

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 13 September 2023

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens)** took the chair at 14:15 and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:17): I lay upon the table the 29th report of the committee, 2022-23.

Report received.

Question Time

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TREATY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs regarding a state-based Treaty.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Clause 8 of the First Nations Voice Act 2023 states, and I quote:

The provisions of this Act are intended to be read in conjunction with, and to complement, the provisions of any other Act that implements measures to progress Truth and Treaty, as identified in the Uluru Statement from the Heart.

It was reported by SBS News on Tuesday 22 March 2022 that the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, the Hon. Kyam Maher, stated, and I quote:

The new premier, Peter Malinauskas is absolutely committed to restarting the treaty process and picking up the other tenants from the Uluru Statement from the Heart...voice and truth.

An Inside Story article published in March this year stated the state government was expected to, and I quote, 'restart the treaty process later this year'. My questions to the minister are: has the minister restarted the Treaty process and, if so, what has been the nature of those discussions and with whom?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:20): I thank the honourable member for her question. As the honourable member correctly points out, it is a restarting of a process. It is a process that commenced I think in 2016, originally, in this state, when I was Minister for Aboriginal Affairs in the former Weatherill Labor government.

That process culminated in very early 2018 with the signing of the Buthera Agreement, an agreement with the Narungga people of the Yorke Peninsula, the first agreement as part of a Treaty process that had been signed in Australia before. As part of that process under the previous government, we held Treaty discussions with Ngarrindjeri, Narungga and Adnyamathanha peoples and, as I said, had progressed along with Narungga to the signing of an agreement on the way to that process.

Of course, with a change of government, a change in what governments want to do, I think one of the first decisions of the former Marshall Liberal government was to scrap the Treaty process. We are committed to restarting the Treaty process in South Australia. Since we started in South

Australia in I think it was 2016, the landscape has changed significantly in Australia after having been the first to start that process.

We now see Victoria well advanced with the second election of a First Peoples' Assembly in Victoria, which is a body that the government is discussing Treaty with in Victoria. We have seen a Treaty commissioner's report handed down in the Northern Territory, with the acting Treaty commissioner putting out examples of how Treaty might work in the Northern Territory, and we have seen Queensland progress their Treaty ambitions in that state.

In South Australia, as I have mentioned in this chamber before, we have agreed with suggestions about the sequencing of the Uluru Statement, with the Voice as the logical first component, and we have seen the passing of legislation earlier this year, as has been talked about in this chamber before.

Our ambition was to have the South Australian First Nations Voice elected and up and running by the end of this year. When the federal government passed the referendum machinery legislation and it became apparent that the referendum was likely to coincide within weeks of the elections for our First Nations South Australian Voice (and as it has turned out it would have been, I think, about two weeks' difference now that we know that the referendum is on 14 October), at the request of Aboriginal elders around South Australia, we delayed those first elections until March next year.

Once those elections occur next year, it is our intention that in discussions with the elected South Australian First Nations Voice, that will help us set out the process to restart those Treaty negotiations.

SENTENCING

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 Attorney-General regarding sentencing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: It was reported in *The Advertiser* on Tuesday 12 September that a man who pleaded guilty to assault causing harm has received a suspended sentence and a two-year good behaviour bond. The court heard that the perpetrator repeatedly punched the victim, who was a security guard, even while he was laying on the ground unconscious.

My questions to the Attorney-General are: does the Attorney believe that the decision to suspend the sentence of the perpetrator was appropriate, given the violent nature of the offence, and what measures are in place to ensure that sentencing reflects the seriousness of the type of offence?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:24): I thank the honourable member for her question. It will be a very similar answer to that which I often give to the Hon. Dennis Hood, who is very vigilant in asking questions in relation to sentencing.

I don't know the exact details of the offence to which the honourable member refers, but it would be the judge or the magistrate in these cases or, in the case of a major indictable offence, perhaps a jury who would hear everything that is put before the court—all the circumstances of the offending, all the details of the offence—and then make a decision in terms of the sentencing based on that.

The ultimate arbiters of the range of sentences that can be imposed, of course, is us, the parliament. We set down the range of sentences imposed, based on community standards, for various offences. It is up to the courts to use the guidelines that parliament has set down for the range of sentences and apply the appropriate sentence, taking into account all of the circumstances in a case. As I said to you, I'm not privy, as the honourable member wouldn't be, to all the circumstances in relation to that case and what led to that sentence.

Of course, there is a safeguard if there is a sentence that is manifestly inadequate. The police, which I assume would be the prosecutor in the case the honourable member is referring

to—or the DPP in more serious offences—have the ability to lodge an appeal to a sentence that is manifestly inadequate, which they often do. As I said, that is a regular thing that occurs.

SENTENCING

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): Supplementary: does the Attorney believe that the sentencing delivered in this case acts as a sufficient deterrent for future perpetrators?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:26): I thank the honourable member for her question. As I said before, I don't know all the circumstances that were before the court in relation to this case. But it is true that one element of sentencing and of the sentences that we as a parliament decide are appropriate for a particular crime is as a deterrent effect, to deter those from doing it in the future. As I said, I'm not privy to all the circumstances that led to the sentence in this case.

FEDERAL VOICE TO PARLIAMENT REFERENDUM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs about the Federal Voice to Parliament.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: It was reported in *The Australian* on Tuesday that prominent yes campaign advocate Professor Marcia Langton while speaking at an event in Western Australia categorised the no campaign as, and I quote, 'base racism or sheer stupidity'.

My question to the minister is: does he agree with Professor Langton that the no campaign, and therefore those who will be voting no, are either racist and/or stupid and, if not, has he or will he publicly condemn the comments made by Professor Langton?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:27): I thank the honourable member for her question. I haven't seen the transcript or the audio of what the honourable member refers to. I did catch the news grab as it flashed up on the screen in the lift on the way down from the office. I think what I saw was 'Marcia Langton denies calling no voters racist'. I would want to see exactly what was said.

Certainly, I think this debate ought to be carried out with respect on all sides. It is not the case that people voting no are necessarily racist; that's just not the case. There are a lot of people who have concerns, and well-founded concerns. I have talked to a lot of people in the community about this referendum and there are people who do hold concerns.

It has been my experience, though, that if I have had the opportunity—whether that is at shopping centres out in the community or knocking on doors talking about this referendum where people have raised concerns—the vast majority of the time, within two or three minutes of talking about what we are actually being asked to vote on in the referendum, and that is an advisory body to government and the parliament that will help Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders have more of a say in decisions that affect their lives, the overwhelming majority of people who have held concerns are assuaged from those concerns after a short conversation.

As I have said in the chamber before, and as have all of my colleagues on the Labor side, we are completely and utterly supportive of this referendum. As I have said, creating a body that at its fundamental core recognises Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in our constitution as the traditional owners of the lands and seas of this country, creating a Voice that allows Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to have more of a say in the decisions that affect their lives, is a fundamentally good thing.

PREMIER'S NAIDOC AWARD

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister inform the council about this year's male winner of the Premier's NAIDOC Award?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:30): I thank the honourable member for her question and her interest in this area, and it would be a great pleasure to inform the chamber about this year's male winner of the Premier's NAIDOC Award. I mentioned last sitting week, and certainly on many occasions before, how important NAIDOC Week is in the calendar for South Australians, particularly for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander South Australians. It is a week to celebrate and look forward to all that First Nations people have contributed and will continue to contribute to this country and our communities.

There are many diverse events right across metropolitan Adelaide and country areas each week during NAIDOC and, as I talked about in previous sitting weeks, the state NAIDOC awards lunch is one of the highlights of the week and presents a great opportunity to celebrate the individuals who give so much of themselves to our community.

The Premier's NAIDOC Award is now shared between two individuals each year—one male and one female. I previously informed the chamber about some of the highlights and the exceptional career of Aunty Eunice Aston, a Ngarrindjeri woman and the female award winner in this year's Premier's NAIDOC Awards. I am very pleased today to update the council about the work of the male recipient of the Premier's NAIDOC Award, Uncle Frank Lampard OAM.

Uncle Frank is a Kaurna and Ngarrindjeri elder who, like Aunty Eunice, has worked throughout his life to improve the health and wellbeing outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Perhaps most notably, Uncle Frank has contributed significantly to the educational and correctional services sectors. He served in the Department for Correctional Services as Executive Director of Aboriginal Prisoners and Offenders Support Services for 10 years, and earlier as Chair of the SA Aboriginal Education and Training Advisory Committee. For this role, he was awarded a Centenary Medal in 2001.

Uncle Frank was also South Australia's Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement from 2015 to 2017, when I was fortunate to serve as the Aboriginal affairs minister in the Weatherill government. Uncle Frank has also advocated for Aboriginal health practitioner roles in the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network and at the emergency department of that network, in order to address the high rates of discharge among Aboriginal patients against medical advice or before the completion of treatment. In no small part thanks to Uncle Frank's advocacy, this role now operates seven days a week.

Uncle Frank Lampard played a crucial role in the establishment of the Aboriginal War Memorial on the Torrens Parade Ground, as well as the ongoing work for the restoration of Aboriginal veterans' graves. For his contribution in this space, as well as his broader work in the community, Uncle Frank was awarded the Medal of the Order of Australia in 2008.

Regularly, when I catch up with Uncle Frank Lampard, he talks about the different places around regional South Australia that he has been in his work in the restoration of Aboriginal veterans' graves. His work broadly spans so many sectors. I think everyone at the NAIDOC awards luncheon wholeheartedly congratulated him on the Premier's NAIDOC Award (male).

There were two other nominees for the category that Uncle Frank was eventually the winner of: Dean Walker and Andrew Wilson. Dean Walker is an Antakirinja Matu-Yankunytjatjara man and has worked for over 15 years as an Aboriginal Senior Community Constable in Coober Pedy. He previously worked as a substance misuse worker for the Port Augusta City Council. It is always a pleasure when I am in Coober Pedy to catch up with Deano. Dean has previously delivered SAPOL's Aboriginal cultural awareness program and won South Australia's Local Hero Award in 2013 for his work in improving relations between police and Aboriginal communities in the Far North.

The other finalist for the male Premier's NAIDOC Award was Andrew Wilson, whose commitment to the Aboriginal community has spanned over 30 years through his work as the Senior Aboriginal Access Officer for State Records of South Australia within the Attorney-General's Department. Andrew has been involved in countless projects with State Records aimed at enriching and explaining Aboriginal records held by the state. These include the development of an Aboriginal resource kit for secondary schools, building an Aboriginal names index to assist with linking family members to their records, and the establishment of the State Records Aboriginal Reference Group, of which he is now a member in his well-deserved retirement.

Throughout their diverse and clearly important areas of work, the nominees for the Premier's NAIDOC Award have contributed so much to the lives of Aboriginal people in this state. I thank all the nominees for their outstanding work and, in particular, my congratulations go to this year's male winner and my good friend Uncle Frank Lampard OAM.

FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

The Hon. S.L. GAME (14:35): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Attorney-General regarding the First Nations Voice.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: With the national Voice campaign ramping up as we head to the 14 October referendum, it is important to remain focused on the state-based Voice as the Malinauskas government continues to build its latest arm of bureaucracy. On 1 September this year, the I Work for SA website posted an advertisement for the executive position of Director, Voice Secretariat, a role which I understand can attract a salary package of over \$270,000. This represents an opportunity cost investing in administration instead of tangible solutions for First Nations people.

The Voice Secretariat is established to support the Local First Nations Voices and the State First Nations Voice. The director is responsible for the operation and management of the secretariat. The application period remained open for 10 days. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. How much will it cost to operate the Voice Secretariat for the first 12 months, and how much of this cost will be in the form of staff and executive salaries and consultancy fees?
2. How many staff will be employed in the Voice Secretariat and which consultancies will be engaged to assist in the running of this agency?
3. How will the effectiveness of this agency be measured in terms of providing tangible solutions for First Nations people?
4. Given the short application period, has the government or the consultancies it engages made direct approaches to potential staff, executive or otherwise?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:37): I thank the honourable member for her question. I don't have the details of the cost of administration each year, but certainly during the second reading debate, when we had the First Nations bill before this parliament earlier this year, I outlined in quite some detail what the anticipated costs would be, so I refer the honourable member to the second reading and committee stage of the debate when the bill was in the chamber.

In relation to the opportunity costs, I have said it before and I will say it again: I completely and utterly don't accept the basis of the honourable member's assertion that the idea that a relatively small amount of money setting up a Voice, whereby we can hear directly from the Aboriginal community about how we best tailor programs and best tailor services, is a waste of money. If you accept that we shouldn't do this, then you are accepting that what we are doing is fine, that the status quo is working. I don't accept that whatsoever, and I think that an opportunity to do something different is a wholeheartedly good thing.

PUBLIC SAFETY MANAGEMENT

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General about public safety.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: In response to the escalating antisocial behaviour around the Adelaide CBD, a declared public precinct determination was put in place to maintain public safety and order in the area. On Wednesday 16 August, ABC News reported that business owners, workers and city dwellers were concerned about the antisocial behaviour in the Adelaide CBD areas, and with the declared public precinct expiring on Monday 9 October 2023, my questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Has the Attorney-General received a recent briefing on the public safety in the Adelaide CBD?

2. Will the Labor government consider expanding the determination of the declared public precinct and, if not, what measures would the Labor government put in place to ensure that public safety and order is maintained in the Adelaide CBD?

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 her question. I assume when the honourable member asks would we consider 'expanding' she means extending the declared public precinct, or does she mean actually expanding the area?

The Hon. J.S. Lee: Both, yes. Expanding and extending.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will check. I don't recall having received information yet in relation to an extension or otherwise, but certainly that would be given due consideration as the original request was given due consideration, and it would depend on the information that was put forward.

COUNTRY CABINET

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:40): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the minister inform the council about his attendance at the country cabinet held at Mount Barker last month?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:40): I thank the honourable member for his question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in country areas, which stands in stark contrast to the former government.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The honourable member is always out in the country.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: If he doesn't like their coffee, he won't go there.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The honourable member has affogatos in all parts of this state. He is a very regular visitor to country South Australia and contributes to this government's understanding of country South Australia, which unfortunately the previous government lacked when they scrapped holding country cabinet—

The Hon. E.S. Bourke interjecting:

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —shamefully scrapped holding country cabinet. As part of a government which actually holds country cabinets, in contrast to those opposite, who scrapped them, I had the pleasure of attending, along with most of the rest of the cabinet—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —the Mount Barker government's most—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —the Mount Barker area's country cabinet.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Attorney-General will be heard in silence.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The reintroduction of country cabinet was reflected in a huge turnout, with nearly 600 Adelaide Hills residents at a community forum and barbecue hosted at the

Mount Barker school on a cold wintry night. The community was able to ask directly of the government a range of questions—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —and I have to say that the questions asked at the Mount Barker community cabinet were to the point and to the correct and relevant portfolio holder, in stark contrast to what we see here day after day after day.

Outside the community forum there was a range of activities that each minister took part in and meetings that ministers took part in. I have to say it was a distinct pleasure to meet with many community groups and many members of the community. It was a particular pleasure to visit Littlehampton Primary School, as part of the Mount Barker community cabinet, where I attended a number of years of primary school before moving to Mount Gambier. It was a pleasure to be shown around the school by principal Barb Jenkins and the students, seeing their bush tucker programs and the Aboriginal education area in the school's resource centre.

It was also valuable to attend at the Mount Barker Magistrates Court to meet with Magistrate Greg Fisher at the courthouse as well as the registry and Sheriff's Officers and talk about the work they do in the community and the challenges that are faced in the justice system in the Adelaide Hills and Mount Barker area.

It was also a pleasure to attend a roundtable lunch with members of the legal profession, including solicitors from Matthews Lawyers and representatives from Tindall Gask Bentley in Mount Barker, Peter Fisher Lawyers, Mead Robson Steele and von Doussas. The growing population of Mount Barker is certainly well served by the legal community and I am sure this will continue to grow into the future.

I also had the opportunity to meet with members of the central Hills justices of the peace association and was able to thank them for the work that JPs perform in their vital service with the community and for the efficient functioning of our legal system. There were many decades of cumulative service of the JPs in the Hills area.

It was a great pleasure also to have a look at some of the best the Hills had to offer in terms of country bakeries. I think I counted six sausage rolls during my time in the Hills over a couple of afternoons—a sausage roll every couple of hours.

I would like to particularly pay tribute to the local member in the area, the Hon. Dan Cregan, and his staff, who were instrumental in helping many of us set up meetings and having the most productive country cabinet we could have in the Adelaide Hills. It is certainly no wonder he is so respected and is voted in by the members of the Hills community, given his keen local connections. I think at every meeting I had, members of the local community were singing the praises of the Hon. Dan Cregan.

COUNTRY CABINET

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:45): Supplementary: was the issue of regional rail raised at the country cabinet? When will the government do something about it?

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 his question. It was not raised directly with me at any of the meetings that I had.

COUNTRY CABINET

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (14:45): Supplementary: does the minister consider Mount Barker to be a regional town?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:45): We had a country cabinet in Mount Barker.

ICAC REPORT

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:46): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General about the report into the investigation and prosecution of former Renewal SA chief executive John Hanlon.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Two months have passed since the report by the ICAC inspector, Philip Strickland SC, who is also the Ombudsman inspector, was tabled in both houses of parliament. There has not been a reaction to his findings—notably, institutional maladministration in public administration by ICAC—from you nor the government. When Mr Strickland appeared before the select committee into reputational damage and harm from ICAC investigations, I described his report as a snow job designed to shield the high-profile individuals at ICAC he named from any consequences for their actions.

The reason for my remark should become apparent to anyone, including the Attorney-General, with knowledge of two significant pieces of legislation: the Independent Commission Against Corruption Act passed in 2021 and the Ombudsman Act amended at the same time. Mr Strickland found, and I quote, 'substantial mismanagement, incompetence, impropriety and negligence by ICAC officers'. Yet, curiously, he declined to sheet the blame on any individuals named, only the institution itself. Surely it cannot be a legally competent finding to excuse individual responsibility.

On page 101 of his report, he cites section 5(4) of the ICAC Act as the reference point to his finding of misconduct and maladministration. However, neither Mr Strickland nor the multiple sets of eyes of the legal eagles who prepared several drafts of his report, nor the commissioner herself—who had to first approve the report's contents to be published—picked up significant jurisdictional errors: principally, that this section does not exist in the ICAC Act. That section was moved to section 4 of the Ombudsman Act and it makes it very clear who must be responsible.

Section 4(2)(i) captures an authority and/or an individual, but only where there has been a misuse of public money or mismanagement of resources. The inspector found nothing there. But placitum (ii) covers individuals guilty of maladministration from impropriety, incompetence or negligence, and at section 4(3) also applies conduct that occurred before the start of this section. Therefore, there is no reason why Mr Strickland could not have attributed maladministration to individuals, ranging from Mr Lander to individual investigators, but for some reason he chose not to.

The inspector has used his findings of impropriety, incompetence and negligence, in the individuals directly involved and assigned to these findings, to arrive at a conclusion that the conduct of the individuals justifies the label 'institutional', but then uses that consequential finding to excuse the conduct of everybody.

His report is meaningless. He is asking us to accept the illogical and wrong as logical and right because of his credentials and because he says that is so. It is sophistry, the clever use of argument, superficially plausible, but which is in reality unsound or fallacious and employed to lull or deceive the audience. The audience here is each member of the two houses of parliament. My questions—

The PRESIDENT: And I am glad we've got to it, the Hon. Mr Pangallo. You really shouldn't use your preamble as commentary. It is for providing information with regard to the question. So I know that you will be better at it next time.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Have you personally read the report in its entirety, and what conclusions will you now draw from Mr Strickland's key findings, considering the jurisdictional errors I have highlighted?
2. Would you agree that the finding of 'institutional maladministration' as excusatory of culpability in anyone, is contrary to the statutory imperatives in section 4(2) and (3) of the Ombudsman Act, in particular section 4(2)(a)(ii), and renders the entire report as lacking in probity and legal efficacy?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for his question. In relation to his first question, yes, I have read the entire report. I don't have it in front of me at the moment; I wouldn't be able to quote sections of it. In relation to his second question, which invites me to denounce the report by Philip Strickland SC, that is not something I will do.

This parliament made changes to our integrity legislation and provided for the ICAC inspector to be set up. I referred this particular matter to the ICAC inspector, and the ICAC inspector handed down a report. I don't accept the honourable member's characterisation or much of how he has described the report or Philip Strickland SC in the preamble to his question.

ICAC REPORT

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:52): Supplementary: will you now seek an independent review of those findings and an explanation from Mr Strickland for those errors and whether the report needs correction?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:52): My short answer is, no, I won't.

The Hon. F. Pangallo: Why not?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That wasn't from the original answer.

APY LANDS

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:52): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs regarding a facility on the APY lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The government recently announced a multiagency facility on the APY lands to improve community safety with a range of key agencies. I understand there is close to \$14 million of funding between the commonwealth and state governments. My questions are:

1. Can the minister advise which agencies are anticipated to be located there?
2. Which location is it to be at?
3. Is this model of a multiagency to be expanded into other locations?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:53): I thank the honourable member for her question. When I was answering a question from the opposition yesterday, I talked about having visited the Pukatja tuberculosis clinic. On the same visit in early August to the APY lands, I was actually able to not just visit but help open the new multiagency facility in Umuwa. As the honourable member points out, it is a facility that is shared by a number of different areas of government.

I think this facility has been talked about for at least a decade, from my memory, and probably spans three different governments in terms of its planning and the ambition for a facility. Certainly and principally, SA Police and Child Protection are two of the major agencies that are already in the facility and will use the facility. In relation to its location, the facility is based at Umuwa. I am not aware of any plans to expand these multiagency facilities out into other communities across the APY lands or elsewhere.

I know one of the reasons for the location in Umuwa is not just the central location in terms of Umuwa being in the middle of the APY lands and can then serve communities to the western side like Amata and Pipalyatjara and then to the eastern side like Mimili, Indulkana and Pukatja, but Umuwa is an administrative centre for the APY lands, and there were sound reasons why such a facility would not be located in one of the major communities. That's particularly for families who don't wish to be seen to be going into such a facility in one of the major communities, and so it is placed in an area that has a greater concentration of people performing administrative functions residing.

For those reasons—and again, spanning three governments in its planning—it's located in Umuwa. I am not aware of any plans to replicate that in other communities, but if it's successful and

those sorts of problems that can occur of people not wishing to be seen to go into these facilities are overcome, there is no reason it can't be looked at in the future.

NAIDOC WEEK

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:56): My question is also to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister inform the council of the 2023 NAIDOC march and family fun day held earlier this year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:56): I thank the member for his question and his interest in this area. It was my pleasure earlier this year in July to join, as I do most years when I am in Adelaide, thousands of other South Australians, both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal, in the NAIDOC march down King William Street from Victoria Square to the steps of Parliament House.

It was, as it is everywhere, a particularly special and impactful event but, as I reflected with a number of Aboriginal elders during the march this year, it was certainly, from my memory and many others' memories, the largest march that we can remember in recent times—an impressive turnout of community members from all walks of life creating an atmosphere of unity and shared purpose. There were many community members, advocates, allies, Aboriginal leaders and friends all united in recognition of Aboriginal culture and a dedication to bring about change and reconciliation.

Certainly, as per usual, the march was enhanced by flags, signs and the jumpers and beanies with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander colours being worn. As is traditional in recent years, it was followed by family fun day celebrations which ran well into the afternoon with many activities for children and young people in particular, with over 50 stallholders from government and non-government organisations. There were also things like a men's zone, a women's zone, an elder zone, a small business zone looking at the best of small business from Aboriginal businesses, and a children's zone.

It was, as it usually is, an opportunity for people to catch up during NAIDOC Week and acknowledge the hard work that's been done by so many over the decades and the bright future ahead.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE VOLUNTEERS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:58): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries, or the minister representing the Minister for Emergency Services, a question about supporting CFS volunteers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: For almost a decade, we have had a commitment to gender diversity across our emergency and firefighting services. Women have long been frontline firefighters in Australia, indeed for at least three decades, but there is still a long way to go to reach gender parity, with representation believed to sit at about only a third, at best, in many services.

Some barriers to gender equality are cultural. We know stereotypes are pervasive, and ongoing systemic work is quite rightly being done to challenge that sexism. The 2016 Statement on Workforce Diversity by the National Council for Fire and Emergency Services is spearheading that.

However, some barriers are simple and could be solved literally overnight. Due to historic and current lack of funding, CFS stations themselves can be a barrier to attraction, recruitment, and retention of an inclusive and diverse firefighting service. The lack of funding has seen the identification of some important structural issues, specifically taps, toilets and a place to change with dignity and privacy.

Consider this: the siren calls you in in the middle of the night, you rush to service but you have no underwear under your pyjamas. Due to the lack of appropriate changing facilities, you are required to change into your turnout gear in full view of others in your brigade. This is uncomfortable or embarrassing at least, and a dealbreaker to serving, at worst. This is entirely unnecessary as a barrier and is stopping women in particular from getting involved or staying involved with the CFS.

I will acknowledge that it is not the case in every station across our state. Indeed, I note some online feedback to the 2022 upgrades at the CFS station in Yahl, Mount Gambier, which revealed great excitement that they now had 'access to a tap and a toilet'. In 2022, they finally had access to a tap and a toilet. Again, picture if you will, the need to use the bathroom—a basic human need—and the expectation that one will be able to take a slash behind the shed rather than avail themselves of a bathroom, which currently in many CFS stations is not there. My questions to the minister are:

1. Can the minister confirm how many CFS stations do not have the basics of a tap and a toilet?
2. How many have no private change spaces and so require volunteers to potentially strip off in public in cases of an unexpected callout?
3. Will the minister commit to an urgent audit of these structural barriers that also include the broader areas of concern raised by the CFS Volunteers Association about workplace safety hazards such as electrical and other issues or the presence of asbestos?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:01): I thank the honourable member for her question, and, as the minister today representing the minister who represents the minister that the honourable member refers that question to, I will refer that on to refer that on to bring the honourable member back a reply.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I was being accurate.

AGE OF CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:01): My questions are to the Attorney-General regarding the government's plan to raise the minimum age of criminal responsibility:

1. How far has the minister progressed in plans to raise the age of criminal responsibility?
2. Which stakeholders has the Attorney-General met with to discuss this issue?
3. How much detail was discussed at the most recent national meeting of Attorneys-General?
4. Has the Attorney spoken to his ACT counterpart, Shane Rattenbury, about the approach and the approach taken in that jurisdiction as he committed on record to doing previously?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:02): I thank the honourable member for her question. I am trying to remember correctly, but the last meeting of the Standing Council of Attorneys-General was in Darwin and it was a number of months ago. The minimum age of criminal responsibility certainly was raised at that meeting and there is a national working party that continues to do work on a model, or models, that would look at what is in place of a criminal justice intervention or a criminal justice response.

Certainly, I have been pleased to avail myself to what is occurring in the Northern Territory, not just with the Attorney-General in the Northern Territory, who is a member of the cabinet, from the Greens in the ACT government, but also with other ministers like Minister Stephen-Smith, who is Minister for Aboriginal Affairs in the ACT government, about their model and where they are progressing. I have also discussed the matter with my colleague the Hon. Chansey Paech, who is the minister in the Northern Territory.

The Northern Territory, of course, have also announced raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility in the work that they are doing. Most recently, I have discussed the matter with the minister in Victoria. After the Victorian election, there was an announcement that the Victorian government would raise the minimum age of criminal responsibility in the work that is being undertaken there. Certainly the work that is being undertaken in the state continues. It's not at a stage to take anything out to external stakeholders at this stage, but that doesn't mean there haven't

been quite a number of external stakeholders who have wanted to talk to the government about their views on how they see it working.

There being a disturbance:

The PRESIDENT: Attorney, can you just wait until the Hon. Mr Wortley has had his phone call.

The Hon. R.P. Wortley: I'll only be a minute.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That work continues in terms of what the state government is doing. As I have said before, we are looking at not just what the two territories and Victoria have done but also Tasmania—who are raising the minimum age of detention rather than the minimum age of criminal responsibility, which is how they are tackling this issue—and right around the world, the many international jurisdictions that are doing this.

Our work continues on two levels as a South Australian government. As I have said, we don't have a fixed policy position. It is something we are looking at, though. The primary concern, as I have stated a number of times, is the safety of the community. Certainly, there is emerging evidence that with young people, particularly very young people—10 and 11 year olds, and what a number of the other jurisdictions in Australia have done is: initially to 12 with an ambition to raise it to 14—community safety may actually be enhanced by not having those young people come under the auspices of the criminal justice system but some sort of therapeutic or family support system.

The South Australian government continues to do that work on two levels, that is, the contribution to the national work that's being done under the auspices of the Standing Council of Attorneys-General and also the work we are doing as a state government and, should we go down this path, how it will look.

AGE OF CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:06): Supplementary: what will the consequences be for young offenders if this legislation passes, given the concerns raised around bus drivers regarding violence and antisocial behaviour and numerous other crimes committed by young people between 10 and 14 years of age?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:06): I thank the honourable member for her question. We are certainly not at the stage to spell out 'this is how a model would work', but as I said in the answer and as I have said before, what is being looked at is: if it is not a criminal justice response, what are the interventions in the young person's life—things like family supports and the therapeutic responses. As I have said in my answer to the substantive question, our overriding view on this is what improves the safety of our community.

AGE OF CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:07): Supplementary: is one of the issues that the government has also considered the costs associated with detaining children in detention, and does the minister have a view on that?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:07): I thank the honourable member for his question. Certainly, that's not one of the overriding issues we are looking at or the lenses we are looking at this through. The safety of the community is paramount. The needs and the outcomes for the children is also an exceptionally important thing to take into account. Certainly, detaining children is expensive, detaining adults is expensive, but as I said, whatever interventions are put in place need to be considered as well and there will be a cost to those—the therapy or family supports as well.

AGE OF CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:07): Supplementary: has it ever been suggested in any of the discussions the Attorney has been privy to that there won't be an appropriate response depending on the severity of the offending in question?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:08): I think I understand the honourable member's question. Certainly, in any discussions I have been involved in, there are no suggestions that there shouldn't be a response to a young person who finds themselves with antisocial behaviour or doing things that would constitute an offence. None of the discussions I have been involved in suggest a young person should just be able to do what would otherwise be offending if you raise the minimum age of criminal responsibility. All the discussions that I have been involved in suggest there needs to be some other intervention in the young person's life.

SALISBURY CITY CENTRE BUSINESS AWARDS

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (15:08): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the minister please inform the council about the winner of the recent Salisbury Business Award for Community Services?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:09): I would be most happy to inform the honourable member of the recent winner of the Salisbury Business Award for Community Services, and I thank him for his interest in community affairs generally.

I am very pleased to share with the council that at the recent Salisbury Business Awards, the very competitive category of Community Services was won by the Northern Community Legal Service. I have spoken in this chamber before about the Northern Community Legal Service and the outstanding free services in legal advice and representation it provides to communities in the northern suburbs, as well as the community legal education that is provided.

The Salisbury-based service first started as the Para Districts Community Legal Service in 1989 and had a steering committee of several local service providers who were each passionate about the need for a community legal service in the northern suburbs location. That service at the time was sponsored by the then Norwood Community Legal Service. The service as it is today was first established in 1990 with both state and then federal funding, and operated out of Little Para House in Elizabeth Vale, provided by the Salisbury council.

As a result of the community legal services review undertaken in South Australia in 1997, several things changed for the service once the review's findings were implemented in 2000. Funding for metropolitan centres was reassigned, which resulted in a significant increase in funding, particularly for the northern suburbs services. As recommended by the review, the then Para Districts Community Legal Service changed its name to the Northern Community Legal Service as we know it today.

Supported by both state and commonwealth Attorney-General's departments, the Northern Community Legal Service continues to thrive and provide a vital service to the northern suburbs community, as is evidenced by this award. The service has won the Salisbury Business Award (Community Services) five times prior, including last year, so it is clearly very consistent in its reputation amongst the local community and the northern suburbs that it serves more generally.

I would like to congratulate and thank the service's director, Ms Patsy Kellett, and all the staff who work tirelessly to provide such professional and personal legal services to the community when they need it most—a most deserved award.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:11): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the President a question about the function of the Legislative Review Committee and public interest.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: As everyone in this place knows, the Legislative Review Committee is one of the most critical committees in terms of its scrutiny role and has an enormous workload. In 2016, it had a total of 415 instruments referred to it; in 2017, 432; in 2018, 372; in 2019, 346; and in 2020, 469. In 2020, the annual report indicated that the Legislative Review Committee reported that of the 514 pieces of legislation enacted, 9 per cent (45 enactments) were primary legislation enacted by parliament, while 91 per cent (469 instruments) were delegated instruments made by the Governor or other persons. That doesn't include codes, guidelines and other instruments that the committee considers.

Members of this chamber would also be aware that this issue was extensively canvassed—and the subject of scrutiny and criticism and, indeed, recommendations—during the committee on committee inquiry. Just yesterday, we passed a bill made necessary by a High Court decision which found regulations to be invalidly made. The taxpayer of South Australia must now pay the significant and yet to be determined costs for that.

That is not the first court challenge based on validity based on regulations. A similar case occurred regarding commercial and retail leases some years ago, again at a significant cost to taxpayers. There is also a move on foot right now to remove prescribed early commencement certification processes, which further undermines transparency and oversight of regulations made.

This has been the subject of recent criticism by the Law Society, which has also raised concerns that regulations are being used to make substantive changes to existing laws. Every other jurisdiction and the commonwealth recognises and ensures adequate resources for their scrutiny committees. My questions to you, Mr President, respectfully, are:

1. Are you aware of continued requests for appropriate funding for suitably qualified staff by successive committee members to support the critical functions of that committee?
2. Have you sought advice on appropriately funding that committee?
3. Are you aware of a decision in recent days to cease providing members with advice other than on administrative matters?
4. What, if anything, do you intend to do to ensure the most important oversight committee—indeed, the only scrutiny committee—in this parliament is not reduced to a rubberstamping measure when it comes to the most utilised lawmaking mechanism?
5. How do you expect members of that committee to undertake their competing duties on committees, in this chamber, and otherwise in the absence of appropriately qualified and resourced staff arrangements?

The PRESIDENT (15:15): I will take your question on notice. If your staff are listening, the convention is normally to make the President aware that he or she is going to have a question asked of them, so they can provide a response on the day. I will take it on notice, and I will certainly come back with a response.

UNIONS IN WORKPLACES

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:15): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Industrial Relations regarding union presence in workplaces.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: Included in the federal Labor government's closing loopholes bill that was introduced last week is a clause that entitles a delegate to represent the interests of not only union members but anyone who is eligible to be a member, and allow them reasonable communication with those potential members. The bill entitles delegates to be given reasonable access to the workplace, its facilities, as well as to paid training during work hours.

Subsequently, union delegates will be entitled to intervene in businesses that have just one or two union members and have formal rights to advocate on behalf of everyone in the workplace while being paid by their employer. Peak industry groups, such as the Australian Industry Group, the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Australian Resources and Energy Employer Association and the Minerals Council of Australia, have all raised significant productivity concerns

as a result of these potential changes that will unduly increase union rights, power, influence and membership at the expense of businesses.

Workplace relations expert Professor Andrew Stewart is quoted in recent media as saying that this 'is something that is genuinely new. It's just not something we have ever seen, to my knowledge, formally enshrined in law.' My questions to the Minister for Industrial Relations are:

1. Does the minister share any of these concerns over productivity or unduly increasing the rights of unions at the expense of South Australian businesses?

2. If so, will he commit to contacting his federal counterpart, workplace relations minister Tony Burke, to advocate on behalf of the South Australian business community, who view this measure as union overreach?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:17): I thank the honourable member for his question. As the honourable member has identified, this is in fact a federal matter. Since the referral of much industrial relation powers, the vast majority of the interaction in the private sector industrial relations system is governed by federal law, including the sorts of right of entry provisions the honourable member has outlined. Again, they are a matter for the federal jurisdiction.

Of course, in the state system, there are right of entry provisions, but they relate to what the state has jurisdiction over, and that is generally the work health and safety provisions. Right of entry in terms of the state industrial relations system is generally in relation to work health and safety issues. They are very important issues.

There are laws before this parliament in relation to industrial manslaughter, which are exceptionally important, and not just myself but other members in this chamber have talked a number of times about the importance of making sure people are safe at work—the expectation when you leave for work in the morning that you come home safe, and of course that is not always the case. Certainly, in our industrial relations system, as far as what is in the state system, making sure there is that balance to keep workers as safe as possible, unions absolutely have a role in that. Unions absolutely have a role in making sure workers are kept safe.

I have been involved in many meetings that have involved business groups in South Australia, and I am very grateful for the strong relationship that not just I but many ministers in the Malinauskas government have with industry bodies. There are many industry bodies that are very keen to make sure that their workplaces are as safe as possible and actually share, in many cases, a common interest and common goal with unions in keeping workers safe. In relation to the areas the honourable member has outlined, that is an area for the federal government.

Matters of Interest

STORKEY, MR G.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:20): Today, I rise to speak in relation to Mr Gary Storkey. I knew Gary from 2017, originally in his role as the Chief Executive of Community Housing Limited, when I was the then shadow minister for human services. Gary taught me a great deal in a short space of time about the opportunities provided by good housing outcomes and how these can best be supported by innovative government policy. He was a great thought leader in areas of public and community housing, shared equity, build-to-rent housing products for Aboriginal people and affordable housing.

Following the election in March 2018, Gary took on an advisory role, helping our new government implement election commitments relating to forming a standalone SA Housing Authority, which brought together housing assets that had formerly been managed by Renewal SA, with the tenancy management and property maintenance roles from the former DCSI. Gary was initially appointed as the interim chair of SAHA and later as the chair of SAHA until 2022.

Gary's career in housing spanned decades, in which he held pivotal roles in HomeStart Finance, the South Australian Housing Trust, Common Ground, the Credit Ombudsman of Australia and CHL. His special passion was helping people on low incomes, which led him to think laterally about solutions. In 1989, his vision led to the creation of HomeStart Finance, which has seen over

60,000 South Australians achieve home ownership, and he also created the Nunga loan. I came across an email I received from Gary in 2017, which I think signifies a lot of what he stood for and his approach. He said, in part:

My interest has always been that of reformer rather than for personal interest of CHL or that of myself. For 20-plus years I have written and discussed how the system of social housing is broken, yet it can be fixed with the right policies and programs. As with politics it is often the good solutions are blocked because of personal power constraints and other personal interests rather than for the benefit of finding a viable solution.

I have also found that if you don't get the reform implemented in the first six months of any new government, ministers move into ownership mode and simply start defending rather than reforming. My history at HomeStart showed me that you can do all these things without too much subsidy and in many cases actually make a profit. However, they all carry risk and at HomeStart I was always of the view that each risk can be measured and quarantined with good management/people. One of the reasons RP Data was established was precisely for instant valuation of property price risk. Most people don't realise property price and credit risk are far less dangerous than interest rate risk, yet most bureaucrats have no idea about this!

The second issue we discussed last time was how you bring about the change or reform. Having been involved in this before the system has created a lot of self-protection mechanisms in it and is very clever at drowning ministers in complications. Even non-housing agencies such as Treasury, Premier's Department, all try to control or block changes to uphold their power. Treasury has inserted so many conditions into everything, such that you can't do anything without getting them onside. In many cases they don't want debate for fear of losing control.

I helped set up the HUD Act to allow the Housing Minister to create a statutory authority by regulation and both HomeStart and Renewal SA come under that.

New ministers try and change the status quo and as I have said that I learnt from HomeStart that it is easy to start the new and then go back to fix the past because the system protects the past so vigorously.

Gary was absolutely critical in the housing reforms we undertook in our term. I say 'reform' because there were a lot of reforms—I have a motion on the *Notice Paper* to talk about that in a lot more detail, which I will do—in the public housing system, which was a sclerotic organisation that had old assets that had been left to rack and ruin because the view of the former administration was that there were 'no votes in public housing'.

There were a lot of changes that we undertook, both within the organisation but also in terms of income and asset tests and the way that antisocial behaviour was managed. There is a huge, long list of things that I will speak to in greater detail at some stage which we could not have done without Gary's vision. He passed away last year. He was a great friend, and I miss his advice. May he rest in peace.

FIRST NATIONS REFERENDUMS

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:25): I rise to speak about a children's picture book which tells of the injustice Aboriginal people suffered before Australia's 1967 referendum. The book, titled *Say Yes*, provides young children with a lesson in history about the racist reality of Australian society in the 1960s.

Most Australians will likely have some understanding of how life was for Indigenous Australians in the sixties; however, I wonder if we are all familiar with the simple truths told in this picture book. *Say Yes* reminds us of the 1902 rule for teachers working in government schools called 'the exclusion on demand policy', which was practised in parts of Australia up to the seventies. The rule gave parents the right to request that an Aboriginal student be removed from their children's school on the basis that they may have disease or could be a bad influence on the white kids.

In the sixties, the town of Moree in New South Wales had a law that Aboriginal people were not allowed in the local swimming pool. Aboriginal people living in the town of Bowraville in New South Wales could not enter a cinema through the main door or sit near white Australians. In Queensland, as well as some other parts of Australia, if an Aboriginal person needed to travel to another state because of an illness or death in the family they had to request permission first.

Author of *Say Yes* Jennifer Castles and illustrator Paul Seden tell how two young women, Mrs Jessie Street and Mrs Faith Bandler, are making speeches everywhere about the unfair way Aboriginals are treated and about the importance of changing the law and voting yes in the 1967 referendum. The illustrations and text describe how two children, one white and an Aboriginal girl called Mandy, want to go to the movies together, but the law says they are not allowed. When

they start school they cannot sit next to each other because this, too, is not allowed. When Mandy's grandma is sick and Mandy and her mum pack a suitcase to visit her, they are not allowed on the train because they do not have permission from the Director of Native Affairs.

In the centrefold of the book there is a photograph of Ruby Hammond taken in 1967, collaborating with Andrew Jones MP, the Liberal member for the federal seat of Adelaide. The pair are pictured together holding a 'Vote yes' message. As we know, Ruby Hammond was our first Aboriginal woman to run for parliament in 1988. Although unsuccessful, the state electorate of Hammond now honours her name, and she certainly paved the way for other Aboriginal women to make their mark.

Australians consider the 1967 referendum to be a great turning point that rightly gave our First Nations people equal rights. More than 50 years later we can look back and acknowledge the positive changes. However, we can also see what has not worked. Moving forward, we can do better. Australia is the only member of the 54-nation commonwealth that does not have a treaty with its First Nations people.

The Uluru Statement talks about Voice, Treaty and Truth. Establishing a Voice is only the first step. Without an Indigenous Voice, how can we have Treaty and Truth? Without an Indigenous Voice, how will the stories, cultures and histories of our First Nations people be passed on to our future generations? Without an Indigenous Voice, how will governments know what will work better so we can achieve better outcomes for our Indigenous communities?

Mr President, 27 May 1967 is described as a good day in this book. On 14 October 2023, I hope this nation has another good day and Australia says yes once again.

METHAMPHETAMINES

The Hon. S.L. GAME (15:29): It is a scourge tormenting families and terrorising communities. It not only destroys the lives of those using this insidious illicit drug but tears at the very fabric of our society. It orphans young children, fuels domestic violence, breeds criminals and violent crime, chokes our hospital system and puts emergency service officers in harm's way. It is the ice epidemic and it is gripping our community.

We have all heard the horror stories of crystal methamphetamine use. It has become the most potent and dangerous drug on Australian streets and its effects are being felt in hospitals, schools, and particularly in the criminal justice system. As legislators, our priority must be supporting families, frontline workers and communities to better respond to people affected by ice. Police, ambulance officers and hospitals are struggling to respond to the growing number of dependent ice users around the country.

The effect that this epidemic has had on violent and drug crime—and, by extension, the prosecution of such offences—is devastating. The Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission has labelled the crystal meth trade in Australia as 'the highest risk to the Australian community and is of significant national concern'. Our corrections officers and police are frequently confronted by high-risk situations where they must look after volatile and violent individuals suffering from withdrawal and the effects of the drug itself.

Those manufacturing and distributing ice operate dangerous meth labs which can go unnoticed in a neighbourhood for years, causing serious health hazards to everyone around. Methamphetamine labs breed crime. This can include burglaries, thefts and murder. Those addicted to ice who cannot pay for their habit invariably turn to crime. High on methamphetamine, there is no telling what a distressed user is capable of. Innocent people have been killed when ice users suffer psychotic reactions, while those involved may be killed over a drug debt or a transaction gone wrong. These types of incidents require a great deal of police attention, further stretching resources.

Children are at high risk of neglect when living with ice-addicted parents, with many having been orphaned. They can be exposed to violence and sexual abuse in their own homes. Data from the 2019 National Drug Strategy Household Survey suggests that, when compared to other forms of methamphetamine, those who use ice are more likely to use it more regularly. Multiple data sources also indicate that ice-related harm is increasing in Australia. The Australian Criminal Intelligence

Commission participated in a wastewater drug monitoring program with 24 countries across Europe and Asia. The subsequent report showed that Australia ranked highest in ice use per capita.

People can become dependent on crystal meth very quickly. Once dependent, they can take the drug every day or even several times a day. I am sure you have seen the many before and after photos of ice addicts online. It renders individuals unrecognisable even to family and loved ones. Meth has several side effects including behavioural issues, mood swings, anxiety, paranoia, hallucinations and psychosis. The wide range of physiological effects include track marks on the arm from needle use; sudden extreme weight loss; burns on the lips, face and fingers; rotting or broken teeth; nosebleeds; premature skin ageing; and irregular sleep patterns.

The first step to helping an ice addict is recognising the side effects and physiological effects of addiction in the first place. But are we equipped to respond effectively? It appears the answer is no. To do better, the priority must be supporting families, workers and communities to better respond to people affected by ice. We must strengthen our efforts to reduce demand for ice through prevention activities, including better educating our children and young adults. Ice users will benefit from treatment and support services that better cater to their needs.

Our law enforcement services work tirelessly to disrupt supply, but more needs to be done by both federal and state governments to ensure adequate resources for a more coordinated and targeted approach. To strengthen our response to the ice epidemic we need better data, more research and regular reporting to keep it on track. There is a need to improve and expand law enforcement responses, with particular attention to major suppliers, by increasing the capability for the illicit drug unit to better target high-end dealers and organised crime.

We can enhance existing services through integrated service delivery and expanding evidence-based treatment responses. With the provision of additional outpatient counselling appointments we can increase access to treatment across the state, particularly in regional South Australia. This can be achieved with new residential rehabilitation services in regional locations.

We need to better support South Australians struggling with addiction and their families. More needs to be done to improve access to information and provide more face-to-face support services for families. Employers and community organisations require support to intervene effectively and address issues at the local level.

RAWINSKI, MS P.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:34): So many words have been written in newspapers and spoken on radio and television, and indeed in this parliament, about the triumph of the Matildas. Australia was rightfully captivated by our champion women footballers, their skills, their tenacity and their determination. We were glued to our television screens—my family was amongst them.

However, there are so many local sporting success stories that also deserve our accolades. They are stories that do not often make it to the pages or the screens of our news outlets. They are stories of our quiet and humble athletes who dedicate years so that they, too, can pull on the green and gold colours to represent their country. Today, I am giving airtime so we can capture such a story forever in the pages of our state's history book, *Hansard*.

To help celebrate this South Australian and Australian athlete, I will use the words of her biggest fans, her children, Blair and Alex. Blair is eight and was nervous about his mum flying to the other side of the world to represent Australia at the Gaelic World Games in Ireland, particularly because this would be the longest they had ever been apart. But Blair thought it was a massive achievement that his mum was picked out of the entire country. Alex, who is six, was also sad when her mum left but feels she knows exactly why she was picked: 'She's so strong! Her legs are so muscly, they are like a footy player's'—no wiser words than those of a literal six year old.

Alex's mum is one of the strongest and most humble people that I know, and I may very well challenge Blair and Alex in being her number one fan. If she knew I was giving this speech, she would have deployed all means possible to prevent me from getting to the chamber today. I know I am not alone in wanting to share her success. Her colleagues at Annesley College want the story of their much-loved PE teacher also forever remembered in *Hansard*.

Sharyn, from the school's leadership team, was the first to admit that Penny Rawinski went about representing her country with few knowing. But what Penny does not know is that it is her story that has inspired so many around her. Penny may have thought her colleagues had not noticed in the lead-up to the Gaelic World Games that she was the first to arrive at school; that her class was first to be set up and ready to go by 7.30am; that she was squeezing in morning training sessions with her two biggest fans, Alex and Blair, dressed in their Annesley school uniform, cheering their mum on as she pushed herself to represent her country; that she would be on her feet the entire day to teach seven lessons of PE; and, of course, during the lunch break Penny was out running three to five kilometres. All of this prep happened quietly without many knowing, but it inspired those around her.

As Kin, the school's PE coordinator, mentioned, to be an elite athlete, on your feet to teach seven lessons of PE, only to go home and be a mum, is honestly inspirational. All that quiet prep had a similar ending to the Matilda's season. The Australasia team made it to the semifinals of the Gaelic World Games. They fell short by one point to America, ranking them third in the world—an incredible achievement.

While I know Penny is disappointed with this result, just like the Matildas, she has inspired many around her through her tenacity on the field and also in the classroom. Penny is a role model. As Sharyn rightfully highlighted, when students know they are being taught by a PE teacher who lives and breathes sport at an elite level, it is very powerful for them. As a fellow PE teacher, Kin knows you need to have a good mindset and a smile permanently on your face when teaching PE. That is Penny, and the students feed off it.

As Kin mentioned, Penny's approach to giving agency to all kids to participate so no child is left behind is a refreshing quality for PE teachers. Penny has moved mountains to give students who may have come last in a race or have anxiety about sports day the opportunity to participate. I will use her husband Paul's words to close:

Penny is not just an incredible mum, but a positive role model for our kids. She's such a humble person, but that does not make us any less proud of her tremendous achievements. She absolutely makes me [a better person].

MOUNT GAMBIER

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:39): I rise to update the chamber on some positive developments in Mount Gambier. A recent article from ABC South East that told of millennials flocking to Mount Gambier for jobs and lifestyle, but house prices and rents continuing to rise, captured both the positive and negative aspects of this development. It is exciting news that more young people are opting to change scenery and move to our beautiful South-East community, and I warmly welcome them as a proud resident of Mount Gambier.

According to data from the Regional Australia Institute, 70 per cent of individuals who relocated to the Mount Gambier local government area in the first quarter of 2023 were millennials. Liz Ritchie, the CEO of the institute, attributes the surge of young people to affordable housing and increased job opportunities, terming it a 'regional renaissance'.

The Big Movers 2023 Report by the RAI reveals that an additional 54,000 millennials have moved to Australia's regions compared with the previous five years, reversing a net loss of 37,000 millennials observed from 2011 to 2016. This influx also includes many highly skilled and educated individuals from overseas, showcasing a dynamic change in our regional landscape.

Belinda Anderson, who was interviewed by ABC South East and previously lived in Sydney, Birdsville and Mount Isa, has played a pivotal role in expanding the Young Professionals Network, with its membership growing from 500 people to over 1,100 in the past six months. I commend her and appreciate the vibrancy and talent that millennial individuals like Belinda bring to Mount Gambier, our state's second biggest city.

However, as the article rightly highlights, the challenge of providing housing for a growing number of young people is certainly there. Domain reports that rents in regional SA have surged by 42 per cent since the start of the pandemic, with median house sales and rents reaching record levels.

As I have argued previously in my time as deputy mayor and councillor of the City of Mount Gambier, to grow the city we can either expand out and take up vital agricultural land, or we can grow up and allow for multistorey living within the city bounds. Large four-bedroom homes are unsuitable for many young professionals, whereas smaller apartments would be more conducive to their lifestyle. It would improve the vibrancy of Mount Gambier's CBD and free up existing housing stock for families. Non-detached or medium-density dwellings, what the RAI refers to as the 'missing middle', are lacking in our regional towns.

Housing diversity is required to ensure we are meeting the needs and preferences of this new cohort of tree changers, who are often young, single professionals and skilled tradespeople. All levels of government must work together to ensure sufficient and suitable housing stock is made available to sustain these positive trends in regional migration.

While I am on my feet, I would like to congratulate the Mount Gambier Chamber of Commerce and the Women in Business and Regional Development for promoting the South-East business community through their 2023 Business Awards. The awards were held on 18 August and saw the induction of Wendy Richardson's Red Gum Country into the Mount Gambier Chamber of Commerce Hall of Fame for her business's 30 years of outstanding customer service.

Raison Detre Creative Co's Rene Veno won the Women in Business and Regional Development scholarship, which provides \$2,000 for self-development and to support her on her business journey. I also wish to congratulate the award winners in eight other categories, namely:

- Illumident Mount Gambier for the Large Business Growth and Resilience Award;
- Alex Marlow of Gym Challenge Meals in the Small Business Growth and Resilience category;
- Just frank in the Micro Business Growth and Resilience category;
- Eirene Couzens of Metro Bakery and Cafe for the Intrapreneur Leader in a Business Award;
- Key 2 Sale for the Commitment to People and Culture Award;
- ac.care for the Community Conscious Award;
- Dr Isabel Holmes for the Courageous Business Leader Award; and
- the three Champions of Business Award winners: Bill Burley from Blue Lake Bar and Bistro, Di Ind from Limestone Coast Solutions and Rachael Ashman from Regional Development Australia Limestone Coast.

I want to congratulate all of these inspiring South-East businesspeople and extend a huge thankyou to executive officer Jacinta Jones from Women in Business and Regional Development, and Candice Fennell, President of the Mount Gambier Chamber of Commerce, and both of those committees for presenting the 2023 Business Awards in Mount Gambier.

EDUCATIONAL EQUITY

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (15:44): Over a decade ago, the University of Adelaide School of Law signed into being a program called the Adelaide Law School Achievement Program. It is an entry pathway that accepts the student from any South Australian secondary school who achieves the top selection rank among their school's year 12 cohort who nominate a law preference. An early student to take up this entry pathway was a top achiever from one of the most disadvantaged high schools in Adelaide. Although a very strong student, her ATAR score would not otherwise have been high enough to study law at Adelaide. She thus became the first student from her high school ever to be accepted to law at the University of Adelaide.

A few years later, she became the first student from her high school ever to earn a law degree, but this cannot be because no other kid from her school ever aspired to become a lawyer. It is widely understood that kids who grow up in environments of social economic disadvantage face massive barriers to educational achievement that their more privileged peers rarely have to contend

with. It is a reality that begins affecting their chances in life long before they start school. Talent is equally distributed across our community; opportunity, however, is not.

Rich kids do not start life smarter than disadvantaged kids. Disadvantaged kids simply do not have a level playing field on which to develop their skills. An unknown number of talented students, due to the circumstances of their lives and often due to their postcodes, are fighting uphill from day one. Their school performance is far less likely than their more privileged peers to reflect their true intellectual potential. Expecting them to keep fighting uphill amid all their challenges for long enough to finish year 12 with strong results is asking too much and is leaving too many behind. It is hard to prioritise school work if, as just one example, you also have to hold down a job to help put food on the table and keep the lights on.

It takes a whole-of-system approach to education and child development policies that starts in the early years and a government willing to invest meaningfully in their efforts to see a nontrivial proportion of talented disadvantaged kids access the opportunities in education and in life that they deserve, but that is exactly how a just society should operate. It should take steps to level the playing field by implementing effective means to distribute opportunity, supporting all young people to make the most of their innate ability. There is a term to describe this: capitalisation of talent. Until I heard it, I did not have a specific phrase to capture one of the main reasons that drove me to get involved in politics.

A jurisdiction's capitalisation rate is the proportion of people within that jurisdiction who can realise their potential whatever the circumstances of their lives. It is one measure that reflects how successful and how fair a society is. When we maximise the capitalisation of talent, everybody wins. It is not just the right thing to do; it is a clear economic and productivity imperative. The individual student benefits, along with their family, their community, their state and their country. With a genuine distribution of opportunity, barriers to economic mobility start to evaporate. If you are serious about capitalisation, you must recognise that supporting disadvantaged secondary school students to access university pathways is only part of the endgame.

The most crucial years of a child's development are the earliest years. I am proud of the Malinauskas government's commitment to delivering on the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Early Childhood Education and Care. Prioritising the 1,000 most vulnerable children in our state in the rollout of universal access to preschool for three year olds is exactly the sort of action that will help to distribute opportunity where it is needed and to facilitate better capitalisation of talent. Each of the 12 recommendations that we will implement will help make a difference.

To see meaningful progress you cannot just do a few things. Success requires a massive shift in the way your systems operate. You must play a very long game. This is a government that I know will keep working to improve how we distribute opportunity for young South Australians. However long I personally remain here, I will embed the principles underlying the effective capitalisation of talent in my work and in my advocacy.

TREVITT, MS S.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:48): I rise to speak about Sophie Trevitt, a former colleague and Greens comrade who passed away on 27 July after a nine-month battle with brain cancer, a heroic battle because she was only 32. The death of any young person is tragic but particularly when that young person was making such an enormous contribution and who had so much more to give to the world.

Sophie was a big part of our Greens family, having been a former convener of the ACT Greens and a long-time parliamentary staffer. She was someone who was integral to the rise of our movement and the fact that so many of my colleagues around the country have spoken about Sophie in their respective chambers really reflects the impact that she had.

Sophie was born on 28 February 1991 in Sydney. She became involved with the Oaktree Foundation at high school, with a passion against injustice that led her to study arts law at Sydney University. In 2013, Sophie moved to the ACT to continue her studies at the ANU and at just 21 she became involved with the ACT Greens on her first election campaign.

I first met Sophie during my time in federal parliament, back in 2015. She was working then for Senator Richard Di Natale, having also been a staffer to his predecessor, Christine Milne. I was only 13 when I went into the federal parliament and was very nervous about my new job.

The Hon. T.A. Franks: How old?

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Sorry, 31.

The PRESIDENT: You are amazing!

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I might only look 13 sometimes, Mr President. I was very nervous about the job, particularly being only 13, but I met Sophie when she was in her early 20s and I really remember her kindness. She was level-headed, she had a great sense of humour, a great wisdom beyond her years, she genuinely believed in the power of politics to change things for the better and she brought that passion and optimism to everything she did. She cared about the parliament and she saw its capacity to do good work. Her office was just around the corner from the party room, so I would often pop in for a chat and I really enjoyed our conversations about politics.

Sophie was one of those people working in the political field who cared deeply about people and we saw this in her years of advocacy work. After finishing at the office of Richard Di Natale in 2016, Sophie moved on to work for the ACT Greens leader, Shane Rattenbury, and she made an instant impact in that role, managing a team of seven and overseeing policy and media and communication strategy.

From there, she went on to work as a solicitor for the North Aboriginal Justice Agency for three years before joining Change the Record. It was through this campaign that we had an opportunity to work together again. She had been following the situation in South Australia, and of course across the country, very closely.

Sophie was a powerhouse campaigner for human rights and for social justice. It was her work on the campaign to raise the age of criminal responsibility that was rightly celebrated. In 2020, she was awarded the ACT Youth Coalition Award and in 2023 she received Liberty Victoria's Voltaire Award for Human Rights. We Greens will certainly continue to pursue that campaign.

While Sophie's time with us was cut tragically short, I know that her legacy will live on. My thoughts are with her partner, Tom, and with her family and friends. In the days after her death, Sophie's partner, climate change strategist Tom Swann, Christine Milne, Cheryl Axelby and Antoinette Braybrook—co-chairs of Change the Record—wrote a moving tribute in *The Guardian*, and I think it is appropriate that I read their words into *Hansard* as I conclude this speech. It reads:

Sophie's wish was for her story to inspire others to make a difference in the world. She urged us to be kind, brave and to fight for justice and the safety of all people

So: be kind, be brave. Fight for justice. Fight to make people safe. Expect better from those in power. Today and all tomorrows, ask yourself: what would Sophie do?

Sophie's legacy is something I know all Greens will continue to draw inspiration from. A life cut way too short. Rest in peace.

Motions

MOROCCO EARTHQUAKE

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:55): On behalf of the Hon. C.M. Scriven, I move:

That this council—

1. Notes the devastating 6.8 magnitude earthquake that has struck central Morocco, 11.11pm local time on Friday 8 September, killing thousands of people, injuring similar numbers, and causing severe destruction across the country;
2. Acknowledges the critical work of rescue crews that have desperately searched for survivors in the immediate aftermath, as well as health workers and first-aid providers who are providing the immediate health response;
3. Notes the ongoing impact and displacement that will face many Moroccan people following the earthquake;

4. Acknowledges the impact this earthquake will have on the small but growing South Australian Moroccan community and stands with our Moroccan community, especially those who have family and friends in affected areas; and
5. Extends its condolences to the people of Morocco and their families and friends here and abroad.

I rise today to convey sincere condolences to the global Moroccan community in the wake of the 6.8 magnitude earthquake that struck the country at 11.11pm local time on Friday 8 September. The epicentre was located in Al Haouz in the High Atlas mountain range near Marrakesh. Shocks were felt in Casablanca, Rabat, Fez and neighbouring towns, causing widespread panic among the impacted population.

It is the biggest earthquake in Morocco in over a century. The Moroccan government has assessed that over 300,000 people have now been displaced by the earthquake or are now homeless. Media are reporting that at least 2,680 people have so far died and another 2,500 have been injured. These statistics will obviously increase as time goes on.

Witnessing the media reports of the devastation has been harrowing. Whole families have been killed, children orphaned, families made homeless, villages destroyed and historic buildings lost forever. I must say, looking at some of these media reports, it is quite sad to see that help has taken so long to get to these villages to help the people. It is pretty sad to see people, everyday citizens, digging in the buildings to try to uncover their loved ones—most of the time, when they are found, they are deceased. Our hearts are with the Moroccan people and those immediately affected.

The fact that much of the housing and buildings in the rural areas are typically made of mud bricks has complicated the situation immensely. The immediate impacts are often not what we see the most, but there are going to be long-term consequences that can impact those affected for years to come. We know that the aftershocks will continue to cause havoc in the area, which will potentially cause additional damage. Rebuilding will take a lot of time and there is going to be a significant proportion who will be displaced. We also cannot forget the emotional toll this earthquake will have on the community.

In these moments of despair, there are also moments of hope and small moments of joy when loved ones have been found and reunited with their families. This is an opportune time to recognise the rescue crews, first responders and health providers who are working around the clock in such difficult circumstances and putting their own lives at risk.

From an Australian perspective, at this stage the Australian government is not aware of any Australian casualties or hospitalisations. While the Australian government has not received a specific request from Morocco for assistance, it is my understanding that they are ready to consider any such request in the future. Australia already contributes to the International Federation of Red Cross Disaster Relief Emergency Fund. The fund has a ready released one million Swiss francs to assist the response of the local Moroccan Red Cross Society.

South Australia is home to a relatively small but growing Moroccan community. The 2021 Census reported only 111 Moroccan-born people in South Australia, up from 80 reported in 2016 and 58 in 2011. I want to convey our thoughts to our community here, especially anyone whose friends or loved ones have been impacted by these tragic events. I can only imagine the worry and concern that our Moroccan community is facing with loved ones impacted or simply seeing their fellow Moroccans go through such tragic circumstances.

It was only a few weeks ago that we were celebrating together with the Moroccan women's national football team, who debuted at the FIFA Women's World Cup this year, the first country in the Arab world to do so since the competition was established in 1991. At the games played in Adelaide, and throughout the tournament, crowd support for Morocco was strong and the passionate community spirit was clear for all to see.

All South Australians stand with Morocco in the wake of the devastating earthquake, and our thoughts remain with our wider Australian Moroccan community at this time.

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

ASTHMA WEEK

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:59): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes that 1 to 7 September was Asthma Week, with the focus for 2023 being 'How Healthy is Your Home?'
2. Acknowledges that the report released by Asthma Australia in 2023, titled Homes, Health and Asthma in Australia, found that—
 - (a) many Australians are exposed to asthma triggers in their home including emissions from gas appliances, mould and pests such as dust mites;
 - (b) 50 per cent of Australians have had mould or dampness in their home in the last 12 months;
 - (c) 48 per cent of Australians use a gas cooktop even though cooking with gas is estimated to be responsible for up to 12 per cent of the childhood asthma burden; and
 - (d) one-quarter of Australians are not happy with, or are unsure about the air quality inside their homes.
3. Calls on the Malinauskas government to address the findings of the report by—
 - (a) banning gas connections to new homes;
 - (b) implementing minimum efficiency standards for rental homes;
 - (c) supporting people on low incomes to transition to efficient heating and cooking appliances; and
 - (d) developing education programs to support people in preventing pests and mould to improve asthma outcomes.

This motion notes that last week, 1 to 7 September, was Asthma Week, with a focus for 2023 being on 'How healthy is your home?'

The motion acknowledges that the report released by Asthma Australia in 2023, entitled Homes, Health and Asthma, found that many Australians are exposed to asthma triggers in their home, including emissions from gas appliances, mould and pests, such as dust mites. Fifty per cent of Australians have had mould or dampness in their home in the last 12 months. Forty-eight per cent of Australians use a gas cooktop, even though cooking with gas is estimated to be responsible for up to 12 per cent of the childhood asthma burden, and one-quarter of Australians are not happy or are unsure about the air quality inside their homes.

The motion calls on the government to take some action in relation to that. In particular, it calls on the Malinauskas government to ban gas connections to new homes. Members of this place will recall that I have a bill before this parliament that would ban gas connections from 2025. It is also calling on the government to implement minimum efficiency standards for rental homes, to support people on low incomes to transition to efficient heating and cooking appliances, and to develop educational programs to support people in preventing pests and mould to improve asthma outcomes.

In terms of a bit about asthma, it is a condition that impacts the lives of many South Australians. According to Asthma Australia, one in nine people in Australia have asthma, and South Australia has the highest rate in the country at 13 per cent. It is a condition that has no boundaries. It affects people of all ages and all walks of life. This year's theme, 'How healthy is your home?', invites us to focus on the relationship between the home and the communities in which we live and asthma. The air we breathe is essential to good health and wellbeing, and the recent report from Asthma Australia highlights that nexus between conditions in the home and health conditions like asthma.

This leads me to highlight some of the problems with gas. Research has shown a clear link between exposure to indoor gas emissions and an increased risk in vulnerable people, such as children and older people. Gas emissions are estimated to be responsible for up to 12 per cent of all childhood asthma, and the presence of many gas appliances in homes is exacerbating the problem. Forty-eight per cent of Australians still have gas cooktops, and many people are unaware of the link between their cooking and asthma.

We need to take action to reduce the health costs of using gas in our homes, and banning gas connections is one clear way that we can do that. I do understand that a lot of people are concerned about the impact of transitioning away from gas and their home cooking habits. For a gourmet chef like myself, that is a big sacrifice.

The Hon. T.A. Franks: You are misleading the parliament.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: The honourable member has pointed out I am misleading the parliament.

The PRESIDENT: Is that a point of order, the Hon. Ms Franks?

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I am making a gag, because I am terrible cook, but I have heard from people who I understand to be good cooks that with the evolution of technology now it is actually possible to still cook effectively with electric, and you can have a lot more control over the new induction-style cooktops, so it is not a case of there being a choice between being able to have that element of control with gas versus electric, as used to be the case perhaps years ago. Technology has evolved. Instead of having gas connected to new properties, we need to be encouraging the adoption of electric cooktops that produce fewer indoor pollutants and are a cleaner and a safer alternative.

Asthma Australia reports also call for better energy efficiency and ventilation standards, and this is particularly important for renters who are disempowered in ensuring that the health of their home is being upheld. We know that renters are often in a situation where they are at the mercy of the landlord and, if they have a problem with asthma, they are often powerless to be able to get the landlord to take the steps necessary. Hopefully, that will be something the Malinauskas government will remedy when it finally brings its next tranche of reforms to this house for consideration.

By ensuring there are minimum standards for rental properties and social housing we can give those people more security that their home will not have adverse impacts on their health. People on low incomes also need to be given support to make a transition away from asthma triggers and be able to access more efficient heating and cooking appliances. That is one of the reasons the Greens have been calling for the government to follow the lead of other jurisdictions like the ACT and actually make subsidies available to support people to make that transition.

Access to affordable energy efficient options can improve indoor air while reducing energy costs. This support can come in the form of subsidies, incentives or community grant programs aimed at providing these vital upgrades for people in our community who need them most.

I should also reflect that the motion makes reference to the effect of mould and pests. The Asthma Australia report on healthy homes found that, in the last 12 months, 50 per cent of Australians have had damp or mould in their homes—50 per cent! We know of course that that is being impacted by climate change as well and the change of weather conditions, but 50 per cent have had damp or mould in their home and 70 per cent have had pests. The report identifies barriers to people addressing these contributing factors, such as the cost of eradication, the lack of autonomy over property and the lack of knowledge.

The Greens are calling on the Malinauskas government to undertake community education and support for people so they can assert their rights. By addressing these factors in the home that contribute to asthma we can make inroads into reducing the impact of asthma on South Australians, our health system and the whole community.

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

AUSTRALIAN EDUCATION UNION

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:06): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes that the Australian Education Union (AEU) (SA Branch) took industrial action on 1 September 2023 in response to the Malinauskas government's enterprise bargaining offer.
2. Acknowledges that 80 per cent of AEU members who voted in the ballot to take industrial action voted in favour of doing so.

3. Calls on the Malinauskas government to commit to supporting South Australian public education by making an offer that meets the AEU's requests for—
 - (a) reducing face-to-face teaching by 20 per cent to eliminate excessive and unsustainable workloads;
 - (b) an additional school services officer in every classroom to provide school students with necessary learning support; and
 - (c) a salary rise of 20 per cent over three years to attract and retain public school educators.

This motion notes that the Australian Education Union (SA Branch) took industrial action on 1 September 2023 in response to the Malinauskas government's enterprise bargaining offer. It acknowledges that 80 per cent of our new members who voted in the ballot to take that industrial action voted in favour of the strike.

The motion calls on the Malinauskas government to commit to supporting South Australian public education by making an offer that meets the AEU's requests for reducing face-to-face teaching by 20 per cent to eliminate excessive, unsustainable workloads; provides for an additional school services officer in every classroom to provide school students with necessary learning support; and a salary rise of 20 per cent over three years to attract and retain public school educators.

It is important for this parliament to discuss the industrial action that was recently taken by public schoolteachers and the state of the ongoing enterprise bargaining negotiations between the state government and the Australian Education Union, because teachers and educators were forced to take that action, as the pressure on our teachers is higher than ever and they are facing growing bureaucratic requirements that reduce time for the core work of teaching. Whilst this is happening, they must manage increasing complex needs from students, and we are seeing this right across our education system.

It is worth highlighting a UniSA report, which was released earlier this year, which surveyed 1,600 South Australian teachers and found that our teachers work above and beyond the hours for which they are paid. On average, they are working over 50 hours a week, including just over 20 hours of face-to-face teaching and 30 hours of additional tasks. Shockingly, almost half of all respondents stated that they intended to leave teaching within five years. Almost half of all respondents said that they intend to leave the profession within five years. Imagine what impact that could have on our public education system, particularly when one considers the crisis it is already facing.

It is clear that there is a crisis affecting our schools and preschools right across the state and that our school leaders and support staff are doing their best just to keep the education system running. Indeed, recent Department for Education data indicates that over 35,000 SA students are without a consistent teacher due to staffing shortages.

In the ongoing enterprise bargaining negotiations, the Australian Education Union put forward solutions to fix the crisis. These included a reduction in face-to-face teaching by 20 per cent to eliminate excessive and unsustainable workloads, an additional school services officer in every classroom to provide school students with necessary learning support, and a salary increase. But the offer they received from the state government ignored almost every proposal put forward by teachers and their union to fix the education system.

It was hardly surprising, then, that the AEU's statewide ballot to take industrial action saw an extraordinary 80 per cent of its members vote in support. Teachers were simply no longer willing to accept an offer that would have seen this crisis continue. The Greens stood in solidarity with thousands of public school educators when they took industrial action on 1 September, and it was an honour to address the crowd outside the front of Parliament House. We will continue to support them in their struggle for better pay and work conditions.

Although I understand the state government has come back to the table with a revised offer to avert this Friday's planned strike action, it is clear there is still a long way to go between the AEU's asks and the government's new offer. The revised salary increase of just 3 per cent per year is still below the AEU demands for between 5 and 8.6 per cent per year for three years and below inflation before the last strike.

It is especially concerning that some teachers in some schools will not receive a reduction in their workloads until 2030. Teachers are already working above and beyond the hours for which they are paid, and seven years is simply far too long for them to wait. It is the responsibility of governments to adequately invest in and provide a quality public education for all. It must provide working conditions that ensure that our educators can deliver the best outcomes for South Australian students irrespective of where they live and whatever their postcode may be. The government needs to sit down in good faith, listen to our teachers and support South Australian public education by putting an offer on the table that actually meets their needs.

I think it is worth reflecting on the journey we have been on during these COVID years. If I look at the focus on healthcare workers, there has been an appropriate focus on the contribution they have made, and I think their contribution has been celebrated and rightly so. They were working at the frontline in terms of keeping our communities safe.

But what about our teachers? What about our teachers, who were also working through those really challenging conditions, trying to negotiate online teaching, or who were accommodating students back into the classroom, keeping our children safe in the middle of a pandemic? Where has been the recognition from government for their work? Where has been the recognition from the former Liberal government and now the Malinauskas Labor government for their work?

It is not acceptable in my mind for the government to say, 'We can't afford it. We don't have the money to make this happen.' Budgets are about choices, and this is a government that was willing to throw half a billion dollars at a university merger without even reading the business case. They were happy to do that, yet they expect the community to believe that they cannot find the money to pay teachers what they are worth.

We have a government in Canberra that is going to be spending \$250 billion on tax cuts for the megarich, yet we cannot afford to pay teachers what they are worth. We are going to be seeing \$360 billion being spent on war machines that are going to be made in South Australia, but, again, we cannot afford to pay teachers what they are worth.

This is a government in South Australia that is shelling out \$15 billion on a road project that has blown out. Talk about tunnel vision—quite literally tunnel vision. What are they going to do about the teacher crisis? They cannot keep saying they cannot afford it. It does not wash. The government needs to do something about it.

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

NATIONAL THREATENED SPECIES DAY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:14): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that Thursday 7 September 2023 was National Threatened Species Day;
2. Notes that Whalers Way, located on the southern tip of Eyre Peninsula, is home to a number of threatened, endangered and migratory species including the southern emu-wren and southern right whale;
3. Acknowledges that the Southern Launch Whalers Way Orbital Launch Complex poses a significant risk to the protected habitat crucial for the survival of the southern emu-wren and southern right whale; and
4. Calls on the Malinauskas government to safeguard this nature sanctuary and commit to zero extinctions as a matter of priority.

This is Biodiversity Month and last week it was National Threatened Species Day. It is an important day in Australian history, as it marks the date on which the Tasmanian tiger was officially declared an extinct species in 1936. It was 60 years on, in 1996, that we saw the first inaugural National Threatened Species Day.

It is, I think, a time to reflect on human stupidity and greed. That tiger was believed to have died from the cold after being locked out of its sleeping quarters in the Hobart Zoo back in 1936. Yet the species, of course, had already received its real death sentence despite being common in Tasmania before European settlement as far back as 1803. Tasmanian tigers were believed to have

been driven to extinction predominantly by hunting, with habitat destruction and disease believed also to have played a role.

Since 1936, far too many other species have followed the Tassie tiger down that sad extinction path. National Threatened Species Day is a stark reminder that the native species we respect and adore could well slip away from us unless we act now. There are far too many on the list, but today I will focus on two in particular and one place in South Australia in particular—a very special place.

Whalers Way, located on the southern tip of Eyre Peninsula in South Australia, is home to a number of threatened, endangered and migratory species. It is located within a conservation zone and it is covered by a state heritage agreement due to its significant native vegetation. Whalers Way also represents critical remnant habitat for the southern emu-wren of Eyre Peninsula, a beautiful bird which has recently had its protection increased by changing its national conservation status from vulnerable to endangered.

The southern emu-wren is a small bird with a stick-like tail of six feathers. It is called an emu-wren because those tail feathers are emu-like. Their plumage is olive grey or brown grey. It has a brown streak across its head, neck and back, and it has a white belly. The male has a distinctive large patch of light or sky blue on its chin, throat and upper breast, and a stripe above its eye, which the female does not have. The southern emu-wren is not very skilled at flying, and instead tends to hop or scramble like a mouse through scrubland and habitat. It might be able to fly for perhaps a few metres at best, if it can manage that.

The main threat to the southern emu-wren at Whalers Way is the loss, degradation and fragmentation of habitat. The largest threat right now to the southern emu-wren in South Australia at Whalers Way is Southern Launch, an Australian rocket launch and range service provider which has been using Whalers Way as a rocket launching complex since September 2021. According to Southern Launch's own environmental impact statement, the southern emu-wren may well be significantly impacted by:

...habitat loss, fauna mortality from vehicle strike, and indirect impacts that may lead to behavioural changes from noise and light.

Put simply, Whalers Way is the wrong place for space. It is an industry that is experimental by its very nature and fraught with danger to this species.

The Nature Conservation Society of South Australia has said land clearance, disturbance by humans, including noise, vibration and cars, as well as the increased risk of bushfire, puts the bird at extreme risk. The rocket launching campaign is a significant risk to this area of national environmental significance and threatens the protected habitat that is critical to these species' survival. Despite all this, the proponent, Southern Launch, continues to push ahead with its plan and refuses to refer it for consideration under the EPBC Act.

Whalers Way is also an important nursery for the migratory southern right whale, listed as endangered under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act. The southern right whale usually calves every three years, but a 2022 Curtin University led study has found that the majority of whales are having an offspring only every four or five years. Indeed, the report found that increased calving intervals have been linked to climate change and slower recovery rates.

For more than 30 years researchers have conducted annual surveys of southern right whales to track their population off Australia's southern coastline. Southern right whales were once abundant in the waters off South Australia, but intensive whaling in the 1800s drastically scaled back their numbers. Again, we point to human greed and, in some ways, stupidity. The right whales, as many in this chamber would know, were called the 'right whales' because they were seen as the right ones to hunt. Why? Because they were close to the shore, they were slow, they would float when dead, and it would be easy to harvest the abundant oil and baleen.

Conservation efforts have boosted the endangered species' Australian population to around 3,000, but the report author, Dr Claire Charlton, has said more can be done to protect the southern right whales. A recent census recorded low numbers this year. Only 320 whales were counted this year, compared to 530 last year, with significantly fewer mother and calf pairs than in previous years.

Census takers, photographers and tourism officials are devastated, saying the ocean feels like a 'barren desert' this season.

We know that the key threats to whale populations are habitat destruction, underwater noise and strikes from marine vessels and entanglement. Scientific evidence continues to emerge that the level of noise pollution associated with this type of development causes serious behavioural disruption in these marine mammals. This is not the right place for space at Whalers Way.

Southern Launch's environmental impact statement is also trying to claim that the debris would not have a significant impact on marine life below the surface and that the noise from rocket-launchers and tests would not expose any wildlife to a decibel level sufficient to cause 'permanent hearing damage'. This rocket launching campaign will have devastating impacts on all the animals who call Whalers Way their home. That is the real potential here. Allowing this experimental process to go ahead—something that was approved only temporarily—does risk long-term damage to Australia's already struggling biodiversity.

The South Australian Heritage Act was established in 1978 to prevent the overclearance of native vegetation and to protect native fauna in the agricultural regions of our state. The memorandum of agreement states that the landholder shall not, without the written consent of the minister, undertake or permit within the heritage agreement area the clearance of native vegetation; the planting of vegetation, whether native or exotic; the construction of a building or other structure; the grazing of stock or any other activity that, in the opinion of the minister, is likely to damage, injure or endanger the native vegetation or native fauna within the heritage agreement area.

Less than 1 per cent of land in South Australia is protected under the Heritage Act, and Whalers Way is just a tiny part of that tiny percentage. That heritage agreement is an incredibly important act, as we reflect on Biodiversity Month, because it was established at a time when it was becoming clearer and clearer that we needed to protect what little we had left of our native vegetation, the flora and fauna, into the future.

That was 45 years ago. The need was great then; the need is even greater now. Natural ecosystems and biodiversity are essential to human health and wellbeing and there is an inextricable link between a healthy environment and the health of us and our society. Protected areas such as Whalers Way are vital to the preservation of Australia's biodiversity. They are vital to the continuation in South Australia of the southern emu-wren.

As we reflect on National Threatened Species Day, and the stupidity of human populations and the devastating effect that has on other populations, I think it is important to reflect on a day like this that is important, a month like this that is important, but action right now is important: putting space in the right place, ensuring we do not repeat the mistakes of our past. If we do not reflect on days like today and the history that we already have, we are doomed to reflect and repeat the mistakes of our past. With that, I commend the motion.

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

TOURISM AND TRANSPORT FORUM AUSTRALIA

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:26): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that the Tourism and Transport Forum Australia (TTF) is the peak industry group for the Australian tourism, transport and aviation sectors;
2. Acknowledges the impact of TTF as a membership organisation consisting of leading businesses and institutions and its important work to grow industry capacity, resilience and connections since its establishment in 1989; and
3. Congratulates TTF for hosting its inaugural Friends of Tourism event in South Australia on 30 August 2023 by highlighting the important contribution of tourism to our regional, state and national economies and communities.

As the shadow minister for tourism and hospitality, it is a great honour to speak about the tourism industry in parliament today and to recognise the Tourism and Transport Forum Australia as the peak

industry group for the Australian tourism, transport and aviation sectors and its important work to grow industry capacity, resilience and connections since its establishment in 1989.

The travel and tourism industry is one of the largest industries in Australia, contributing over \$50 billion to GDP in recent years. It is also the country's largest service export industry, accounting for around 10 per cent of total exports. Before the pandemic, approximately 748,000 people were employed directly within the tourism sector, or roughly one in 13 working Australians. This is a figure that has almost doubled over the last decade. By comparison, in the financial year 2019 the mining sector in Australia employed approximately just 50,000 people in total, and had a much slower job growth rate of 0.4 per cent over the next five years.

Prior to COVID, there had been huge growth in Australian tourism from China, India, the Asia-Pacific and other countries that have growing middle classes. The resumption of tourism after the COVID era is good news for thousands of people employed directly in hospitality and tourism, but it is also great news for the whole country. Tourism is a huge and growing industry that provides a lot of direct employment and has been the key driver of major economies. Going forward, the tourism sector will form an even more crucial part of Australia's post-pandemic economic recovery over the coming years.

I also want to take a moment in my contribution today to highlight the impact tourism has on secondary and regional communities. In addition to the significant direct and indirect employment of thousands of people in Australia, tourism also has a positive flow-on impact on other industries, such as agriculture and cultural industries, and on remote and regional communities. Perhaps most obviously, hospitality and tourism are intrinsically connected, with roughly 30 per cent of every international tourist dollar being spent on food and accommodation services in Australia. Roughly 44¢ of every tourist dollar goes to regional areas, making it an important mainstream revenue source for rural communities.

Of course, tourists do not only eat, drink or stay at hotels. They are also increasingly interested in recreational and cultural activities, and their spending supports sports and cultural events, local artists and creative industries. The number of international tourists who are participating in Indigenous cultural activities in Australia, for example, grew by over 40 per cent between 2013 and 2018. In 2017, 47 per cent of those visitors saw an art, craft or cultural display or exhibition, 29 per cent attended a dance or theatre performance, and 14 per cent purchased locally made products, crafts, art and souvenirs to take home.

The love of animals and ecosystems is now a major reason for travelling. This area accounts for 20 to 40 per cent of the global tourism industry. The Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. David Speirs, is passionate about nature-based tourism and he did an amazing job as the Minister for Environment and Water in the Marshall Liberal government in opening up reservoirs and national parks. He continues to work hard to advocate for tourism policies that connect people with nature.

Indeed, Australia's isolation, unique flora and fauna, natural assets and low population have made it a popular destination for international visitors who want to enjoy nature away from the crowds. That desire for natural purity and sparse population has become even more popular among tourists following the pandemic. A 2021 survey across 13 countries involving 20,000 respondents showed that Australia, New Zealand and Canada came in as the top destinations that tourists would like to visit. Not surprisingly, the reasons given by respondents are that countries like Australia, New Zealand and Canada are less populated, nature-based destinations with clean environments.

Having outlined how important our tourism industry is for our regional state and national economies and communities, I would like to highlight the outstanding work of the Tourism and Transport Forum as the peak industry body for the Australian tourism, transport and aviation sectors. These sectors are important to our economy and prosperity. Over the last few years, these sectors have faced several challenges but are bouncing back, demonstrating incredible resilience.

By way of background, TTF was originally known as the tourism passport. It was established as a not-for-profit company in 1989 to provide a strong voice for the tourism and aviation sectors in the wake of Australia's devastating pilot strikes that year, which weakened tourism and business. Further to this, the task force was established to address other issues impacting the industry at the

time, including a reduction of the Australian Tourist Commission budget, hotel ownership and the development of Sydney Airport's third runway.

In 2002, a distinguished business leader in the airline industry, Leslie Cassar AM, took on the leadership and expanded TTF's charter to better embrace aviation and transport. The following year, TTF rebranded from tourism task force and became Tourism and Transport Forum Australia to better reflect its direction. Of course, it was very clear and fortuitous that the acronym TTF remained the same, even though its full title has changed.

Recognising the interdependence of tourism, aviation and transport, TTF has six member pillars:

- accommodation including advisers, casinos, hotel owners, investors, resort services and apartment sectors;
- aviation including airlines, airports and air navigation sectors;
- major and business events retail and hospitality including caterers, event suppliers, convention and exhibition centres, restaurants, stadiums and wineries;
- professional services including education and technology which incorporates accounting, advisory, consulting, education, legal, public relations, research and technology sectors;
- tourism marketing, attractions and travel operators, which include cruise lines, cultural attractions, nature-based tourism, theme parks, tourism marketing organisations and travel operators; and
- transport and infrastructure including sectors for buses and coaches, construction firms, ferries, project advisers, rental cars and taxi services.

This is a very broad sector. TTF continues its important work of supporting tourism, aviation and transport businesses to respond to contemporary challenges that these sectors experience by growing their industry capacity, resilience and connections.

Leadership, of course, is fundamental to drive the success of TTF. I would like to place my acknowledgement on the public record to thank the chair, board members, the CEO and the entire TTF team. The TTF chair, the Hon. Bruce Baird's professional career has spanned the Australian Trade Commission service and the New South Wales and federal parliaments.

Bruce was the federal member for Cook for nine years and, during that time, he was chairman of both the trade committee and house Standing Committee on Economics. He previously held roles as the New South Wales minister for transport, tourism and roads and minister for Sydney's Olympic bid. Prior to this, he was Australia's assistant trade commissioner in Germany and trade commissioner in New York. Bruce certainly is serving TTF very well.

In addition to the chair and the board's leadership, TTF is a formidable peak body because it has an industry champion as a chief executive officer in Margy Osmond. Margy assumed the role in 2014 and has been doing an amazing job with passion and tenacity. Margy has extensive experience in policy development, advocacy, politics, membership organisations, management, media and public relations. Before joining TTF, Margy was the inaugural CEO of the Australian National Retailers Association, now the Retail Council, which was established in 2006. Prior to this, Margy was the CEO of the state and Sydney chambers of commerce in New South Wales for five years.

I was delighted to meet with Margy and some of the TTF team members during their recent visit to Adelaide. With the support of the state government and Uber, it was wonderful to join the TTF CEO and executives, government ministers and shadow ministers, other members of parliament, industry stakeholders and representatives for the inaugural TTF Friends of Tourism forum event in Parliament House on 13 August 2023.

The Friends of Tourism event consists of a series of events organised by TTF which aim to provide industry leaders and members of the tourism, transport and aviation industries the

opportunity to network and meet with legislators, political leaders and decision-makers in recognising the significant contribution of the tourism and transport industry.

In other states, the Friends of Tourism event is exceedingly popular and highly regarded amongst TTF members due to the relaxed and casual setting of the function. This is a bipartisan-supported event, which both the government and opposition MPs, ministers and shadow ministers participate in and are able to meet lots of industry leaders at the same time.

I truly appreciated the invitation and the opportunity to say a few words, representing the Liberal Party at the Parliament House event, to acknowledge the important contributions of the tourism and transport industry. I also want to take this opportunity to thank Krystal Lees, manager of business events, and the TTF team for their contribution behind the scenes to make the event into a great success. I trust that all my parliamentary colleagues enjoyed the Friends of Tourism event organised by TTF and were grateful to have the opportunity to meet and mingle with business leaders and industry champions who attended the event.

Labour shortages, rising inflation, industrial relations, taxation, travel marketing, infrastructure issues, security and cross-border regulations, visa issues and uncertain economic conditions are some of the challenges the tourism industry is confronted with.

As a policymaker and shadow minister for tourism and hospitality, I am grateful for the important advocacy work by TTF, particularly in calling for positive reforms to address the challenges I listed earlier and to put in measures that will support the growth and success of tourism and transport across Australia, particularly in South Australia. I look forward to working with TTF to argue the case for greater government investment from the state and federal governments in the tourism, aviation and transport sectors to build a stronger visitor economy.

Finally, a big shout-out to all the industry champions, business leaders, operators, employees and personnel of the tourism, transport and aviation sectors for their hard work, passion, resilience and for making enormous contributions to build the Australian tourism brand and generate jobs, social benefits and prosperity for our regions, for our economy and for our community. I commend the motion.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. R.P. Wortley.

R U OK? DAY

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (16:40): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges that 14 September 2023 is R U OK? Day;
2. Recognises the important work and advocacy R U OK? Day does in the mental health space;
3. Encourages people to ask others R U OK?, supporting mental health and awareness in our community; and
4. Notes the contribution R U OK? Day has made to the attitude and discussion to mental health since its inaugural event in 2009.

An unknown number of Australians attempt suicide every year, but there is an estimate that suggests that figure exceeds 65,000 Australians per year. There are 8.6 Australians who commit suicide per day; that is more than double the road toll. Suicide is the leading cause of death for those aged between 15 and 44, and we know that people in rural and regional populations are two times more likely to take their life. The suicide rate in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities is twice that of their non-Indigenous counterparts, and 75 per cent of those who take their own life are male.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON: Is everyone listening? These are startling figures; these are figures that I had to do a double take on when I first read them. They are figures that I hope shock and concern everybody in this place.

I am sure that every single person who is in this chamber right now would be aware of someone who is close to them who has had their own mental health battles and challenges, and

perhaps there may even be some people in this chamber who have had their own battles along the way.

Too often, I think we get so preoccupied and busy with our day-to-day lives and the hustle and bustle that sometimes we might miss people who might need that little bit of extra support. When we ask if someone is okay, are we really listening to them? Do we really dig that little bit deeper when perhaps they say, 'I'm good'? How often do we really say, 'Are you sure? Do you want to have a chat?' How often do we get so caught up in the busyness of life that we neglect our own wellbeing? How often do we let pride, perhaps, get in the way when we do need to ask for that little bit of support if we are struggling?

Tomorrow marks R U OK? Day. I hope that this serves as a reminder, as we reflect on these tragically high statistics, that this can serve as a prompt, a reminder, to check in with a loved one, to check in with your family, your friends, your colleagues, but also really importantly to check in with yourself. Go for that walk or that run, take care of your wellbeing, perhaps make that appointment with the psychologist that you have been dreading. Make that first step in getting help and acknowledging that perhaps you might not be okay—and you know what, that is okay too.

An estimated one in three Australians reported feeling lonely. R U OK? Day is a public health promotion charity that encourages people to stay connected and have conversations that can help others through difficult times in their lives. R U OK? Day contributes to suicide prevention efforts by encouraging people to invest more time in their personal relationships and building the capacity of informal support networks—friends, family, colleagues—to be alert to those around them, have conversations if they identify signs of distress or difficulty, and connect someone to the appropriate support before they are in crisis.

We know that when someone takes their life it has a ripple effect. Lifeline has shown that beyond the tragic loss of the person, the impact of suicide deaths is felt by up to 135 people. Let that sink in—135 people. The family, the friends, the colleagues, and the first responders at the time of death are all impacted by each death. Today, I move this motion to keep the conversation going. I move this motion in the hope of continuing to break down the stigma that is often associated with talking about mental health and to acknowledging that people are not always okay. Because, after all, it is okay to not be okay.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (16:45): I rise to support the honourable member's motion and to acknowledge that 14 September 2023 is R U OK? Day. R U OK? Day, since its establishment in 2009, has contributed significantly to mental health advocacy and reducing the stigma surrounding mental health. Stigma surrounding mental health in our regions has often taken the form of the toughen up culture, particularly for men and for farmers. Fortunately, this outdated outlook on mental health has been replaced with a more progressive approach thanks to initiatives such as R U OK? Day.

R U OK? Rural and Remote Mateship Manual, created especially for rural residents, acknowledges that those living in rural areas can find it harder to deal with mental health issues and provides an approach to supporting those suffering in silence. With farmers particularly less likely to access mental health care, combined with rural stoicism and embedded mental health stigma, it is devastating, yet unsurprising, that suicide rates are two times higher in regional South Australia.

Isolation, loneliness and fear of future prospects are a few contributors to the exacerbation of mental health in our regions. On top of this, we know that our regions are prone to natural disasters, particularly bushfires and floods, which only adds to the pressure and stress, increasing anxieties for rural families, emergency services workers and the wider community. As we approach another hot and dry Aussie summer, these anxieties will undoubtedly surface once more.

It is heartening to hear that 60 per cent of people believe that the R U OK? message has reduced the stigma surrounding mental health. R U OK? Day has been implemented in school communities across Australia, creating a positive culture for supporting young people's mental health that is having a ripple effect for all Australians, stemming from our youngest generation.

I would like to pay special mention to Allendale East Area School, which early in May was recognised for championing the R U OK? message through efforts to change attitudes of both staff

and students by encouraging support between friends, classmates and colleagues. I congratulate Allendale East Area School for their efforts and approach to rural mental health and for receiving the R U OK? Education Award at the 2023 Barbara Hocking Memorial Awards.

Recently, in Mount Gambier, we have seen the establishment of a dedicated hub at the Mulga Street Primary School that offers support during our current cost-of-living crisis. Thanks to a grant from OneFortyOne, the Mulga Street Hub assists struggling families with a range of goods to ensure that our children are in the best possible position to learn, as well as providing pastoral support.

We have also seen workplaces and industries adopt the message to encourage supportive conversations between staff and to implement awareness and consideration for colleagues who may be struggling with their mental health. 'R U OK?' is a simple question, with immeasurable impact. The question prompts meaningful conversations that could save a life. I encourage the R U OK? Day message, and I am pleased with its positive contributions to the discussions of mental health, particularly in regional South Australia, since its inaugural event in 2009.

Of course, R U OK? Day really should be every day, and I hope that we reach out to all of our mates, our friends and our family and ask them tomorrow, and every day, 'R U OK?' I commend the motion to the chamber.

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

SOUTHERN OCEAN WIND FARM

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. C. Bonaros:

That this council—

1. Expresses its concern over the extension of the proposed Southern Ocean offshore wind zone off the coast of South Australia following the consultation announcement made by Federal Minister for Climate Change and Energy, the Hon Chris Bowen MP, on 27 June 2023.
2. Notes offshore wind developer BlueFloat Energy has already lodged plans for a 77-turbine wind farm off the coast of Port MacDonnell, South Australia's most southerly town.
3. Recognises the potential for more wind farms should the proposed zone be proclaimed, with no benefit to South Australia.
4. Expresses its concern at the sheer size and footprint of each wind turbine which measures up to 350 metres above sea level and requires about 700 to 1,000 tonnes of concrete and steel to be fixed to the ocean floor.
5. Expresses its concern about the destruction of critical habitat and migrating seabirds and mammals.
6. Notes the proposed BlueFloat Energy windfarm:
 - (a) will provide no net energy benefit to South Australians;
 - (b) will result in very few jobs for South Australians;
 - (c) will exclude recreational and commercial fishing boats from important fishing areas; and
 - (d) has the potential to decimate Port MacDonnell's fishing and summer tourism industries and cause extensive job and business losses in those industries.
7. Acknowledges the southern zone rock lobster fishery of South Australia generates more than \$250 million of economic activity annually and supports at least 1,200 jobs.
8. Recognises the proposed zone exacerbates the stress and anxiety the rock lobster industry has endured in recent years due to trade issues with China.
9. Recognises the overwhelming concern of the Port MacDonnell community that the proposal threatens to wipe out the township and create long-term uncertainty for individuals and businesses.
10. Calls on the Premier and the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development to register South Australia's objection to the wind farm zone encroaching past the Victorian border and advocate this in the strongest possible terms.
11. Calls on the Premier and the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development to personally meet with the federal Minister for Climate Change and Energy to convey this message.

(Continued from 30 August 2023.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:49): I rise today to support the honourable member's motion, not only as the Leader of the Opposition in this place but as the shadow minister for primary industries and regional development. My team collectively and wholeheartedly oppose the indicated location for the Southern Ocean offshore renewable energy zone.

In mid-2023, the commonwealth Minister for Climate Change and Energy, the Hon. Chris Bowen MP, announced the beginning of community consultation for a 5,100 square kilometre offshore wind zone off the coast of south-east South Australia and south-west Victoria. The proposed offshore wind zone, stretching from Warrnambool in Victoria to Port MacDonnell in South Australia, would enable up to 15 gigawatts of offshore wind to be developed, according to the minister.

The Spanish offshore wind developer, BlueFloat Energy, submitted a plan for a 77-turbine wind energy farm off the coast of Port MacDonnell. At that time, the local fishing community, predominantly the southern zone rock lobster industry, raised significant concerns with local, state and federal representatives, as well as with the broader fishing community, about the proposed offshore wind zone. They cited environmental concerns and communicated that it may hamper, if not end completely, their industry and with it decimate their local economy and community. We believe that these concerns are absolutely valid.

In particular, as shadow minister for primary industries and regional South Australia, I would like to specifically speak to the risks to the fishing industry and to the South-East region and its community more broadly. Communities worldwide rely on fishing for their livelihoods and as a vital source of food and nutrition. More than a third of the global population relies on seafood as a source of protein.

It is well known that the commercial southern rock lobster fisheries contribute around \$250 million in landed seafood value to the Australian economy each year. In addition, as the mover of the motion stated, the industry supports at least 1,200 jobs. These are important numbers, not just to the industry but to the economies and the communities which rely on this industry.

The numbers could be at real and significant risk if these wind turbines are allowed to be constructed off the coast of Port MacDonnell. That is potentially 1,200 people at risk of losing income, and still more. The potential for severe disruption to the local commercial fishing industry, due to the limit on the access to traditional fishing grounds, is real. This will result in reduced catch rates and reduced profitability in an industry already doing it tough due to consequences of the trade ban with China.

In the event of approval of the Southern Ocean offshore renewable energy zone, increased operational costs will also be forced on the industry as many fishers will need to navigate around these exclusion zones. We all know that the cost of doing business in South Australia and the nation is currently high, with fuel prices skyrocketing and increased labour costs. Our fishers cannot afford another added cost in time and fuel expenditure due to the many more miles travelled to avoid large wind turbines measuring up to 350 metres above sea level.

Exclusion zones in restricting navigation also have the potential to introduce safety risks for boat operators, both in terms of overcrowding in the remaining fishing areas and added obstacles for fishers increasing the risk of accidents. The safety of our communities in South Australia has to be a priority for us as a state and is yet another reason why this proposal needs to be blocked.

These turbines also have the risk of ongoing impact to the sustainability of the industry. Sustainable fishing means leaving enough fish in the ocean, respecting habitats and ensuring people who depend on fishing can maintain their livelihoods. The South Australian government itself has created a seafood growth strategy, which was developed by the former Liberal government and which outlines a pathway to driving growth and opportunities for a sustainable seafood sector.

The formation of wind turbines in our ocean amongst fishing habitats and in an area that is prime fishing ground, it could be argued, certainly does not appear to be consistent with the growth and maintenance of a sustainable seafood sector. These uncertainties around negative

environmental impacts and future access to fishing grounds could impact investment in the fishing industry, primarily the rock lobster industry, into the future.

Then there is the question of its impact on the wider regional community. There are significant concerns about how this proposal could negatively impact Port MacDonnell's local economy, principally due to the negative consequences foreseen to the fishing industry, which is a primary contributor to the Port MacDonnell community. Should the fishing industry be impacted, the lives and livelihoods of the many community members who are fishers or who rely on fishers would be impaired, and wellbeing could and is likely to be affected. Economic hardship that could result to commercial fishers from the proposal could impact community cohesion and alter the town's identity forever.

We also must not forget the risk this proposal puts on the tourism industry in this region. Those of us who travel around the regions regularly and visit often will absolutely appreciate the uniqueness of Port MacDonnell's tourism sector. This town is picturesque and boasts some of the state's most beautiful coastline. Its cafes, restaurants and other tourist attractions survive and thrive not just on the local economy but on the hundreds and thousands of people who visit the area every single year for both business and pleasure. This, then, has a positive flow-on effect to the town's small and medium business sector. The establishment of these wind turbines, creating an overwhelming negative impact, damaging the visual amenity, has the potential to absolutely decimate the town's tourism sector.

There are also negative consequences for both local and visiting recreational fishers, whose preferred spots may be excluded, resulting in reduced participation and enjoyment from their activities. This will have a further impact as the recreational fishing sector, as we all know, contributes a significant amount of money to coastal communities with regard to tourism. As the mover of the motion, the Hon. Connie Bonaros, pointed out to the chamber, this proposed wind farm has absolutely no net energy benefit to South Australia and will result in very few jobs for people in our state.

I am disappointed it took the government so long to announce their opposition to this proposal, particularly when the pushback was coming quite literally from the minister's own backyard. We call on the Malinauskas government and their ministers to speak to their federal colleagues to ensure that the offshore wind turbine project at Port MacDonnell does not proceed, to protect the future wellbeing of the ocean and the coastline surrounding Port MacDonnell.

In closing, I would like to acknowledge the work of the Southern Coast Ocean Care group under chair Chris Carrison, who have worked tirelessly over the last few months to ensure that the industry, its representatives and the broader community understand the consequences of this project and its proposal. South Australia has many naturally competitive advantages for seafood production, and it is well positioned to be the premium seafood state of the Southern Hemisphere. However, it cannot achieve this status with such uncertainty hanging over its head.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (16:58): I rise to support the honourable member's motion and to offer my strong objection to the location of the proposed Southern Ocean offshore renewable energy zone as a South-East local. My honourable colleague the Hon. Nicola Centofanti has outlined many good reasons for not doing this, but I want to speak on the fact that the need for more effective public consultation on this project was just one of the concerning aspects of this proposal.

From the outset, community sessions and forums had been disorganised and completely ignorant of the strong interest shown by the Port MacDonnell community. The overwhelming demand to be heard should not come as any surprise, as 400 Port MacDonnell local community members packed into the footy club for the sole drop-in information session offered to that town. As the only member of parliament present at both the Mount Gambier and Port MacDonnell meetings, I heard the community raise many concerns that simply could not be answered. They spoke about their serious concerns for their town, their businesses, local industries and the marine environment that this proposal will negatively impact.

Port MacDonnell is the coastal community proudly dubbed the southern rock lobster capital of Australia and it will have its status threatened, should this proposal proceed. Australian southern rock lobster fishers were the first to implement third-party auditing certification systems, setting up

minimum standards for environmental management, work health and safety, food safety quality, animal welfare and sustainability. They do a fantastic job down in our region and it is beyond disappointing to see the efforts of hardworking regional community members disregarded without considerable community consultation.

To maintain the sustainability of our rock lobster resource, fishers have invested tens of millions of dollars in research to understand the impacts of fishing. The unknown outcomes stemming from the proposed location in a high conservation and highly productive fishing zone demand a cautious and conservative approach when considering all the implications of this proposal. They just do not seem to have been taken into account by the federal government.

One thing we know for sure is that South Australia will see zero benefit from this proposal. The disadvantages and negative impacts on the health of our ocean and on this regional township will be long-lasting. Preserving the unique marine environment at Port MacDonnell must be the primary focus when the federal government considers this proposal.

Notably, the proposed zone is home to the Bonney Upwelling, one of only two known major feeding sites for blue whales in Australia. This proposal will directly impact marine life, threatening natural habitats and disrupting feeding and breeding cycles. As the honourable member points out in her motion, some 700 to 1,000 tonnes of concrete will be required for each plinth on which to put these gigantic turbines, which will do immeasurable damage to our natural environment off the coast of Port MacDonnell.

The Bonney Upwelling is a nationally significant location. It sustains the economically critical commercial fisheries and South Australia's most sustainable and essential food resource, the southern rock lobster. Consequently, the \$250 million industry and the 1,200 jobs it supports will be at serious risk. The anticipated negative impacts of the proposal have already caused significant anxiety and concern amongst the local community, and this angst will only continue to progress where uncertainty remains.

Public discussions on the proposal have triggered a petition to oppose the offshore wind zone location at Port MacDonnell, which will have detrimental effects on industry, environment and community. The petition calls on the federal House of Representatives to reject any proposal to create a designated area or to allow wind turbines to be installed off the Port MacDonnell coast for renewable energy projects.

While better late than never, I am glad that the Premier and the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development have heard the community's outcry at the proposed development and have submitted to the federal government against this proposal. I would note that three weeks before the government finally saw sense, opposition leader David Speirs, the Hon. Nicola Centofanti MLC and myself wrote a joint letter of support to the grassroots-led Southern Coast Ocean Care group.

The Southern Coast Ocean Care group has been at the coalface of this issue, working tirelessly to protect the future wellbeing of the ocean and coastline off their town. The group's chair, Chris Carrison, a local abalone diver and electrician, initially believed the proposal to generate more green energy could only be a good thing. It was not until he sought more information that he then took a firm view that he was 100 per cent against the proposed location of this wind farm. As an electrician and an abalone diver with 30 years and over 8,000 hours spent underwater, Chris is a respected voice who should be listened to in this debate.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the community of Port MacDonnell, especially Chris, who has passionately chaired the Southern Coast Ocean Care group; secretary Kacee Driver, with whom I have worked on the petition; community member Lisa Edwards for her advocacy; and, of course, all of the community members and committee members in Port MacDonnell who have raised their voices against this absolutely terrible idea coming from the federal government.

I would also like to extend my thanks to the federal member for Barker, Tony Pasin, for his advocacy on this issue, having led a delegation to federal parliament to speak to Minister Bowen. Of course, I do thank the original mover of this motion, the Hon. Connie Bonaros, for her interest in a region that I call home and a region that I love. I commend this motion to the chamber.

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

PATIENT ASSISTANCE TRANSPORT SCHEME

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

That this council—

1. Acknowledges that the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme is vital to our rural regions;
2. Accepts that the government needs to review its current framework; and
3. Recognises that without the Patient Assisted Transport Scheme, patients in rural areas are more likely to die from a range of preventable illnesses.

(Continued from 14 June 2023.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:05): Overly complex, bureaucratic, stressful, essential, lifesaving—these are just some of the terms I have heard to describe the state's Patient Assistance Transport Scheme. At a seniors' regional health forum held only last month, residents from Port Pirie and the surrounding districts told my Liberal colleagues and I that this scheme is vital and that current rebates are inadequate.

The Patient Assistance Transport Scheme (PATS) is supported by all parties in politics and is recognised as imperative to the health and wellbeing of people living in regional South Australia. It should be noted that we, as the opposition, support the amendments to this motion put forward by the Hon. Robert Simms. We appreciate every opportunity we have to work with our colleagues on such important matters as rural and remote health.

I note our colleagues in other jurisdictions, both interstate and federal, are also intent on ensuring their respective schemes are reviewed with a critical eye to improving outcomes and streamlining processes for patients and families already enduring enough stress in their lives.

PATS seems simple enough on paper. It is a financial rebate towards the cost of travel and accommodation for people who reside more than 100 kilometres from their medical appointments or medical treatments. They must be a permanent South Australian resident to claim the subsidy. They must not receive any reimbursement or financial assistance from a private health fund or other government scheme towards that travel or accommodation, and there must be proof of a medical specialist pathway to confirm that medical appointment or treatment, such as a referring doctor or specialist.

The finer details can get a little bit more complicated. My office has spoken with a family who live out past Blinman in the state's north. They attempted to utilise PATS for medical complications after the birth of their first child. The delays in collating the three-part form—one part from the local or referring doctor, one from the treating specialist, and one for themselves—as well as the lodgement process and the six-week lag between travel, treatment and reimbursement, meant they had to take out credit card debt to facilitate treatment in Port Augusta. Their home is a 440-kilometre round trip from treatment.

Allied health, general dentistry, nursing specialists and GPs are not covered in the scheme. Appointments and treatments for these services cannot be claimed. I note that my colleague the Hon. Ben Hood will give some further details of this in his speech today, particularly addressing concerns about the absence of dental in this scheme.

Lowering the threshold for distances travelled and restructuring the travel calculations is one recommendation from the recent 2022 Tasmanian Patient Travel Assistance Scheme review. The government there has implemented either a 50-kilometre or a 75-kilometre one-way trip measurement for different types of treatment. In Queensland, their scheme is valid for a transportation rebate at 50 kilometres for a one-way trip.

Other jurisdictions, such as New South Wales and Victoria, allow for so-called block treatments to bump up eligibility. For example, a New South Wales regional patient who must travel 80 kilometres one way for radiation therapy treatment cannot claim PATS. However, if they are scheduled for multiple treatment sessions in a week, totalling more than 200 kilometres, they are able to claim that travel rebate.

In South Australia, this is unavailable. Our rural and remote communities are missing out. There is plenty of advocacy for an improved Patient Assistance Transport Scheme. If ever brought to this chamber, we are open and enthusiastic to innovation and efficiencies for this scheme to improve outcomes for country patients.

The Liberal Party has a proud history of advocating for regional communities and, in particular, focusing on regional health. My colleague the member for Frome questioned the Minister for Health and Wellbeing in the other place on this matter in May of last year, and we had a 2022 election commitment to double the travel fuel rebate.

Whilst the increase to the travel rebate on 1 January 2023 by the Malinauskas government was absolutely welcomed, it does not go far enough given the current cost-of-living crisis. Fuel prices, especially in regional and remote areas, are consistently holding at over \$2 per litre. Add to this the likelihood of at least an overnight stay, if not longer, and there is a definite out-of-pocket expense for someone who is very ill and away from home.

Ronald McDonald House South Australia is a non-profit organisation that does not charge a family anything to stay at their Melbourne Street accommodation whilst receiving treatment from the Women's and Children's Hospital. This is despite the calculated cost per family per night being over \$160. Madam Acting President, do you know what the rebate is for PATS per night in South Australia? It is \$40—only \$40 per night for patients over 100 kilometres away from their home. That is the lowest rate in the nation.

Another not-for-profit organisation that deals daily with PATS is the Cancer Council of South Australia. Prior to the 2022 state election, Cancer Council SA developed a suite of election priorities. Their second key priority was regarding PATS, which states:

Reducing the financial burden for rural and remote people with cancer

The rebated rates for transport and accommodation have not kept pace with the rate of cost-of-living increases in the state. South Australian rebates also lag behind the rest of the states and territories.

They provide data to show that the minimum appropriate level of accommodation for regional and remote patients who are immunocompromised had a daily rate in South Australia of \$114 during the 2020-21 reporting period. Accommodation prices have certainly not gone down.

There are several other South Australian-based not-for-profit organisations providing subsidised accommodation for health patients which confirm the Cancer Council's position statement. Without the support of subsidised or gratis places like these not-for-profits, the financial impact on South Australian families needing to stay in Adelaide for long periods would be crippling. I know it was crippling for the young family from out past Blinman.

The Queensland state government recently increased the amount they rebate for nightly accommodation, and the Western Australian government rebates \$100 per PATS claim per night. Again, I remind the chamber that South Australia only rebates \$40 a night, the lowest in the country. Our regional communities are missing out.

It is encouraging to acknowledge that so many in this chamber support PATS. I would like to acknowledge the mover of this motion, the Hon. Sarah Game. The Liberal Party truly understands the impact of living in regional and remote communities because that is where I and many of my colleagues live. We know the added burdens that come from making arrangements to travel long distances for health appointments.

Those of us living out in regional and remote South Australia, an area that contributes over \$26 billion to the state's economy with just under 30 per cent of the state's population, should not be disadvantaged when it comes to health care. Our party supports this motion wholeheartedly.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:13): The Patient Assistance Transport Scheme serves regional commuters who must travel long distances to the city or larger regional centres to access health treatment. Many individuals rely on the support of friends or volunteer drivers to get them to their destinations in their personal vehicles, often at greater cost than the modest rebate per kilometre travelled that is paid, and I know that this amount has only recently been increased. However, it is

still an expensive trip for someone who also has the added pressure of having to find affordable accommodation during rental squeezes on their travels.

During the 2022 election campaign, I caught up with several people in Whyalla who are regular users of the PAT Scheme and they expressed to me the difficulties they faced on the scheme. Their vehicles also suffer from wear and tear for which they are not really compensated. The PAT Scheme also highlights other problems confronting regional communities, notably the lack of regular and reliable transport, particularly rail passenger services that were axed by penny-pinching state Labor and Liberal governments over the decades, and also the centralisation of crucial health services for patients facing life-threatening conditions like cancer, cardiac and kidney disease, neurological treatments or even the less serious issues, but certainly important to them, like dental or ophthalmological services.

We have to live with PATS because of the failures of government health and transport policies. Communities needing specialist health treatments in the cities deserve better from their government and not having to rely on drivers transporting them along dangerous rural roads. In closing, I would like to salute all those who keep this vital service going despite the obstacles that they face. I commend the motion to the chamber.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:16): I also rise in support of the motion. In doing so, I move an amendment:

After paragraph 3, a new paragraph be inserted as follows:

4. Recognises the advocacy of all members of parliament and political parties on this important issue.

The reason for the amendment is that I think this is a moment of unity for the chamber where every member of parliament and, indeed, every political party is supportive of this vital scheme and ensuring that it meets the needs of people in regional South Australia, so I wanted to make sure that that was encapsulated in the motion. It is not often that I lavish praise on the government, but I will praise them for increasing the amount of money made available under this scheme. That has been a good thing to do and something that we certainly welcome in the Greens, so I do want to recognise the government's leadership on that.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: It's not very lavish.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I see the Hon. Mr Hunter is overwhelmed by the generous nature of my praise—effusive. I did want to put that on the record and, as I say, recognise that all members of parliament are concerned about this and want to see this scheme meet the needs of regional communities.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:18): I rise to speak on behalf of SA-Best as the health spokesperson on the motion by the Hon. Sarah Game on the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme. We have heard now that PATS provides financial assistance to people who are required to travel at least 100 kilometres from home to access vital medical services they cannot access locally. To be eligible, we know that the patient needs to be a permanent South Australian resident, they need to be enrolled in Medicare and have an appointment for a claimable Medicare treatment at the nearest appropriate medical service.

It cannot be otherwise claimable from a private health fund. In other words, there is no double dipping. It does not provide subsidies for appointments seeking a second opinion amongst other things. Many of us in this chamber, as has been pointed out, have tried in vain, I think, to advocate on behalf of this scheme for a number of years, and that is on behalf of those patients who have no other option for fair and just compensation, as is reflected in the amendment moved by the Hon. Rob Simms, but importantly also in the motion itself.

As at 1 January this year, the fuel subsidy doubled from 16¢ to 32¢ per kilometre travelled in a private vehicle, or most but not necessarily all of the cost of public transport or air travel. Recently, yes, changes were made to the scheme to provide up to \$200 in subsidised ferry travel to Kangaroo Island residents, recognising the 100-kilometre proximity to Victor Harbor is not helpful if there is an ocean in the way.

My review, I do not think, is quite as lavish as the Greens'. We do acknowledge those improvements. We acknowledge that the scheme reimburses now up to \$44 a night, including GST, for commercial accommodation. It is designed to contribute to the transport and accommodation costs, which come out of the patient's own pocket, but here in the real world we all know that it barely touches the sides. Good luck finding anywhere in Adelaide to stay for \$44 a night.

So while there may have been improvements and they are very welcome, not just by us but particularly by the patients who are relying on them, they do absolutely the bare minimum in terms of assisting those patients despite the fact that I am sure each and every one of them is not only relying on that but extremely grateful for it.

We know there are countless patients who have no choice because treatment is not otherwise available in their regions, and if those treatments were available then we would not be looking at this sort of scheme being needed to provide additional assistance for those who have no choice but to visit the city for health treatment.

PATS does not claim to be a full reimbursement scheme, but absolutely, given that those treatment options are not available, and that they have no choice other than to come to the city, it should be a scheme that is covered in full. If not for the lack of services close to home, you would not be out of pocket—it is as simple as that. That in and of itself is just another issue we know is impacting the state of health in this state.

We can pretend our health system is not on its knees and all of these issues do not have a domino effect, but in reality the only ones we are fooling are ourselves because we absolutely know that is precisely what is happening, which is why we, together with our colleagues, will continue to advocate for a full and fair reimbursement scheme to make up for that shortfall.

It is important that there appears to be unanimous support in this chamber today for this motion, but support alone does not result in outcomes. If the government does not do what the motion calls for, if the government does not actually consider what we are going to do to address this issue—and it is my expectation and I am sure it is the mover's expectation, I am sure it is everyone who is supporting this motion's expectation, that the government will do what has been called for in this motion—then the will of this parliament for one will be ignored, but, more importantly, it will do nothing to address yet another issue that is having a crippling effect on our health system.

Make no mistake, despite the fact that we are not seeing the headlines every day in the newspapers, our health system continues to be in a state of crisis. These are issues that could assist. If patients were not coming into Adelaide and relying on services in Adelaide, if we were not ignoring the domino effect that all these issues have, then our health system would not be in the state that it is in. It is for that reason that we wholeheartedly support this motion. We thank the Hon. Sarah Game for bringing it once again to the attention of this parliament and look forward to not just further momentum but some real, tangible change that will make this a better scheme.

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (17:24): I rise to speak on this motion and indicate that we will be supporting both the motion and the Simms amendment. The Patient Assistance Transport Scheme provides financial subsidies to patients who are required to travel more than 100 kilometres each way to access necessary and approved medical specialist appointments that are not available locally. These subsidies provide a vital financial offset when patients have no option but to travel for specialist services.

Recently, there have been significant improvements to the scheme. The fuel subsidy was increased from 16¢ to 32¢ per kilometre for patients travelling from 2023 onwards. The scheme is undergoing internal review, and this review has already resulted in two small but important reforms: firstly, expanding eligibility requirements to include prosthetics claims, and secondly acknowledging the disadvantage of the Kangaroo Island community, expanding ferry subsidies and PATS eligibility to the entire island. Previously, the eastern side of the island had been considered technically under the 100-kilometre requirement when referred to Victor Harbor hospital for treatment.

The Malinauskas government is investing in specialist services in regional areas, which will reduce the need for patients to travel out of the regions. This increase will provide regional areas with doctors who are able to treat a wide range of preventable illnesses. In the event that treatment

is unable to be performed in the regional areas, PATS will be able to provide a travel and/or accommodation subsidy to the patient.

If a patient is diagnosed with a terminal illness, confirmation from the treating specialist can be provided to PATS and a choice specialist for the patient's treatment will be noted on the PATS database. Additionally, travel and accommodation for treatment deemed as urgent by either the referring doctor or a specialist is supported by PATS. I confirm that we will be supporting the motion and the amendment.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (17:26): I rise to add my voice in support for this motion that acknowledges the vital importance of the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme for regional South Australia and calls for review into its current framework.

The Liberal Party proudly supported this scheme for many years, and we were glad to see our 2022 election commitment to double the fuel rebate allowance eventually taken up by this government in January. Under the former Liberal government, we updated PATS to enable more flexible travel and support under the scheme. This included:

- reimbursing patients for their actual travel costs rather than reimbursing them for travel to the GPO;
- enabling eligible family members and carers who travel separately to the patient in an emergency situation to be subsidised;
- removing restrictive criteria, which previously meant when a patient required interstate travel for treatment their support person was unable to work near the new treatment location, for the patient to continue receiving the subsidy;
- expanding the eligibility criteria to include Airbnbs and similar accommodation options or commercial subsidies; and
- covering remote patients when land travel over 100 kilometres is required to travel to a regional airport, which was previously not covered under the subsidy.

While the doubling of the fuel rebate to 32¢ per kilometre is welcome, unfortunately with the current cost-of-living crisis it does not go far enough. Fuel prices have surged since March 2022 and have not fallen to the same levels we saw under the former Liberal government's time. From 2018 to early 2022, fuel prices hovered from a low of \$1.02 per litre to highs that rarely ever reached beyond \$1.60. FuelPrice Australia reports that current average prices have not fallen below \$1.98 in the past month in South Australia. Subsequently, inflation is well and truly eating up the extra rebate allowance.

Shadow regional health minister, Penny Pratt MP, called for the recent state budget to increase the accommodation subsidy from \$40 for singles and \$80 per couple, which is the lowest rebate in any state. The fact that this rebate has remained unchanged is a kick in the guts, given the spiralling cost of living we are now witnessing.

As Cancer Council SA notes in their 2022 state election priorities document, South Australian rebates are lagging behind every other state and territory in the country. Western Australia's accommodation subsidy is now over \$100 for singles, over 2½ times our own. New South Wales increased their accommodation subsidy from \$43 to \$75 per night and up to \$120 per night for eight or more nights. Even Tasmania exceeds our subsidy amount by almost two times, at \$76 per night. Many of our interstate counterparts offer more generous qualifying criteria as well, including a reduced minimum travel requirement and the ability to combine multiple trips in one week to reach the minimum kilometre threshold.

The 2013 review into PATS that the mover of this motion alluded to in her speech considered a range of expansion motions for the scheme. Of the 200 letters and submissions to that report, allied health services were the most called for addition, followed by dental services. Coincidentally, my office received a phone call from a resident in Tarpeena just last week who raised the issue of dental services not being included in PATS.

While the review from 10 years ago identified that an expansion to include dental services would require significant additional resources, it would be prudent to re-evaluate this in 2023. In

reviewing this, it is important that the benefits for improving access to preventative health are included in a cost-benefit analysis to ensure that not only the up-front costs are considered but also what long-term savings could be achieved through improving the oral health of our regional communities.

As we debate this motion and consider regional health measures, we must keep in mind the fact that health outcomes are almost universally poorer for those who live outside of Adelaide. Figures from the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare report that death rates range from 10 per cent to 70 per cent higher for regional, rural and remote residents compared with those living in our major cities.

The Heart Foundation reports that death rates from heart disease are 60 per cent higher for regional and rural towns, while hospitalisations due to heart failure were as much as 90 per cent higher compared with those living in the city. The Australian Bureau of Statistics National Health Survey also consistently shows that regional, rural and remote Australians have higher rates of virtually all diseases and conditions, and I could go on and on.

This is why a scheme like PATS is so important, but it also must go further to ensure health outcomes for regional, rural and remote South Australians are not left in the dust compared with their city brethren. I would also point out that Mount Gambier is still calling for radiotherapy in the Limestone Coast. Just imagine the money that could be saved in terms of PATS if people from Mount Gambier did not have to do a 10-hour round trip for a 15-minute consult and treatment for cancer. Think about those families who would not have to go through that terrible situation while dealing with the fight of their lives. I look forward to seeing the government's response to this motion, and I commend it to the chamber.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (17:31): I thank all the honourable members for their contribution. I want to make clear that I absolutely support the amendment by the Hon. Robert Simms to recognise the advocacy of all members of parliament and political parties on this important issue. I want to echo the sentiments of the Hon. Connie Bonaros that the purpose of the motion is not really to congratulate the government, but it is to spur on, hopefully, real, tangible movement in that area.

I want to thank the Hon. Ben Hood and the Hon. Nicola Centofanti as well for their contributions in particular, and echo that we absolutely need change with regard to the range of medical provisions that people are eligible for under PATS, and also echo how unsatisfactory it is that we have the worst accommodation subsidy in the country.

It was positive to hear from the government that there is some movement underway, and they are open for more change. I did ask the government last year if they would review the PATS system, and I was told they would not. I did ask the government last year if they would increase the fuel subsidy, and I was told they would not; they subsequently did in January or February of this year. I would call on the government to take this motion seriously, with a view to real, tangible outcomes to rural communities and their ability to access good quality medical care.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

DAFFODIL DAY

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. R.B. Martin:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges that 22 August 2023 is Daffodil Day; and
2. Commends the Cancer Council for its ongoing commitment to raising funds for cancer research, increasing cancer awareness and providing support to Australians diagnosed with cancer and their families.

(Continued from 30 August 2023.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:34): I rise to indicate the opposition's support of the motion brought forward by the honourable member. Cancer care services, such as those provided by Cancer Care SA, are critical to South Australians experiencing or in remission from cancer. Cancer Council SA plays a critical role in public health by promoting cancer prevention and early screening programs.

Encouraging healthy lifestyle choices and regular screenings can reduce the incidence of cancer and improve South Australia's overall community health. They play a crucial role in early detection and diagnosis of certain cancers. A timely detection can lead to more effective treatment options and better outcomes for patients right across this state and the nation.

Cancer Council SA is a highly visible, not-for-profit organisation, on site at community events with skin cancer awareness messaging encouraging healthy lifestyles and good food choices. They have strong advertising campaigns for bowel and breast screening, skin checks, the impacts of alcohol and self-collection cervical screening options.

While I acknowledge the extraordinary ongoing work of the Cancer Council of South Australia, I take this opportunity to again remind the chamber of the urgent need to include cancer-related radiation therapy services in the South-East. Sixteen thousand community members signed and submitted a petition to the parliament encouraging the government to do the right thing and to commit these services to Mount Gambier. I acknowledge my honourable colleague Ben Hood in his advocacy for delivering these services to the South-East.

The Mount Gambier and Districts Health Service is part of the Limestone Coast Local Health Network, and they provide a fantastic range of acute services, including specialist surgical, obstetric, paediatric and anaesthetic services delivered by medical consultants, but they do not have radiation therapy services and currently South-East patients must attend Adelaide or Wollongong for these treatments.

Cancer Council SA used a slogan in their 2022 election priority collateral, where they stated 'Distance should not equal disadvantage'. I wholeheartedly agree with that message. I would also like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the incredible support the Cancer Council Lodge has given for decades to regional and remote patients travelling to Adelaide for treatment.

From the comfortable home away from home style of accommodation, to the shuttle bus operated by volunteers who make sure patients too unwell to drive get to and from their appointments safely, Cancer Council SA has played a role in many country people's cancer journeys. I know my honourable colleagues have more to say on this motion, but I conclude by stating that we, the opposition, absolutely support and appreciate this motion.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (17:37): I commend the Cancer Council on its many initiatives, including Daffodil Day, and the outstanding support this organisation gives to the community. The Cancer Council is Australia's leading cancer charity, working across every area of every cancer. Whilst it is important to celebrate the achievements of our successful charitable groups, we need the government to do more. This is why I brought a motion to this council to recognise that we need an immediate review of our ineffective Patient Assistance Transport Scheme.

South Australia has one of the lowest subsidies available for patient assistance transport schemes in the nation, and is a vital scheme for those in need, including South Australians battling cancer and other deadly diseases. The fact remains that you are more likely to die from a range of preventable and treatable diseases if you live outside Adelaide, which is unacceptable. More than 13,000 South Australians received financial support last year through the scheme, highlighting how many people rely on it.

Without adequate funding the scheme will continue to exclude coverage for GPs and allied health professionals, and this results in a significant gap in healthcare services, potentially leading to missed opportunities for improved health and wellbeing outcomes. As a result, some will not access preventative health care due to the costs involved. I will continue to advocate for the expansion and improvement of the scheme to ensure accessibility, efficiency and responsiveness to the changing needs of South Australians.

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (17:39): I rise today in support of the honourable member's motion in acknowledging Daffodil Day and the important work the Cancer Council does in its ongoing commitment to raising funds for cancer research, increasing cancer awareness and providing support for Australians diagnosed with cancer and their families.

It is estimated that 151,000 Australians were diagnosed with cancer in 2021. That is over 400 people per day. That is 400 families who are touched by this insidious disease each and every

day. Every year, approximately 3,800 South Australians lose their lives to cancer. That is 3,800 families who lose a mum, a dad, a sister, a friend, a grandparent, a child.

Sadly, we have all been touched by cancer in one way or another. Maybe it was a grandparent, maybe a parent, maybe a friend, maybe even yourself. It is estimated that over one million Australians are currently living with cancer or beyond cancer. The number of new Australian cancer cases diagnosed over the period from 2020 to 2044 is projected to total more than 4.56 million.

Around 70 per cent of people will likely survive five years after a cancer diagnosis. This is an increase from 51 per cent in the late 1980s. The number of Australians living with or beyond cancer is expected to increase by a staggering 72 per cent in the next 22 years. By 2040, 1.9 million Australians will be living with or beyond cancer.

If there is one thing that we know for sure, it is that cancer does not discriminate. The most common cancers for South Australian females in 2020 were breast cancer, colorectal cancer and lung cancer. Lung cancer was the most commonly reported cancer cause of death for females in South Australia, accounting for 17.4 per cent of cancer deaths, followed by breast cancer. For South Australian males the most commonly diagnosed cancers in 2020 were prostate cancer, colorectal cancer and lung cancer. The most commonly reported cancer causes of death in South Australian males were lung cancer, accounting for 20 per cent of all male cancer deaths, followed by prostate cancer. These are incredibly sobering statistics that serve as a good reminder to us to us all to go get that health check-up that we have probably been putting off.

My family is not immune from cancer, having had multiple family members who are either in remission or who have sadly lost their battle with cancer. One of those people is my mum's mum, Barbra. Whilst I sadly never had the opportunity to meet my grandmother, as she lost her battle with acute myeloid leukaemia at the young age of 45, she lives on in my mum.

Last month, my mum and I had a fundraiser for the Leukaemia Foundation in honour of Barbra where we were able to fundraise over \$1,000 and donated our hair to Sustainable Salons, who are part of the Ponytail Project run by the Cancer Council. This organisation distributes hair to charities and local wigmakers, where they can become wigs for people going through medically induced hair loss conditions such as alopecia and cancer, or help fund other life-changing programs. I would like to take a moment to thank the many people who have donated generously for their generosity to this very important cause.

I am sure that we have all got similar stories about the devastation and heartbreak of cancer. I, for one, am very glad that charities like the Cancer Council exist to provide ongoing support for patients, their families and ongoing medical research. Thank you for those who have taken the time to support Daffodil Day and for those who continue to support charities like the Cancer Council. I would like to take a moment to acknowledge the honourable member once again for his contribution in bringing this motion to this place but also for his honesty in sharing with this place his own personal circumstances. Thank you.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (17:43): I rise today in support of the Hon. Reggie Martin's motion. As the largest non-government funding body, the Cancer Council is at the forefront of cancer research in Australia. This life-saving research can reduce the impact of cancer in many ways from early detection to improving treatment options. Daffodil Day raises money towards the Cancer Council's work in research, prevention, advocacy and support. It is also a day for communities to come together and show their support for those affected by cancer, which sadly will be one in two Australians.

Cancer, as we all know, does not discriminate. It affects individuals irrespective of age, gender or background and exacts a profound toll on the afflicted and their families. It is also important to understand that cancer can be a life sentence for many people. I know all too well that having cancer and receiving treatment does not mean that you rid yourself of cancer.

I and many others will live with this disease for the rest of our lives. Staying vigilant, and regularly testing to see that the cancer has not reappeared or spread to other parts of the body, is a crucial part of treatment and recovery. This fear of a potential recurrence is something that you will

always have in the back of your mind. The fear is a constant companion that you learn to live with. Where the cancer does metastasise or reoccur, there is an overwhelming sense of grief, uncertainty and exhaustion in having to go through it all over again.

The Cancer Council is an organisation that works tirelessly to reduce the impact of cancer on individuals and communities. Cancer research and the innovations that come from it are vital. One such Australian innovation is the HPV vaccine. Since its introduction in 2006, it has significantly reduced the number of cervical cancer cases. Whilst we should recognise the pivotal work of the Cancer Council, there is always more that we can be doing to help.

Cancer is a disease that is only going to affect more and more people over time. The *BMJ Oncology* journal recently published a study revealing that in the last three decades there has been an 80 per cent increase worldwide in cancer diagnoses amongst individuals aged below 50 years. Organisations such as the Cancer Council often face resource limitations and competing priorities, so it is essential that we continue to actively support and fund cancer research. The more we know about cancer, the better we can prevent, diagnose and treat it. The more we know about cancer, the better chance we stand at achieving positive results for ourselves and for our loved ones.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (17:46): I rise in support of this motion and commend the Cancer Council on their annual Daffodil Day, which has raised funds for cancer research, support and prevention programs for 37 years running. Tragically, we all know a sufferer of this heartbreaking disease which directly affects one in two of us in our lifetimes. On this year's Daffodil Day, I was pleased to drop in to the Garden of Hope in Rundle Mall to plant a daffodil in memory of my stepdad, Patrick, and my grandpa, Lindsay.

Myself and my lovely sister Lucy in the other place have spoken about Patrick and Lindsay a number of times. These two men have given me so much in my life and I am pleased to acknowledge them today. Patrick passed away in the year 2000 and Lindsay passed away in 2017. A huge thankyou also to the CEO of Cancer Council SA, Kerry Rowlands, for the important work of her charity and for supporting the families of cancer sufferers right across this state.

It would be remiss of me, while I am on my feet in support of this motion, not to take the opportunity again to raise the issue of the urgent need for radiotherapy services in the South-East. While this community anxiously awaits the completion of a feasibility study into the viability of a service, we know that hundreds of cancer sufferers in the Limestone Coast are forced to travel interstate or drive 10 hours to and from Adelaide for their brief radiation treatment.

We know from experts in the field that radiotherapy services can be safely delivered in a region like Mount Gambier. Ninety to 95 per cent of patients needing radiotherapy get their treatment as outpatients, and the likelihood of an unplanned admission requiring access to services like the ICU is extremely low. Mount Gambier already offers chemotherapy infusions, and the risk profile of this kind of systemic therapy is significantly higher than that of radiotherapy. If our local medical oncologists are already able to manage higher risk profile treatments, it stands to reason that lower risk profile treatments like radiotherapy could be delivered in a safe manner.

Studies tell us that regional, remote and rural cancer patients are 35 per cent more likely to die within five years after receiving their diagnosis, compared with their metropolitan counterparts. A lack of access to services, and the long distances required to receive treatment, are the main drivers in this disparity. I remain hopeful that this state government will utilise the \$4.3 million that has been set aside to deliver this vital service in the way it was intended. I know that the 20,000 people who signed the petition on the Limestone Coast, calling on this government to provide radiotherapy services for the Limestone Coast, feel exactly the same.

I end my remarks by thanking the Cancer Council and all those who work and volunteer to improve the lives of our community members who suffer from cancer, and those who provide invaluable support to their families. I extend my heartfelt feelings to those who are going through this terrible disease and, of course, to those people who have lost loved ones to cancer as well. I thank the mover, the Hon. Reggie Martin, for his personal stories and bringing this motion to the chamber; thank you, Reggie. I commend the motion.

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (17:50): I will keep the wrap-up brief, but I would like to place on the record my thanks for the contributions from the Hon. Ms Centofanti, the Hon. Ms Game, the Hon. Ms Henderson, the Hon. Ms Pnevmatikos and the Hon. Mr Ben Hood. I think it is clear from all the contributions that everyone in this chamber has been touched at some stage by that insidious disease which is cancer. The only way out is through medical research, and that is one of the reasons why I wanted to bring this motion to the house. Daffodil Day is a great day to draw attention to the need for raising funds for this vital medical research. The Cancer Council does fantastic work in doing everything they can to prevent and fight this disease. I thank everyone in the chamber for their support for this motion.

Motion carried.

NEURODIVERSITY CELEBRATION WEEK

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. E.S. Bourke:

That this council—

1. Recognises 13 to 19 March 2023 as Neurodiversity Celebration Week;
2. Acknowledges Neurodiversity Celebration Week as a time to increase knowledge and understanding of neurodiversity and celebrate neurodivergent people, including members of the autistic community; and
3. Congratulates the Malinauskas government's commitment to start supporting neurodiversity through the establishment of the nation's first Office for Autism in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, placing inclusion at the heart and centre of government.

(Continued from 8 March 2023.)

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (17:51): I move the amendment standing in my name:

To delete paragraph 3 and substitute the following:

3. Calls for the Malinauskas government to put in guarantees that no child will be worse off in attention, funding or outcome as a result of this policy and funding change and reminds the government that the children and young people should be at the heart of this policy area.

I rise to speak on this important motion today and indicate that, whilst we are supportive of the first two parts of the motion, we do have an amendment to the third element. There are some estimates that one in seven people are neurodiverse. Weeks like Neurodiversity Celebration Week, which was held in March this year, seek to celebrate those who are under the umbrella of neurodiversity. That can include those who are living with autism, dyslexia, dyspraxia or have ADHD, along with others.

Neurodiversity Celebration Week is a worldwide initiative that challenges the stereotypes and social misconceptions about neurological differences. By providing support to schools, universities and organisations, it hopes to celebrate and recognise the many talents and advantages of those who are neurodiverse. Increasing the knowledge and insights of our community to those who have different qualities is very important.

Founded in the UK by 16-year-old Siena Castellon in 2016, it is now a worldwide initiative. The focus of Neurodiversity Celebration Week is, as the name suggests and also in the organisation's own words, 'to help the world to understand, value and celebrate the talents of neurodiverse minds'. We as a society must do more to help to the fullest those who have a different way of participating in society.

I want to speak of a young man who I recently met. Ji is a 20-year-old young man who is described by his mum as diligent, punctual and determined, and he is trying hard to find full-time work. He has been trying for two years since he left school. He has a driver's licence, forklift licence, security licence and has volunteered for the Salvation Army for the past two years. The assistant minister knows of the correspondence his mother sent through to her, federal Minister Shorten, the Minister for Education and myself as shadow minister for disabilities.

All she and Ji are looking for is a fair go. In his mother's words, they were not looking for the world to change and adapt but rather are wanting to contribute to the world, as we all do. Ji wanted to feel useful and needed. The assistant minister referred Ji to the Office for Autism, and they have given Ji some resources to assist in his job hunt, and I wish him all the very best.

Speaking of the Office for Autism, should it result in an increase in employment and opportunity amongst neurodiverse people, my hope is that it also increases the employment rate for those living with a disability right across the state.

Turning now to my amendment, it removes the politicalisation we commonly see with this government, instead focusing on what we need to do as elected members to ensure that all people feel included. This motion, as an example that the assistant minister last spoke about in March of this year, congratulates the government themselves on an initiative only announced in February.

My amendment to the motion today seeks to ensure that children who are neurodiverse are not forgotten in the race for a headline or news grab by this government. My amendment to the motion is to leave out paragraph 3 and to insert 'calls for the Malinauskas government to put in guarantees that no child will be worse off in attention, funding or outcome as a result of this policy and funding change and reminds the government that children and young people should be at the heart of this policy area.'

The danger when government seeks to do what the private sector is already doing is upsetting the balance of things. There are examples where government intervention is needed and is an improvement, but we on this side will not be afraid to call out the government if they are simply taking from Peter to pay Paul when it is the children and young people who miss out, recognising that instability can do damage to a young person's self-worth and ability to thrive in a world that already treats them differently.

Next year's celebration week is just over six months away, 18 to 24 March 2024, and I encourage all members to seek out ways to include those who are neurodiverse in the community so that they may all participate in society to their full potential.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:56): I rise on behalf of the Greens with great pleasure to speak in support of this motion, and I thank the Hon. Emily Bourke for bringing it to this council. I also rise to acknowledge the work of my federal colleagues, particularly that of Senator Jordan Steele-John in advocating for the rights of those with disabilities. My colleagues have often been outspoken on the flaws within the system, such as the NDIS, and even giving a dissenting report criticising the federal inquiry into services, support and life outcomes for autistic Australians.

The Greens have repeatedly made informed choices about the language used to describe disabled people. In doing so, we have consistently emphasised the significant contribution made by neurodiverse people to our communities. It is respectful curiosity that I bring to this chamber today and reflect on the language in the workshop that I enjoyed that was hosted by the Hon. Emily Bourke earlier on this sitting day.

We in the Greens acknowledge the deficit language surrounding neurodiversity that says that people have deficits. It is actually a fundamental truth that we are all neurodiverse, just like we are all diverse in ethnicity, race, gender or sexuality. Neurodiversity simply refers to the diversity of human minds and all the unique and different ways that people can exist, that people think, that people act, that people process, and that people feel and function.

Neurodiversity Celebration Week was celebrated quite a while ago now, from 13 to 19 March 2023, and it provided us with an opportunity to celebrate the immense contributions of neurodiverse individuals to our communities, our workplaces and our society as a whole. It is estimated that around 20 per cent of Australians are neurodivergent and yet often being neurodivergent is considered a negative thing surrounded by that negative stigma, and significant barriers still remain across far too many areas of life.

The neurodivergent population is grossly under-represented when it comes to employment in Australia. Amaze, an organisation in Victoria that provides resources and implements change for people with autism, commissioned a report in 2018 that found that the unemployment rate for autistic people in Australia is 31.6 per cent, three times higher than for people with a physical disability, and six times higher than the average for Australians without a disability. This is shocking.

This is despite much research showing that improved diversity in our workplaces can only positively contribute to an organisation and improve internal culture and acceptance and improve business outcomes. Educational institutions, workplaces and communities should be designed to

support neurodiversity. We must ensure there are reasonable accommodations, awareness programs and anti-discrimination policies in place to protect the rights of neurodiverse individuals.

Also, while ADHD significantly impacts the lives of one in 20 Australians, it still remains fundamentally misunderstood. Earlier this year, the Greens undertook a survey asking people with ADHD to share their experiences with getting a diagnosis and with getting care in our healthcare system. There were more than 10,000 responses and still counting. I would like to share with you some of the outcomes of that work and some of its more distressing figures.

More than 63 per cent of respondents who suspect they have ADHD said that cost is the reason they have not been formally diagnosed. More than half worry that medical professionals will not take their ADHD concerns seriously and over 82 per cent of respondents identify as women, non-binary or gender fluid people. This tells us that cost and lack of training are big barriers to ADHD diagnosis and that these barriers impact women and LGBTQIA folks the most.

We know how to address this because 92 per cent of those respondents told us how; that is, add ADHD diagnosis to Medicare. Such insights are why community engagement is so important. In order to ensure equity and drive attitudinal change to disability, governments have the responsibility to provide the necessary funding in all areas, including education, health, housing, mobility, employment, transport, sport, and cultural and social engagement and, indeed, as was noted in the workshop today, in planning with inclusive design.

We should all strive to create a world where neurodiversity is not just accepted but embraced. We must encourage and celebrate the unique strengths that neurodiverse individuals bring to our communities and champion the idea that difference should be celebrated and not stigmatised or demonised. The Greens know that different does not equate to lesser than and I hope that in all our lives we not only empower neurodiverse individuals to reach their full potential but also to enrich our society and benefit from that.

In closing, I do wish to reflect and thank again the Hon. Emily Bourke and her team for the workshop they provided to members of parliament today and the news that there will be an Office for Autism under the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. It is welcome news. It is positive change. It was a really insightful hour of reflection and I absolutely appreciated it, and I appreciated the generosity with which it was provided. I sat there, though, thinking that we were there learning, and I was certainly learning. There were things that reaffirmed what I already knew, but there were things I did not know, and I welcomed being given a safe environment in which to learn.

This motion recognises Neurodiversity Celebration Week and acknowledges that week as a time to increase our knowledge and understanding of neurodiversity and celebrate neurodivergent people, including members of the autistic community. It congratulates the Malinauskas government's commitment to start supporting neurodiversity through the establishment of the nation's first Office for Autism in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, placing inclusion at the heart and centre of government. It is a very simple motion that is all a statement of fact. Sure, maybe you want to remove the word 'congratulate' and simply 'note', but I do congratulate the Malinauskas government for doing this. It is a national first. It is something I think is well overdue and is incredibly important.

I am really disappointed that the Liberal opposition have chosen to leave out paragraph 3, which talks about the establishment of the new office, and calls for the Malinauskas government to put in guarantees that no child will be worse off in attention funding or outcome as a result of this policy and funding change and reminds the government that children and young people should be at the heart of this policy area.

The reference to put in this new part 3 does not add up with 1 and 2. We are celebrating Neurodiversity Celebration Week. We are acknowledging this week as a time to increase knowledge and understanding, particularly of the people involved, and this part 3 has no connection to parts 1 and 2. It seeks to replace part 3, which talks about the establishment of the Office for Autism. Perhaps, that is what it is referring to. It is not clear to me. I think this was an attempt to politicise and polemicise this issue, which I find really disappointing. I thought that some issues in this place should be above politics and unfortunately that is not the case today.

However, I am an optimist and I hope that the Liberal opposition will reflect on these words, which simply do not make sense as a motion and seem to somehow divide the community and divide this council for political reasons. These words are just not adding any benefit today to this motion, a very positive motion to create the new office, which I think is a very welcome move.

Sure, you may have issues about the way the schools policy has been rolled out, but this motion is not about the education policies of the Malinauskas government, so leaving out paragraph 3 and inserting a new paragraph 3 seems to have no logical reason for being here, unless of course one wishes to think that perhaps politics was being played, and, sadly, that is my conclusion today. With that, I commend the motion. The Greens will be opposing the amendment and we look forward to better discussions in the future.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (18:05): I rise in support of this motion by the Hon. Emily Bourke, recognising Neurodiversity Celebration Week. Neurodiversity refers to the concept that neurological differences, such as autism, ADHD and dyslexia, are natural variations of the human brain rather than disorders that need to be fixed. It recognises that these differences contribute to the diversity of human experiences and should be respected and valued.

People on the autism spectrum, also known as individuals with autism spectrum disorder, have unique ways of perceiving and interacting with the world. Engaging and communicating with them requires understanding, patience and calm, to adapt to their specific needs. This complex and challenging area has at last been recognised by one government in this country. I commend and support the initiatives undertaken by Premier Peter Malinauskas and Assistant Minister Emily Bourke in the establishment of the first Office for Autism in the nation. There will also be specialist support in our classrooms, which is quite important and significant.

Hopefully, others will follow this outstanding example of recognising the needs of the community and those with special needs. For far too long, it was not acknowledged, nor were there any tangible efforts made to address and deal with the issue that today impacts so many families. One in four Australians know someone with autism. One to two persons per 100 of the population are autistic—it is a significant number—but we still would not know how many of the population have it because some individuals may remain undiagnosed or may not seek a formal diagnosis.

A member of the Office for Autism put those statistics in perspective during an enlightening parliamentary workshop today: if you were at the Adelaide Oval, with a capacity of 50,000, 1,000 of those attending would be dealing with autism in their lives.

My wife, Angie, and I are proud parents of a person on the autism spectrum. Watching our son, Connor, fly through school and now complete double degrees at Flinders University after being told he would never amount to anything has been an extremely gratifying and joyful experience for us and also for Connor. While it did give us some difficult challenges initially, love and understanding got us through it.

We are looking forward to the next stage of Connor's young adult life once he completes his studies. He actively participates and engages with children and young adults on the autism spectrum through his part-time work at the Gold Foundation, a not-for-profit charity delivering social skills and learning programs to many, which was started by my wife 15 years ago.

One of their projects is the Shine Like Gold mobile cafe, where individuals who participate in Gold Foundation activities are trained as baristas and do paid work in the cafe, attending social and sporting events. It provides them with not just income and work experience but, more importantly, social interaction with the community. As Connor told David Penberthy on FIVEaa only last Friday while making him a coffee:

Young people on the autism spectrum have a lot of skills that put them at a competitive advantage in the job market. We are gradually shifting perspectives on autism from a problem to be fixed to an advantage to be leveraged.

That was highlighted today by the staff from the Office for Autism, who said workers with autism were focused on their job tasks, dependable, loyal and reliable. However, because there are those in the community who fail to understand those individuals' specific needs and traits, it can sometimes result in adverse or tragic outcomes. We were told that the suicide rate among autistic people is still worryingly high.

They also pointed out that understanding the needs and actions of individuals on the spectrum requires empathy and flexibility. Their behaviours may serve a purpose or be responsive to their environment. By taking time to understand their unique perspectives and needs, we can create inclusive and supportive environments that allow them to thrive.

In recent years, there has been an increased awareness and understanding of autism in Australia, leading to improved diagnostic practices and support services through schemes like the government-funded NDIS. By understanding how to identify individuals on the spectrum, communicate effectively with them and meet their unique needs, we can foster a more inclusive society.

While autism is relatively common in Australia, it is crucial to continue raising awareness, providing support and promoting acceptance to ensure individuals on the spectrum can reach their potential. Neurodiversity Celebration Week works effectively to achieve that. I commend the motion by the member but indicate we will not be supporting the amendment by the Hon. Heidi Girolamo.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (18:11): I would like to thank the members who have spoken to this motion: the Hon. Heidi Girolamo, the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. Frank Pangallo. I also note that all three members were at today's workshop, and I want to thank you for giving your lunch break to come along to that forum. I think it is a really good reminder about why we need to have a resource like the Office for Autism that we can go to and call on not only their wealth of knowledge but also their lived experience. I think it is really important.

We all know in this place, we have all heard the saying, 'You can't be what you can't see.' The Office for Autism is not just about providing that space for knowledge building but also to remind all of us that autistic people can be leaders—they can be very senior members in our government in the Office for Autism, which is based in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

This leads me to the amendment that was made by the Liberal Party and those opposite. I have to say, to sit here and listen to those opposite say that we on this side are making politics of autism and the neurodivergent community is rather offensive. If there is anyone seeking headlines here, it is those opposite. Quite honestly, it is a bit difficult to follow where they are going with this amendment.

We have an amendment that has been put forward that says we should have, essentially, a stronger focus on children and that young people should be at the heart of this policy. I do not think anyone would disagree that we should be focusing on giving support to children, particularly autistic children. But if we go back, in March the opposition removed the commitments made by this government to give funding and focus to children. They wanted us to remove from that motion any commentary about a commitment of \$28.8 million to increase access to autism inclusion teachers in our primary schools.

They wanted us to remove any reference to seeking to increase the number of autism-qualified staff in preschools. They wanted us to remove any reference to working with service providers to offer early intervention services in children's centres, so I am a bit confused why this time they are wanting us to take out a reference to the creation of the Office for Autism which the honourable member made mention of herself.

She said that her constituent Ji utilised the office and was given resources in how to access employment benefits or support. It was a very useful resource for her to call on for her constituent, but she now wants to remove any reference to the Office for Autism, which helped one of her constituents. She then put a focus on children in this motion when she sought to remove a focus on children in the previous motion.

I am a little bit confused about where those opposite are going with this amendment. I do not support this amendment, because that is what we are seeking to do anyway: make our community more inclusive for everyone. We know that you are born autistic and you will pass away autistic, so yes, we are putting those supports into our schools. We are doing things that no other government in the world is doing. We have people from Western Australia coming here to see what we are doing. We have people contacting us from the UK, from the US, seeking information about what we are

doing because we are leading the world, literally, in what we are doing here to provide a more inclusive community.

The honourable member wants to remove things that make us a world leader, like the Office for Autism. You did not seek to replace the benefits of having the Office for Autism; it was removed completely from this motion. By removing something that makes our state a leader, by having the Office for Autism removed from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, what message are those opposite sending to the community? We believe in the Office for Autism. It does not sound like you do. I will not be supporting the opposition's motion because we believe in the Office for Autism. We believe in a pillar of knowledge in government.

If you have the time, if you have not done so already, I strongly encourage you to read the consultation report into the first ever strategy that has gone out for autism in South Australia. The consultation report is one of the largest consultation reports into disability in our state ever through YourSAy. It is very clear in that report that they are looking for this pillar of knowledge in government. They want a hub to go to when they are going through the process of 'should I go and get an assessment? Do I need a diagnosis? What is my next step?' People want that pillar of knowledge in government. We are delivering on what the people want by having this and celebrating it through this motion. I thank everyone who supported the motion.

Amendment negatived; motion carried.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) (NO 4) BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 18:20 the council adjourned until Thursday 14 September 2023 at 14:15.