would certainly encourage anyone who is looking to volunteer their time to help their local community by considering working with the Red Cross to assist them with their valuable programs. I commend the Red Cross and in particular the South Australian Red Cross for the wide-ranging work they do supporting our community, and I thank the honourable member for introducing this motion.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:29): The motion brought to us by the Hon. Jing Lee provides an opportunity for this chamber to acknowledge the valuable work of the Australian Red Cross for more than 100 years. Indeed, I first met with representatives from the Red Cross in July and heard about the many programs that are being run to support communities, and many of these have been outlined by my colleague the Hon. Reggie Martin. The Red Cross have been a lifeline for marginal communities for many years, with their programs covering the justice system, First Nations' support, migrant support and, particularly relevant at the moment, disaster response.

This year, the Red Cross celebrated 50 years of providing their telecross program. This service makes daily wellbeing calls to people who are older, who have a disability or are housebound or are recovering from an accident or illness. These calls are also made during heatwaves and during other extreme weather events. I want to commend the honourable member for bringing this motion to the chamber and indicate that, of course, the Greens will be supporting it.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:30): Can I just express, wholeheartedly, my thanks to the Hon. Reggie Martin and also the Hon. Robert Simms for their most heartfelt contributions to this motion, and I thank all honourable members for supporting this motion to have a successful passage.

Motion carried.

VARIETY, THE CHILDREN'S CHARITY

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:31): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that Variety, The Children's Charity SA, has been supporting children who are sick, disadvantaged, or living with disability in South Australia for almost 40 years;
2. Acknowledges the significant positive impact that Variety SA has made in the lives of South Australian children through providing grants, scholarships, gifts, activities and equipment to support kids in need and their families; and
3. Acknowledges that the generosity of Variety's donors, partners, and volunteers helped support more than 29,000 South Australian children in 2020-21.

It is a great honour to rise today to move the motion standing in my name. It is a great opportunity today to recognise the incredible contributions of Variety, The Children's Charity South Australia make towards supporting children who are sick, disadvantaged and living with disability in our state. For almost 40 years, Variety has been supporting South Australian children to follow their dreams and achieve their goals no matter what their ability and no matter what life throws at them.

The Variety Children's Charity was first founded in 1928 in Pittsburgh, United States. It was a heartbreaking story that sparked a movement to support disadvantaged children around the world. On Christmas Eve 1927, 11 theatre owners and showmen who were part of the social group called the Variety Club found a baby girl who had been left abandoned at the Sheridan Square Film Theatre with a note that read:

Please take care of my baby. Her name is Catherine. I can no longer take care of her. I have eight others. My husband is out of work. She was born on Thanksgiving Day. I have always heard of the goodness of showbusiness people and pray to God that you will look after her. Signed, a heartbroken mother.

Despite searching extensively, the mother was never found and the club members named the baby Catherine Variety Sheridan, paying for her upbringing and education. Inspired by Catherine's story and the media attention gained during their search, the club was inundated with donations and offers for help—far more than they needed to look after one child. Recognising that the issues Catherine's family faced were not unique, the Variety Club assisted other disadvantaged children and the charity was officially formed in 1928.

Variety Australia was founded in Sydney in 1975 and between 1980 and 1988 regional committees were founded in each of Australia's mainland capital cities. Today, Variety the Children's Charity has a network of 40 offices in 11 countries, supporting millions of children around the world through the generosity of Variety's donors, sponsors and supporters.

As a tribute to the show business origins of Variety, offices are still referred to as 'tents' and chairmen are known as 'chief barkers', while the logo features the iconic heart and top hat. Variety SA is known as Tent 75, and despite facing all the challenges of the COVID pandemic it supported over 29,000 children in South Australia in 2020-21. It granted over \$2.8 million to help SA kids in need through 135 grants and positively impacted more than 75,000 children Australia-wide. As shadow minister for communities, I am immensely proud of the positive impact Variety has on our community by providing grants, scholarships, gifts, activities and equipment to support kids in need and their families.

Variety SA also hosts a range of unique experiences for children in need, to bring a smile to their faces and enrich their lives through entertainment and educational experiences. Variety Kids' Experiences offer children an opportunity to be part of activities and events that they otherwise would not be able to experience, due to disability or financial hardship.

I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge and thank the Variety SA board for giving their time, skills, expertise and dedication to supporting this incredible charity. A special thank you to chief barker (aka chair), Tanya Stratton, and board member Rob Kerin, former Premier of South Australia, along with all the other board members and ambassadors for their exceptional service.

There are so many ways that South Australians can get involved with Variety, from fundraising to volunteering, to donating their hair to be made into wigs to help kids and teenagers who have lost their hair due to illness or disease. Many honourable members will have heard of the key fundraising initiatives such as the Variety SA Annual Themed Ball, the Variety 4WD Adventure, and the Variety Bash. I have been delighted to support Variety for many years by attending many fundraising events, and was delighted to once again attend the Variety ball in July this year, with the theme of Christmas Wonderland channelling the spirit of Christmas as the season of giving.

I would just like to quickly turn my attention to talk about the Variety Bash. The Variety SA Bash was first held in 1989 and has not changed from its original concept. Vehicles are decorated and driver teams often dress up in themes. You can find Ghostbusters, Smurfs, vikings, Wiggles, and judges all driving alongside each other in fancy dress and fancy cars.

I just want to acknowledge a number of multicultural leaders and friends who have been involved and a big part of Variety Bash, including George Belperio, who is the chair of Variety Bash, Frank Agostino and Mario Romaldi. They are all involved in the Bash. I am also really proud to say that my good friend Danny Caiazza and his family have been involved with the Variety Aussie Muscle Car Run for a number of years, taking great pride in showcasing his dad's AP5 Valiant Regal 1964 and raising money for a great cause. Over the years, Danny and his family and his team have raised over \$73,000 in total for both the Leukaemia Foundation and now Variety. It is such an incredible contribution and achievement.

The other person I would like to highlight is Roz Chow, who is the owner of the House of Chow restaurant. Roz has Car 88, which is called Madagascar. Madagascar is a 1982 Holden Commodore. Roz and her team members Maylene Loo, Lyn Hobbs and Melissa McKenzie dress up as animals that represent the team of Madagascar. Roz is the lioness. Her husband often jokes and says that she should be the dragon—not calling her a dragon lady, that is not very polite—but she is really quite a fantastic, dynamic woman who fits being a lioness as well as a dragon, I think. In 2022, Car 88 under the leadership of Roz Chow has raised over \$92,000 for Variety. It is the third highest fundraising team among all the participating cars. In total, Car 88 has actually raised more than \$2 million over the years since her involvement and is showing no signs of slowing down.

It is really a great privilege to have supported Variety over the years. I want to express my thanks to all the teams, the generous sponsors, donors and supporters for their exceptionally generous contributions to support such an amazing cause. Congratulations once again for making a difference in the lives of kids and families who are facing many, many challenges in their lives. All kids deserve a fair go, and I encourage all honourable members to support Variety, The Children's Charity SA and their great work. I commend the motion to the chamber.

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

AUSTRALIAN SOCCER

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. F. Pangallo:

That this council—

1. Congratulates Australia's men's football team, also known as the Socceroos, on qualifying for the sixth time for FIFA's World Cup tournament to be staged in Qatar from 21 November to 18 December 2022;
2. Acknowledges the contributions made to the team and to the code in Australia by their coach, Graham Arnold; his assistants; and the sport governing body, the Football Federation of Australia;
3. Wishes Australia success in their group D matches against France, Denmark and Tunisia;

4. Extends its appreciation and congratulates the emirate of Qatar and the organising committee for FIFA Qatar 2022 in staging the iconic four-yearly global event, and held in a Middle Eastern country for the first time; and
5. Notes that the FIFA Women's World Cup will be jointly staged for the first time in Australian cities, including Adelaide; in regions; and in New Zealand from 20 July to 20 August 2023.

(Continued from 28 September 2022.)

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (17:40): I rise to make a rather lengthy contribution on the motion of the Hon. Mr Pangallo. I see the look of dismay on your face, Acting President. Can I just remind you that in fact it will be lengthy in comparison to my normal contributions, but it will be very short in comparison to the Hon. Mr Pangallo's normal contributions. I indicate that I will be moving an amendment to the Hon. Mr Pangallo's motion.

At the outset, I would like to thank the Hon. Mr Pangallo for engaging with honourable members on the content of the motion. I had a discussion with him, and I know that other honourable members have as well, about some of the phrasing in his original proposition. I explained to the Hon. Mr Pangallo how some of us could find parts of his motion troubling and indeed offensive. I think the Hon. Mr Pangallo was quite surprised by that, but he engaged with a willingness to talk about the issue and was incredibly empathetic to the views that I expressed, at least, and I am sure to other members. So I want to thank the Hon. Mr Pangallo for doing that and for coming to a compromise position so that we can all support this motion today. With that, I move to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out paragraph 3 and insert new paragraph 3 as follows:

3. Congratulates the Socceroos on achieving a win over Tunisia and sitting second in group D as of 28 November 2022 and wishes Australia success in their match against Denmark;

In paragraph 4:

Leave out 'Extends its appreciation and congratulates the emirate of' and insert 'Recognises'

In paragraph 5, after '20 August 2023' insert:

'and recognises the state government's support for the local Women's World Cup activities, including funding for facilities upgrades and the establishment of a legacy program to ensure future South Australians are able to benefit from this historic event and to promote lasting change around gender equality and eradicating violence against women.'

I will make a few remarks, brief by the Hon. Mr Pangallo's standards but more lengthy by mine. The motion we are discussing today is the ongoing FIFA 2022 Men's World Cup, hosted in Qatar. Qatar in 2010 made the winning bid to hold the 2022 FIFA World Cup and is hosting it, as I said. They won the right to host the World Cup despite not meeting FIFA's parameters, I am advised.

They did not have the required infrastructure, they did not have a tradition of football or a large population to spread it to, and it was much too hot to host the cup at its usual time of year. Qatar was shown not to be a suitable host, according to the FIFA host country parameters, and was technically a much less viable candidate than the runner-up, the USA. So FIFA must have made a decision to ignore its own parameters and make the selection of Qatar, and I am at a loss to really understand why. Nonetheless, that is the situation we face and that is where the World Cup is being held.

The main points that I raise about this issue are basically because of the human rights record of Qatar. I base some of my concerns on a document called Human Rights Guide for Reporters: 2022 FIFA World Cup in Qatar, a report produced, as I said, by Human Rights Watch. It is basically a guide for journalists. I seek leave to table that document.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: In particular, I want to focus on three main areas: migrant workers, whose lives were unfortunately treated, I believe, as expendable; the issue of queer people in Qatar—it is illegal to be homosexual in Qatar; and the rights of women, who are treated as what I think can only be described as second-class citizens. These are the three most widely cited abuses, certainly in the report that I have just tabled.

To the frustration, probably, of FIFA and also Qatar, these are issues that have been firmly linked to the World Cup reporting. Considering that Qatar has none of the required infrastructure to hold a global event, the small nation has relied on a huge number of migrant workers to complete the gargantuan project list that they have undertaken. They have built seven new stadiums and fully rehabilitated an eighth, and they also built an entire city, complete with residential buildings, hotels and a subway system to support the event.

Qatar has reportedly spent \$220 billion on this infrastructure, but the eye-watering amount of money spent on infrastructure has not gone into the pockets of the migrant workers building it. I understand that migrant workers themselves report that their earnings amount to about \$1 per hour. There is a culture of abuse against migrant workers, which is prevalent and acknowledged in Qatar; it is called the kafala system of sponsorship-based employment, which legally binds foreign workers to their employers, trapping them in a cycle of abuse.

These workers are expected to work in up to 45° weather for 10 hours a day. Fatalities from heat stress are very common. There are estimates suggesting that 6,500 migrant workers have died due to the conditions they have faced whilst they work on these projects. Qatar only recognises 37 deaths, I am advised, as directly connected to the construction of the World Cup projects, saying that the rest were due to non-related causes, but those non-related causes that Qatar officially attributes to these other deaths include heart attacks and respiratory failure, symptoms that are very typical of heatstroke induced by heavy labour in extreme heat—the common working conditions which these labourers have been facing.

This number not only displays the Qatari government's clear disregard, I believe, for the lives they have taken but the willingness to severely obfuscate the number of deaths to hide their corrupt and exploitative treatment of workers. After significant pressure the Qatari government has introduced reforms, I understand, to improve the working conditions for migrant workers, but I am also advised—again relying on this report that I have tabled—there has been very little enforcement, which has allowed the abuse to continue largely unchecked. And this is just one form of human rights abuses that we have raised surrounding the World Cup.

Perhaps the most widely discussed human rights abuses are Qatar's archaic laws on sexuality and gender identity. Being gay, as I said earlier, is currently illegal in Qatar. The punishment for this uncontrollable aspect of our humanity ranges from three years to 10 years' imprisonment, and even death, through the Sharia court system. Qatar is one of just 10 countries around the world that still holds the power to enforce the death penalty for people who choose to love in ways that the Qatari officials do not support.

Queer people can be punished, as I said, for up to 10 years' imprisonment, seven years under the Penal Code of 2004, and under Sharia law gay men in Qatar can be sentenced to imprisonment, flogging and death. For years, queer people have reported being targeted and arbitrarily imprisoned by the notorious Preventive Security Department. Arrests have reportedly occurred in public with no apparent offence having taken place. People are detained without charge and subjected to verbal, physical and sexual abuse. Before they are released—if they are released—they are forced to sign pledges stating they will cease immoral activity.

These arbitrary detentions and this state-sanctioned abuse is imposed under Law No. 17 of the 2002 Protection of Community laws. Human rights abuses against queer people are essentially codified in Qatari law. This law allows authorities to detain individuals on the basis of a well-founded belief they committed crimes involving state security, honour, decency or public morals. In other words, you can be arrested in Qatar for being queer.

Queer people are not the only group to be victims of archaic and harsh treatment by the Qatari government. Women are by all measures treated as second-class citizens. Under a male guardianship system, Qatari women need permission from a male relative to marry, study abroad, work in government jobs and travel abroad. Women must have a marriage licence before they are able to receive some forms of reproductive health care, including Pap smears, transvaginal ultrasounds and womb biopsies.

This year, the World Cup will be hosted in a country where women's health care is dependent on their marital status, with no legal right to make decisions free from interference from men and

religious codes. Despite this affront to human rights, FIFA selected Qatar as the host of the 2022 Men's World Cup event, knowing that many fans will face difficult and unfair decisions about their safety if they decide to travel.

There are soccer tragics who are queer and who would want to go and support their team in Qatar, but they are essentially, if they choose to do that, taking their life in their hands. I find FIFA's decision quite disappointing, but it is consistent with some of their past decision-making. In an unusual move, FIFA announced the host countries of the 2018 and 2022 World Cups at the same time. The 2022 winner, of course, was Qatar but the 2018 winner was Russia.

Russia has a comparably shameful approach to queer people and women, with both groups subjected to routine persecution, violence and infringements of their civil liberties. Both Qatar and Russia are countries with abysmal human rights records but very deep pockets. I suppose there is some kind of moral symmetry there in FIFA's decision-making. In making this decision to host the World Cup in Qatar and Russia, this has implicitly endorsed, I believe, the shameful human rights records of both countries. FIFA has done nothing at all to change the human rights records or the laws in Russia and is doing nothing about changing the laws in Qatar.

Athletes around the world are banding together to express their disgust with FIFA's decision to award Qatar the event and, similarly, the Qatari government's response to human rights abuses. South Australia's own Josh Cavallo has expressed fears for his safety were he to be invited to participate in the World Cup. Josh, members may recall, made history late last year when he publicly came out as a gay man, becoming at the time Australia's only openly gay active A-league footballer. He has stated that the handling of the 2022 cup by FIFA has shown that 'football isn't a place for everyone'.

Australia's own athletes participating in the cup, the Socceroos, have released a video and an open letter criticising the treatment of queer people in Qatar and requesting better conditions for migrant workers. In their video they state:

We have learned that the decision to host the World Cup in Qatar has resulted in the suffering and in the harm of countless of our fellow workers. As players we fully support the rights of LGBTI+ people. But in Qatar people are not free to love the person that they choose.

The Socceroos have joined calls for establishing a migrant resource centre, effective remedy for these who have been denied their rights and the decriminalisation of all same-sex relationships. These are the basic rights that should be afforded to all and will ensure continued progress in Qatar.

Many international teams have used various acts to make statements on the field about the issues in Qatar. Seven teams have planned to have their captains wear a rainbow 'one love' armband as a show of solidarity with their queer fans. However, this was abandoned when FIFA threatened to issue yellow cards or one-match bans if the armbands were worn.

Not only has FIFA barred players from wearing the armband, rainbows of any kind have drawn the attention of Qatari security forces. Many spectators, I am advised, wearing rainbow paraphernalia have reportedly been detained and denied entry to the facilities until they remove their rainbow clothing and accessories. One journalist was detained, he says, for at least 25 minutes and only allowed to leave when he took off his rainbow T-shirt.

FIFA has hurriedly instructed Qatari authorities, I am advised, that fans are permitted to wear rainbow items of clothing, have tried to reassure fans they will not be detained or have their items confiscated, but to no great effect. This event has been a debacle, and a deeply problematic one, from the very start. Whether it is the blatantly corrupt awarding of the hosting rights—and I understand some nations now are considering actually withdrawing from FIFA, some Nordic countries, because of this—fans being accosted for wearing rainbows or T-shirts with rainbows on them or players being given yellow cards for wearing an armband are the threats that have been made.

We cannot ignore the thousands of migrant workers dying to build stadiums and infrastructure. The women and the queer people, who will all have to continue in Qatar, where their rights are being suppressed when everybody else has left the stadiums and have gone home, will still be oppressed by these laws which make it illegal to be queer and subject to the death penalty.

FIFA must understand the importance of the role of sport on the international stage. It is not new—it has been going on since the All Blacks and South Africa, going back many years. I can remember having those debates inside the Labor Party, where I was advocating to stop flights by Qantas to South Africa. This is a long time that sport and politics have been in the mix, and I am so pleased to see now that athletes are finding their own voices and standing up to their teams and nations and countries like Qatar and saying that this is not on.

Alongside these athletes, I would like to add my voice to the call for FIFA to take seriously its role on the world stage. In its pursuit of profit, FIFA has become complicit in oppressing Qatar's migrant workers, women and the queer community in particular. No longer can we ignore human rights abuses during global events like the FIFA World Cup.

I welcome the focus on these failings in much of the reporting that is going on at the moment. I commend the amendment to the chamber. Again, I would like to thank the Hon. Mr Pangallo for his willingness to engage and the empathy with which he has done so.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:54): In starting, I really want to commend the Hon. Mr Hunter for the speech he has given and also recognise his decades of service as an advocate and a campaigner in the space of LGBTI rights and human rights more broadly.

I want to take this opportunity to condemn the decision of FIFA to hold the World Cup in a country that has a reputation as a human rights abuser. The human rights record of Qatar is well documented, and the Hon. Mr Hunter has detailed that history of abuse. Qatar has a history of abusing LGBTI people, women and workers. Indeed, *The Guardian* has reported that up to 6,500 South Asian migrant workers have died in connection with building infrastructure for the World Cup.

In its human rights report on the country in 2021, Amnesty International reported, and I quote from the report that is on their website:

Women continued to face discrimination in law and practice. Under the guardianship system, women remained tied to their male guardian, usually their father, brother, grandfather or uncle, or for married women, to their husband. Women continued to need their guardian's permission for key life decisions to marry, study abroad...work in many government jobs, travel abroad...and receive some forms of reproductive healthcare.

Family laws continued to discriminate against women by making it difficult for them to divorce. Divorced women are unable to act as their children's guardian.

This is in Qatar in 2022. The Human Dignity Trust provides information on the human rights abuses of LGBTI people in Qatar. It states, and again I quote from their website:

Qatar criminalises same-sex sexual activity between men and between women. Sentences can involve a possible maximum penalty of death by stoning.

Same-sex sexual activity is prohibited under the Penal Code 2004, which criminalises acts of 'sodomy' and 'sexual intercourse' between people of the same sex...Both men and women are criminalised under this law.

The Human Dignity Trust goes on to note:

The Constitution of Qatar designates Islam as the state religion, and Islamic law as the main source of legislation. As such, in addition to the Penal Code, Qatar operates an interpretation of Sharia law which criminalises sexual activity between men, under which it is possible that the death penalty can be imposed.

I know that the government of Qatar has argued that these things are not used in practice. Well, we know that is not the case because Human Rights Watch has reported on what has been occurring in Qatar as recently as October. Indeed, Human Rights Watch has revealed that the government of Qatar even goes as far as to monitor people's social media, their online activity, their behaviour on dating apps. They use this as a way to track and monitor LGBTI people, in particular gay men. It is reprehensible.

On 25 October, Reuters reported Human Rights Watch's concerns for the welfare of LGBTI Qataris in the lead-up to the World Cup. I quote from their article:

The organisation—

that is, Human Rights Watch—

said it had interviewed six LGBT Qataris, including four transgender women, one bisexual woman and one gay man, who reported being detained between 2019 and 2022 and subjected to verbal and physical abuse, including kicking and punching.

They were detained without charge in an underground prison in Doha, and one individual was held for two months in solitary confinement—two months. 'All six said that police had forced them to sign pledges indicating that they would cease immoral activity,' the article said, adding that transgender women detainees were mandated to attend conversion therapy sessions at government-sponsored clinics.

One of the transgender Qatari women interviewed by Human Rights Watch told Reuters on condition of anonymity that she was arrested several times, most recently this summer when she was held for weeks on end. Authorities stopped her due to her appearance or for possessing make-up, the woman said, adding that she had been beaten to the point of bleeding and was forced to have her head shaved—this shameful human rights abuse happening in Qatar in 2022.

Recently, Qatar's World Cup ambassador Khalid Salman referred to homosexuality as 'damage to the mind'. This is the view of Qatar's World Cup ambassador. It is hardly surprising, then, that LGBTI sportspeople around the world have spoken out against Qatar holding this event. SA's own out soccer player, Joshua Cavallo, whom the Hon. Ian Hunter and I have had the opportunity to meet with, has been outspoken in his critique. I certainly, like the Hon. Mr Hunter, support his comments.

As one of two out and proud gay men in this place, I want to add my voice to those opposing Qatar hosting the World Cup. I am appalled that LGBTI soccer players and fans are being put in this situation where their human rights are potentially at risk. I am appalled that a country with such an appalling, despicable human rights record is being given the honour of hosting this event and being given the opportunity for a social licence that comes with hosting an event of this nature.

I am appalled that so many workers have died, had their very basic human rights trampled, in an effort to host this event and to make money. Money has literally been made off the backs of some of the world's most desperate and vulnerable people. Surely, we have reached a point where the international community and international organisations like FIFA have to show some moral leadership.

We cannot simply turn our backs on these people. We cannot continue to condone what is despicable human rights abuse. I really do hope that FIFA reflect on their appalling lack of leadership. I hope that they reflect on what has been a despicable moral failure on their part and that they change their policies and processes to ensure that this kind of sportswashing is never allowed to happen again because it is truly despicable.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (18:02): I rise today as the lead speaker for the opposition on the motion of the Hon. Frank Pangallo and note the opposition's support for the amended motion. The FIFA World Cup is an iconic event and perhaps the biggest sporting event outside the Olympics given the global audience it attracts, with soccer a truly global sport.

The success of the Socceroos to qualify as one of the only 32 nations is an extraordinary achievement and one that deserves the dedicated recognition and congratulations of this chamber. We send our collective well wishes to the Australian men's football team ahead of their remaining fixture in the Qatar FIFA World Cup 2022. Tomorrow morning at 1.30am local time, the Socceroos will match up against a highly competitive Danish side in the hope of reaching the knockout stage of the tournament.

The Socceroos have contributed to some of our nation's finest sporting moments, whether it has been at the FIFA World Cup or in the qualification rounds. It only seems like yesterday when Adelaide's own John Aloisi stopped the nation when he stepped up to score a divisive penalty against Uruguay in 2005 to qualify for the World Cup after many years of heartbreak. It almost felt like *deja vu* when Graham Arnold entrusted Andrew Redmayne to write his chapter in our proud sporting history when his penalty shootout heroics guided Australia to this year's World Cup with a win against Peru. These moments epitomise the Australian fighting spirit and the pride in representing Australia on the international stage. Above all, the Socceroos encapsulate and reflect modern Australia.

Soccer is referred to as the world game, and the array of cultural backgrounds within our national team is an exemplary success of Australia's multiculturalism and our diverse migrant history. Our current Socceroos feature a rich tapestry of Bosnian, Croatian, Turkish Cypriot, South African, Scottish and South Sudanese backgrounds, and I could not be prouder to call each and every last member a fellow Australian.

I congratulate the Socceroos for their success in again qualifying for such a prestigious tournament and for breaking their 12-year drought of FIFA World Cup final games when they won last Saturday. Whatever the result against Denmark, we are all incredibly proud of the entire team, players, coaches and support staff, and the heights they have achieved.

I would also like to congratulate and send my best wishes to our fellow South Australians who grew up playing soccer in our state and are now creating history with the Socceroos: Thomas Deng of Adelaide Blue Eagles, Awer Mabil of St Augustines Soccer Club and South Australia's 2023 Young Australian of the Year, Riley McGree of Gawler Eagles Football Club, and Craig Goodwin of Munno Para City and now Adelaide United. Your inclusion in the Socceroos 26-man squad embodies the results of many years of hard work and sacrifice. You are all nothing short of an inspiration to the thousands who dream of wearing the green and gold at the FIFA World Cup, and the whole state is behind you.

Finally, with the 2023 FIFA Women's World Cup to be hosted by Australia and New Zealand for the first time, the upcoming 12 months will be momentous for soccer in this country. Record investment in sporting infrastructure across South Australia by the former Liberal government helped Adelaide secure the Young Matildas training camp in the lead-up to the 2023 FIFA Women's World Cup and helped us attract four group stage fixtures and a round of 16 clash.

We invested more than \$86 million in football facilities and programs across South Australia, including \$53 million for much-needed upgrades to Hindmarsh Stadium and \$24 million in upgrading the State Centre of Football at Gepps Cross. With the FIFA Women's World Cup attracting the best female soccer players and a global television audience of more than one billion people, a lot of eyes will be cast on what our great state is capable of. We wish the Socceroos and the Matildas all the best with their respective tournaments as they chase success.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (18:07): I would like to thank my colleagues, the Hon. Ian Hunter, the Hon. Robert Simms and the Hon. Nicola Centofanti for their contributions. I understand and support the views of the Hon. Ian Hunter and the Hon. Robert Simms on the harsh same-sex laws. Let's hope that we do see meaningful progress and reforms in time, but of course it is a Muslim country.

I am also hearing criticism from members who have not been there, and I have. Qatar and FIFA have already publicly welcomed members of the LGBT+ community to the country. Hassan Al-Thawadi, the eloquent head of the Qatar Supreme Committee for Delivery and Legacy, told broadcaster Piers Morgan only yesterday that Qatar is a safe place for gay people to live. He went on to say that public displays of affection, aside from holding hands, is not in their culture. For instance, touching or shaking hands with a Muslim woman in public is not appropriate. I respect that. He said that they were opposed to the wearing of rainbow armbands by teams because it appeared to specifically target the standards in Qatar.

I am unsure if any members in this chamber have spent some time in Qatar—perhaps the Hon. Laura Curran has; I am sorry, I do not have your new married name.

The Hon. L.A. Curran: I am Curran for probably another month.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Okay, thank you—apart from transiting or getting a proper understanding and perspective of this very young, tiny country that is being misunderstood—

The Hon. R.A. Simms: I would get locked up, Frank.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I will bail you out—and made a pariah by moralising Western media, particularly the English, who strut around with a superiority complex when it comes to football. So that is what I wanted to do—see the place for myself, not just form an opinion based upon the opinions and conscious or unconscious bias of journalists, along with the hate and intolerance that

is being spread on social media platforms. It truly smacks of racism, Islamophobia, and of Orientalism.

Last month, I went to Qatar where I had quite enlightened discussions, including with our ambassador, Jonathan Muir, the local organising committee of the World Cup, Eugene de Jongh, the business partner of South Australian company Peat's, that is doing amazing work in recycling waste that is being embraced by Qatar at the tournament.

I also looked at some of the stunning facilities at the World Cup, the incredible cities of Doha and Lusail, and the modern transport infrastructure that has sprung up because of winning the World Cup bid. I engaged with many local Qataris and foreigners living and working there. You cannot help but be impressed at what they have done and the genuine sense of pride the Qataris feel.

I want to address the hysterical and hypocritical level of criticism, much of it unfair, unbalanced and some mischievously misleading, being made against Qatar, not necessarily by honourable members here, but from countries which still have a lot to explain about their own human rights and labour abuses, as well as their own social flaws, and also correct some comments that have been made here today.

First, though, the purpose of my motion was to acknowledge Australia's performance at the tournament. I thank the Hon. Nicola Centofanti for doing that. In a few hours, as we know, the Socceroos' destiny will be determined when they face Denmark in the final group match. A draw will be sufficient to see the Australians through to round 16, something they have not done since 2006 in Germany which, in fact, I was actually fortunate to experience—against Italy in Kaiserslautern. Although we were beaten, nonetheless it shows that Australia can hold its own against the best in the world. We should be proud of this team and our coach Graham Arnold, who has made enormous personal sacrifices and put in an extraordinary effort to get us on to this global stage for a sixth time.

Arnie bleeds for his country. I saw that as a player and now as a coach and a leader, and Australia is right behind him and the Socceroos. The TV ratings have been huge for SBS. People are tuning into Qatar and not turning off. We have just passed the halfway stage of this World Cup and the football has been outstanding. While a clutch of teams have already booked their passage to the next round, every group is still open. The football is being celebrated by hundreds of thousands of fans who have made the journey. They are also enjoying the warm hospitality of the Qataris, as I did last month.

Just today I got this from Justin Brooks, a person I know who has just returned to Adelaide and who has never been to a World Cup before. He said that he and his son Cameron had the time of their lives being in the country and watching the Socceroos. The atmosphere was so euphoric that he said he did not need an alcoholic beer for the four hours that he was in the stadium. You only need to see the fan cutaways in the TV matches to see that they are all embracing the Arabic culture, like wearing those colourful Arabic-style headscarves. There have been no reports of serious misbehaviour or crime.

Qatar is a conservative Islamic state and we should be respectful of that, just as they would be respectful of our way of life. We live in a secular inclusive democracy but that was not always the case—even until quite recently, in 2017, when the Australian parliament historically passed gay marriage laws. It was illegal to be gay in many places in this country until the late 1970s. It took this nation a long time to enact many social reforms that we celebrate today. We actually had a White Australia policy here.

Qatar is not a secular democracy, it is an emirate, an hereditary monarchy under Sharia law, like many Arabic nations. It is also an emerging nation, barely 50 years in the making. It was once a speck in the desert on the Arabian Gulf dotted with Bedouin tents, and was primarily known for its pearl harvest. It struck riches through oil and gas, and its development has been rapid. There are nearly \$500 billion in its sovereign wealth fund.

Qatar has investments around the world. In Britain, for instance, it owns several landmarks and businesses, including luxury store Harrods, The Shard skyscraper, the Canary Wharf, it owns

The Savoy and the Grosvenor House Hotel, and has a 20 per cent stake in Heathrow Airport, and 40 per cent in Sainsbury's, the second-largest supermarket group.

The British have been the loudest critics of Qatar, yet it has not stopped the likes of Harry Kane, Gary Lineker or Stan Collymore shopping in their stores, staying in their hotels, or flying out of their country on Qatar's national airline to hundreds of destinations. Meanwhile, the Mayor of London has banned advertising travel to Qatar on its public transport systems. There are double standards at play here.

England captain, Harry Kane, had a subtle poke at Qatar's anti same-sex laws by wearing a \$1 million rainbow Rolex as a moral halo in the place of the armband he could not wear. He has probably paid for that. Of course, when this World Cup ends, Harry and the rest of Britain will need stay warm this coming freezing English winter thanks to Britain's heavy reliance on the gulf nation's liquefied gas. The same goes for several other European nations who are at the World Cup, like Germany, as Russian gas has been turned off.

Qatar is the majority owner of the South Hook LNG terminal in Wales and the UK is eager to shore up supplies in a politically uncertain world. With energy security becoming a real challenge, many Asian countries are doing the same because Qatar is seen as friendly to the West. That is why all this virtue signalling and double standards in the relentless attacks by some of history's biggest human rights violators against Qatar needs to be called out.

Go through the list of countries at the World Cup lecturing Qatar and you will find many that have been guilty of far more serious human rights abuses in their history. Let's start in alphabetical order, for instance: A for Argentina. In 1978, when they hosted and won the World Cup, the brutal military junta was kidnapping and murdering thousands of young dissidents. Their bodies were never returned. Their mothers spent decades protesting outside the presidential palace. I saw no sign of the international community voicing their concerns or boycotting that tournament.

A for Australia: human rights abuses and racism against our First Nations people continue. It began with the British. Last Friday night, in a powerful address, the Attorney-General spoke about how they tried to eradicate and exterminate an entire race in colonial times, walking hundreds of Aborigines off cliffs to their deaths or drowning them in tidal pools. That was only 200 or so years ago.

B for Belgium: they had a brutal crackdown on Africans in the Congo. Estimates of up to 10 million died in famine, killings and disease under Belgian rule, which only ended in 1960. C for Croatia, S for Serbia, and the many thousands massacred in their civil war of independence 30 years ago. E for England: they were for centuries the biggest human rights abusers in countries they colonised, including Australia. They were the biggest slave traders, a cruel and abhorrent practice which is still being felt today.

Along with the United States, another country in Qatar, they illegally invaded Iraq under false claims, sparking decades of terror attacks in the West. In the year that England won the World Cup in 1966, being gay was illegal. Last year, when they hosted the European Football Championships, drunk and drug-addled English fans behaved appallingly. When one of their coloured players missed a decisive penalty in the decider against Italy, he and other members in the team were subjected to the most disgraceful racist taunts on social media—by their own.

France: you want to go there? Germany did not want, nor did they get reminding of the Holocaust when they hosted the World Cup in 1974 and again in 2006, along with the Munich Olympics. The Netherlands: colonising South Africa ultimately gave us apartheid. Spain, Portugal, Japan, Iran, Saudi Arabia and Brazil all have questionable histories, recent and past, which have been forgiven or subjected to wilful blindness. The same applies for FIFA member nations Iraq, Israel, Syria, Bahrain, China, and North Korea. Where do you stop?

As for the United States, they will be one of the hosts at the next tournament. Will they be subjected to criticism for their ongoing civil rights abuses, racial profiling by their police, or the gun mentality that has seen thousands of innocent people and school students massacred? What about the abortion debate and the death penalty that still applies in many states? As FIFA boss Gianni

Infantino said, for what Europeans have been doing for 3,000 years around the world, we should be apologising for the next 3,000 before giving moral lessons.

I will admit that my jaw dropped when Qatar won the right to host this World Cup over Australia and the US, Korea and Japan 12 years ago. There was much talk of corruption of FIFA in the bidding process. Qatar was cleared of paying bribes, although in 2015 several FIFA officials were indicted and convicted after being arrested by the FBI for corruption. It led to a clean-out of FIFA, a body that oversees more than 215 member nations. If large nations want to pull out of FIFA, good luck to them. There are plenty more that will take their place.

How could Qatar pull off such a monumental task for such a tiny country barely 40 years old? However, they have managed to do it. Doha is a spectacular metropolis, a modern oasis of impressive buildings, highways, an underground driverless metro system, eight fabulous stadiums, over 100 hotels, the best airport in the world, and the airline judged the best in the world. The people themselves are friendly, gentle, courteous and respectful. They are well-educated, they are proud of their culture and their heritage, and they want to share it with the world.

Qatar's wealth from oil and gas has helped considerably—Mr President, I am nearly winding up—but bear in mind that the country's population is 2.5 million, of which just 350,000 are Qataris. It had to rely on migrant labour, many poorly skilled, from India, Pakistan, Nepal, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka who needed to work there. I just want to fact check one of the most negative comments about Qatar: the 6,500 migrant workers who died since Qatar won the World Cup. Some put it as high as 15,000. However, these figures refer merely to non-Qataris of different nationalities who died in the country between 2010 and 2019 from various causes.

Mr Al-Thawadi says 400 to 500 died on hectic construction sites and other work-related activities between 2014 and 2020. He says three died on actual stadium sites. Two Australian companies are actually the largest construction companies in Qatar. People die on construction sites and in workplaces daily around the world; three died building our new hospital, where working conditions are actually much stricter.

Qatar, like any other country, is not above criticism, but at least the Qataris have learned much from it. The scrutiny applied has led to significant labour reform laws and workers' welfare and health care, including the abolition of the kafala system of restrictive contract employment in 2021. They now pay minimum wages. Qatar is a benchmark for workers' welfare in the region and now produces annual welfare progress reports. I have one right here, and I will seek to table that. This comes out every year now. They have been pushed to do that, and they have done it quite freely. In closing, I do want to give them some credit.

The PRESIDENT: Do you wish to table that document?

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Yes, I seek leave to table the document.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Few want to give them any credit for the rapid progress they are making and will continue to make, but they are a beacon in the region compared with regimes in Saudi Arabia. This government here has just done a deal with LIV for the golf. I have no objection to that, but the Saudi Arabians, seriously, are amongst the worst abusers there—Bahrain, Iran, Iraq, Syria, Israel. Did these same critics point the virtuous finger at China or Russia when they hosted the Olympics and a World Cup in 2018? I witnessed atrocious human rights violations when I covered the 2010 World Cup in South Africa. There was no real scrutiny of China's human rights record when I was at the Beijing Olympics.

What about the good that Qatar is doing in the world? Its philanthropy has educated 12 million underprivileged children and there are other global welfare programs it is assisting. The US and the UK have airbases there. During the pandemic, Qatar Airlines was the one airline that did not cease operating. It flew 100,000 Australians stranded overseas back home, outdoing the home-grown airline Qantas. It will fly into Adelaide daily from January.

The lesson for us is: let's stick to the joyous pleasures of football competition between nations and leave politics and religion behind. This attitude is typified by France's goalkeeper, Hugo Lloris, who commented why he chose not to wear the rainbow armband:

In France, when we welcome foreigners, we often want them to play by our rules and respect our culture and I will do the same when I go to Qatar.

Some final words from recently returned fan Justin Brooks:

Best experience of my life—to be part of a city which welcomed 32 different nations all at once.

I didn't miss having a beer...No one was drinking in the stadiums or on the streets but there were plenty of options elsewhere.

The Qataris were warm and welcoming. They reminded me of Fijians—just beautiful people. They knew they were hosting a world event, they knew they were on stage, and they were proud to show their country to the world. All I saw was peace, harmony, and inclusiveness.

I commend and congratulate Qatar and the progressive paths they are now taking. There was pressure put on them and they have responded to that. Let's hope it continues. I am particularly looking forward to the Women's World Cup coming to Australia next August where I hope our way of life will be celebrated and also respected.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

ANIMAL WELFARE

Orders of the Day, Private Business, No. 51: Hon. T.A. Franks to move:

That she have leave to introduce a bill for an act to amend the Animal Welfare Act 1985 and the Dog and Cat Management Act 1995.

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

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; order of the day discharged.

Bills

AUTOMATED EXTERNAL DEFIBRILLATORS (PUBLIC ACCESS) BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the bill without any amendment.

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (MONITORING ORDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the bill without any amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) (NO 3) BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the bill without any amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (STEALTHING AND CONSENT) BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 18:31 the council adjourned until Thursday 1 December 2022 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***BAROSSA NEW WATER PROJECT**

165 The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (19 October 2022). Can the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water advise, regarding the Barossa New Water project—

1. Is this project, to secure more water for productivity growth in the Barossa region and increase economic benefits to the state more widely, as high a priority for the Labor government as it was to the previous Liberal government?
2. Can you please provide an update on the progress of this project?
3. Who is the agency ultimately responsible for this project?
4. Is Barossa Irrigation Limited still closely involved in the project?
5. What short, and medium, term options for securing water into the region are being explored?
6. What capital and operating grants and other funding options are being/have been explored?
7. How are the key stakeholders the Barossa community being kept informed of this project?
8. How does this project relate to the work being done to improve water security in the Clare Valley region?
9. It is understood the final report has been finalised. When is the final report expected to be made public for this project?
10. How long after this report is government expected to decide?
11. Will this report be made public?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development has advised:

The new water infrastructure to the Barossa project, or Barossa New Water project, is the development of a detailed business case to explore options to deliver new, secure, climate-independent and affordable water. The development of the detailed business case is funded under the commonwealth government's National Water Grid Fund.

The detailed business case has included engagement with relevant stakeholders including Barossa Infrastructure Limited. Stakeholders are being kept informed through their representative bodies and regional presentations.

The Barossa New Water Project is independent of the investigations underway to improve water security in the Clare Valley region.

Once a final business case is received, it will be considered by government.

FORESTRYSA

168 The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (1 November 2022). Can the minister advise:

1. What was the total number of applications for the tender to supply harvesting and transport services—ForestrySA—Mount Lofty Ranges—start date 1 July 2022?
2. How many applications were received from South Australian companies?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I am advised:

ForestrySA's tender to supply timber harvesting and transport services in the Mount Lofty Ranges—start date 1 July 2022, attracted a total of six (6) applications.

Five (5) out of the six (6) applications were received from South Australian companies.

BOW AND CROSSBOW HUNTING

169 The Hon. S.L. GAME (2 November 2022). Can the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water advise:

1. Why is there now a need to ban bow hunting, after the Social Development Committee's report on its inquiry into issues related to bow and crossbow hunting in South Australia did not recommend a ban?
2. What evidence stipulates that poisoning is a more humane method of culling feral animals than hunting?

3. What consideration has been given to hunting as a means to address protein intake during our cost-of-living crisis?
4. Where is the evidence that banning bow hunting was a pre-election promise from the Malinauskas government?
5. What compensation plans have been arranged if bow hunting is banned to compensate businesses and hunters, having rendered their stock and equipment useless?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Minister for Climate, Environment and Water has advised:

The Labor Party has had a longstanding commitment to ban hunting with bows and crossbows since before the 2018 election. This commitment has been published in letters to the Animal Justice Party and in response to a survey by South Aussies for Animals Inc.

Advice from PIRSA provided to the Social Development Committee's inquiry into issues related to bow and crossbow hunting in South Australia is clear that biological control, poison baiting and trapping are typically more effective methods for killing pest animals than bow hunting. Where baiting or trapping cannot be applied, use of appropriate firearms (i.e. guns) in ground or aerial culling programs is preferred.

This ban will not limit hunting with guns which will remain a legal means of obtaining meat where allowed for by the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 and other relevant legislation.

As it is only the act of hunting animals, specifically birds and mammals, with bow or crossbow in South Australia that will be banned, there is currently no plan to compensate business or hunters. Bow hunting equipment will not be rendered useless as this ban will not limit the use or ownership of bows or crossbows for purposes not involving the killing of birds or mammals. For example, owners will still be able to use their archery equipment for target archery or bow hunting in other jurisdictions where it remains legal.

The Department for Environment and Water will be undertaking consultation to inform the implementation of the ban.

PORT LINCOLN HOSPITAL SECURITY

In reply to **the Hon. S.L. GAME** (6 September 2022).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

We have been aware of security incidents at Port Lincoln Hospital for several years, and during the election campaign we committed to a security review of the hospital.

A comprehensive review of security risks and arrangements will be conducted and to ensure exceptional quality, will be overseen by a committee, led by an independent chair, and made up of a broad membership, including health, clinical, consumer, cultural and union representatives, with the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation among them.

The first formal meeting on the security review was undertaken on 24 October.

In the meantime, following approval by the Eyre and Far North Local Health Network governing board, I am pleased to confirm that security guards have been stationed to provide 24/7 coverage at the hospital, which commenced 10 October.

BARNGARLA PEOPLE, LITIGATION

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (27 September 2022).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): I have been advised:

The proceedings referred to were both initiated by the Barngarla, and the state incurred legal costs defending or negotiating outcomes in them.

The work on the Port Augusta matter for the state was carried out by the native title team of the Crown Solicitor's Office as part of their standard work in a jurisdiction where costs orders are not usually made. That work has not been costed.

The work in the Lake Torrens Kelaray matter was undertaken during the term of the previous government and the state's costs were approximately \$150,000, including counsel. The state has agreed with the Barngarla, subject to the outcome of the appeal now brought by Kelaray, its liability under costs orders in the matter for payment of Barngarla's legal costs.

The state of South Australia has determined not to intervene in the Barngarla's constitutional challenge against the commonwealth in respect of the nuclear waste facility. This was informed by advice from the Solicitor-General.

South Australian Labor has long had a position that the Barnjarla people should have a right of veto over the nuclear waste facility proposed to be built on their land. Given that this is a commonwealth project, it is ultimately a matter for the commonwealth to determine.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

In reply to **the Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition)** (27 September 2022).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

The Malinauskas Labor government has made it clear that our number one priority is addressing the ramping crisis we inherited from the Liberals.

We are delivering a generational investment of billion to rebuild the health system, following four years of neglect under the previous government.

We have committed a record \$2.4 billion to open more than 550 additional beds, recruit more doctors and nurses and ambos and build and upgrade key infrastructure across the state to provide the capacity our healthcare system needs.

While these investments will take time to deliver, we aren't wasting any time in meeting this challenge head on.

We have opened every bed possible to take pressure off our hospitals and free up emergency departments, and increased initiatives like the Virtual Care Service to reduce bed block and improve patient flow.

SACRED MOUND SPRINGS

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (28 September 2022).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Minister for Energy and Mining has advised:

Section 9 of the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Act 1982 applies the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1979 to BHP's Olympic Dam operations in the Olympic Dam area or the Stuart Shelf area.

The Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988 applies for the mound springs located outside of the defined Stuart Shelf area, such as those surrounding Lake Eyre/Kati Thanda.

BHP has confirmed it would like to transition Aboriginal cultural protection management from the 1979 Aboriginal Heritage Act to the 1988 Aboriginal Heritage Act for Olympic Dam activities within the Stuart Shelf Area and Olympic Dam area.

The government looks forward to engaging with BHP on how to best achieve this for the future.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

In reply to **the Hon. C. BONAROS** (28 September 2022).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

1. The new Women's and Children's Hospital (WCH) is being designed to provide the required infrastructure to support future provision of cardiac surgery as part of our commitment to building a world-class hospital that will meet the needs of children in the long-term.

2. The cardiology department at the WCH currently operates a well-established cardiac unit providing a statewide service for the assessment and management of children affected by heart disease. This is a dedicated specialist unit providing inpatient and outpatient services, including intensive care, and comprehensive non-invasive and invasive cardiac investigations. An important aspect of management of some childhood heart disease is highly specialised paediatric cardiac surgery. Paediatric heart surgery for South Australian children continues to be undertaken in partnership with the Royal Children's Hospital, Melbourne and Westmead Children's Hospital, Sydney.

3. South Australian babies and children will always have access to the health services they need. An ECLS (extracorporeal life support) initiation service has now been implemented at the WCH.

4. Steps to determine the future of the existing WCH site will be managed by Renewal SA.

DATA PROTECTION

In reply to **the Hon. R.A. SIMMS** (19 October 2022).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs has advised:

Consumer and Business Services (CBS) is responsible for the administration of the Residential Tenancies Act 1995 (RTA).

The RTA regulates residential tenancy databases, often referred to as tenant blacklists. Sections 99J and 99K of the RTA limit how database operators can store and distribute the personal information of renters.

The national privacy principles, as stated in schedule 3 of the Privacy Act 1988 of the commonwealth, also limit how organisations store, use, and disclose personal data. These principles can apply to how database operators and other organisations treat the personal data of renters.

The Malinauskas government has committed to a review of the RTA. The review will consider restricting the amount of personal information that can be requested from prospective tenants applying for a rental property and will consider regulating the circumstances in which this data can be retained.

COASTAL SAND EROSION

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (19 October 2022).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): I have been advised:

The Minister for Climate, Environment and Water has declared a conflict of interest in respect of all matters associated with the Adelaide beach management review. The Premier has therefore appointed me as the responsible minister for this project.

Other aspects of coast management remain a matter for the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water.

The Malinauskas government was elected with a commitment to establish a scientific review of all options for sand management, with the review to include full community input and transparency, and analysis of climate change impact. Further updates on this project are available on the Department for Environment and Water's website at:

<https://www.environment.sa.gov.au/topics/coasts/managing-adelaides-beaches/adelaide-beach-management-review/>.

CENTRE FOR FIRST NATIONS CULTURES

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (1 November 2022).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Premier has advised:

Prior to the public announcement on 31 October 2022 of the panel, several stakeholders external to government were notified including David Rathman AM the Project Aboriginal Ambassador, the lead contractor (builder), Lendlease, the architect team of Woods Bagot and Diller Scofidio + Renfro, and the Australian government as a funding partner of the centre under the Adelaide City Deal.

The engagement of the panel is still being finalised, which includes the particulars of their remuneration, however the talent and experience of the panel is exceptional. Mr Wyatt served as Minister for Indigenous Australians in the Morrison government, the first Indigenous person to hold the position, Mr Carr is a former New South Wales Premier, Arts Minister, Senator and Foreign Affairs Minister, and Ms Hewson is a former investment banker with over 35 years' experience in the finance sector. A former director of BHP, she currently serves on the boards of the Reserve Bank of Australia and Infrastructure SA. I look forward to the outcomes of their review.

PREMIER'S DELIVERY UNIT

In reply to **the Hon. R.A. SIMMS** (1 November 2022).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Premier has advised:

The Premier's Delivery Unit reports to the Premier and to Cabinet. The unit provides updates on the status of election commitments to the Government Performance Cabinet Committee. It is for cabinet to decide whether those updates are tabled in parliament.

FOSTER AND KINSHIP CARE

In reply to **the Hon. S.L. GAME** (3 November 2022).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Minister for Child Protection has advised:

I have recently been advised by Dr Arney – and have shared this update publicly with stakeholders – that her report will be delivered no later than 30 November 2022. The government can provide details about the findings of the Foster and Kinship Care Inquiry prior to it being tabled in parliament. It is my intention is to share details of the findings of the inquiry this year.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

In reply to **the Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition)** (3 November 2022).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Minister for Local Government has advised:

Under the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999, the Electoral Commissioner is the returning officer for all local government elections.

The Electoral Commissioner is therefore responsible for investigating any allegations of irregularities in the 2022 periodic council elections, and I am confident that he will do so thoroughly. Any questions as to how the Electoral Commissioner undertakes this responsibility should be directed to the commissioner.

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION AND CARE

In reply to **the Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK** (16 November 2022).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): I have been advised:

1. The royal commission supported by a small team, currently comprising 5.9 FTE. In addition, the Department of Treasury and Finance has seconded a policy officer on a part time basis to support the royal commission.
2. The commissioner will be submitting invoices for days worked, to a maximum of \$450,000.
3. There are no deputy commissioners.