

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 18 October 2023

The PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens) took the chair at 14:17 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. R.B. MARTIN (14:19): I bring up the 31st report of the committee, 2022-23.

Report received.

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN: I bring up the 32nd report of the committee, 2022-23.

Report received and read.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:21): I bring up the interim report of the committee on its inquiry into the urban forest.

Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

Criminal Investigation Covert Operations—Report

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Question Time

MARINE SCALEFISH FISHERY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development on the topic of cost recovery and proposed fees for the marine scale fishery.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Prior to the 2018 election, both major parties, as well as minor parties, supported reform of the marine scale fishery to ensure a sustainable and economically viable industry into the future. On the Friday of the October long weekend, marine scale fishermen were notified of the proposed fee structure for 1 July 2024 to 30 June 2025. The base fee is set and all licences are to pay the same base fee whether or not they are net-endorsed licences.

The proposed fee structure percentage is 70 per cent quota fee and 30 per cent base licence fee. The formula used to calculate the quota unit fee is the cost of managing the four quota species, which is then evenly divided by those four species. Some species have 4,000 units, whereas others only have 2,000 units of quota. This creates an uneven burden on those species with smaller units, as they are now required to pay more per unit compared to other species. This has the real and

serious risk of driving several fishers across South Australia out of business due to the serious financial burden within the cost-recovery structure, so my questions to the minister are:

1. Is the minister aware that her department on the Friday of a long weekend notified fishers of the proposed fees for the marine scale fishery for 2024-25?
2. What was the minister's reason for authorising the proposed fee structure of 70 per cent quota fee and 30 per cent base licence fee?
3. What was the minister's reasoning for calculating the quota unit fee as the cost of managing the four quota species evenly divided by four, not taking into consideration the number of units or quotas available?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:27): I thank the honourable member for her question. The first question is a pretty simple one to answer: notifications go out once decisions have been made or gazettals are made or whatever it might be in the particular case. This is a fees notice in regard to commencement in July of next year, so whether it went out on a Friday or a Monday, when we consider that we are six or seven months in advance of that, I don't think is particularly relevant.

However, licence fees in all South Australian commercial fisheries are based on an activity-based cost-recovery model, or user pays if you like, where the costs associated with managing a fishery are distributed among the fishery's licence holders. The former Liberal government instigated the reform of the marine scalefish fishery, and that reform fundamentally changed the structure and management of South Australia's marine scalefish fishery.

One of the key results of the reform was the implementation of individual transferable quotas for four key species, being calamari, garfish, snapper and King George whiting. Another major part of the former government's reform was a \$22 million commitment to encourage the voluntary surrender of up to 150 South Australian commercial marine scalefish fishing licences. Ultimately, 100 licences were surrendered through that process.

As part of the reform package announced by those opposite, indeed, when they were in government, funding of \$2.51 million went to support management services and constrain individual licence fee increases to CPI only for a four-year period, the transition period from 2021 through to 2023-24, and that was while new arrangements were worked through. This is separate to other fee relief measures, such as those that came about from the initial and then ongoing closure of the snapper fishery in the West Coast, Spencer Gulf and Gulf St Vincent zones. Fee relief remains until 2026 for licence holders who hold snapper quota in the current closed fishing zones.

The process up to this point is rolling out as intended by the former Liberal government, knowing that, once those 100 surrendered licences were no longer subsidised, there were going to be inevitable changes to the licence fee system and structure as the cost of compliance and services were spread between fewer licence holders.

We know that the former government came under significant criticism for its handling of the reform, particularly the former minister's handling of the exceptional circumstances cases, and our government has worked towards the finalisation of the reforms that we inherited from those opposite. Ultimately, the 202 licences that are now in the marine scalefish fishery, and other fisheries with access to MSF, have a wide range of ability to access the resource. Some have large quantities of quota and some have very little. I cannot imagine surely that those opposite are suggesting that a licence holder with 10 units of quota should pay the same fees as someone who has access to 100 units.

During the reform, the former state government implemented a number of short-term licence fee relief arrangements, as I mentioned, and then coinciding with the conclusion of these arrangements, a review of the licence fee structure for the fishery was undertaken to remove what was the existing inequity in licence fees between those with or without quota. To assist my department to develop a new licence fee structure, an industry working group was formed comprising representatives from all of the fisheries affected by the reform.

The working group assisted in assessing options for the new licence fee structure for the fishery, which has resulted in those with greater access to the resource—that is, those with more quota—contributing more to the management costs of the fishery. This change means that those with large quota holdings will experience an increase in their licence fees in line with their access to the resource, and there will be a decrease in licence fees for those with little or no quota holdings. The new licence fee arrangements will commence in the 2024-25 financial year, and PIRSA will continue discussions with the industry to identify ways in which efficiencies can be implemented to assist industry to effectively manage the costs of managing the fisheries.

I do think it is worth mentioning what those costs do cover. It is management, it is compliance, it is research, all of which are important in terms of ensuring that we have sustainable fisheries going forward. Licence holders were advised, I am told, back when this reform was first implemented by the former government, that there would be significant changes to the licence structure. The new licence fee structure, I am advised, creates more equity than the previous structure because those with more quota and more access contribute more to the costs of managing the fishery.

Under the new fee structure, it is anticipated that more than half of the licence holders will pay less than they would have if the structure had not changed and the subsidies were removed. In terms of the timing, we need to give advice ready for the 2024-25 financial year.

MARINE SCALEFISH FISHERY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): Supplementary: can the minister explain, then, why she has calculated the quota unit fee as the cost of managing the four quota species evenly divided by four and therefore not taking into consideration the number of units or quotas available per species?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:33): The advisory committee that I mentioned earlier had multiple discussions. They have come up with a number of different scenarios. I understand that the MFA, the Marine Fishers Association, has written to me or to the department—I haven't as yet seen that letter—with some questions around the methodology, and my department is going to be working through those with them. As always, we are happy to continue to discuss concerns with stakeholders.

MARINE SCALEFISH FISHERY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:33): Supplementary: can the minister tell us how many management and compliance officers there are and what the cost of those management and compliance officers is?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:34): I am happy to take that on notice and bring back an answer.

MARINE SCALEFISH FISHERY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:34): Further supplementary: can the minister also outline for us what the lower and upper levels are for licence fees, depending on whether you have a large quota or a small quota?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:34): I'm happy to provide additional information on notice. One other thing I would add is that the department has been working through, with the various fishing sectors, ways overall that management costs can be reduced. This can include things such as initiatives towards more technological solutions for surveillance, for example, and a number of other matters. The department is keen to always be working with stakeholders to look at ways that the overall management costs can be reduced, and that, of course, would then be reflected in changes to fees.

I also would reiterate that this is also covering compliance, and this is also covering research. We need to recall that the aquatic resources are actually a community resource and then licence fees enable individual businesses to be able to access that resource, which is nonetheless a community resource. So we do need to ensure that sustainability is always uppermost and that we do have the resources available to be able to manage fisheries effectively.

MARINE SCALEFISH FISHERY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:35): Supplementary—

The PRESIDENT: And the final supplementary question: this will be the fifth one.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Why, then, has there been a 20 per cent increase in the sardine licence fee for further observation—for compliance, in regard to compliance?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, interjections are out of order.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:36): The Leader of the Opposition asks about the changes to sardines. She needs to be aware that the marine scalefish fishery impacts the four key species of calamari, garfish, snapper and King George whiting, so her question is actually not to do with the original question at all. But we do encourage all of the different fishing sectors to be able to look at ways to improve the way that the fisheries are managed and in particular whether our technological solutions are to be open to being involved in those.

MARINE SCALEFISH FISHERY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:37): I seek leave to provide a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries regarding marine scalefish fishery reform.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The marine scalefish fishing sector was reformed with the clear objectives of securing biological and financially sustainable fishing practices. The industry are well underway with improved fish stock sustainability, but according to industry sources the government is about to ruin the financial component for a portion of their industry due to the recent fee structure announcements.

The industry was and is supposed to be participating in an autonomous adjustment process to assist in the continuation of the reform process; however, the government's position on the costing method has just undone a major component of the industry's autonomous adjustment capability by undermining financial confidence in the industry's future.

The Gulf St Vincent King George whiting and garfish fishers are set to pay 30 per cent of the GVP of those species in government levies. One fisher's licence fees will be increasing by over 500 per cent from one year to the next. This is simply not viable. My questions to the minister are:

1. Given the dramatic management cost increases projected for licence holders fishing for individual transferable quota managed species in 2024-25, has the minister now made a decision regarding cost recovery in the marine scalefish fishing industry?

2. Why hasn't the minister made any decisions regarding cost recovery of the marine scalefish fisheries given she has now had the report of the independent review of the seafood sector's cost-recovery policy model for three months?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:38): I thank the honourable member for her question. First of all, in regard to the comment she made about increases from one year to the next, I do refer back to my answer to the previous question in that there has been a significant subsidy in place for four years during the transition period. That subsidy was only ever intended to be for four years under the previous government that implemented this reform and therefore it would obviously make sense—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —that once a subsidy has finished there would be changes. I would like to emphasise again that, because there is a base fee and a quota fee, those who have the greatest quota, therefore a greater asset both in terms of the ability to trade that asset, buy and sell that asset, and also the ability to actually catch fish, because they have the quota, and therefore to make a greater financial return, will be paying more than those who have a very small or no quota. That appears to be an equitable outcome.

In terms of individual mechanisms and methodology, of course I am more than happy, as I mentioned, for the department to continue to have those sorts of discussions.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I hear those opposite querying how that is equitable. I would say to them: how would it be equitable for someone who has a very small amount of quota to be paying the same fee as someone who has a very large amount of quota, which is the type of system that has been in place up until now?

In terms of the cost-recovery review, as I think I have mentioned in this place previously I did receive a draft copy of that review, and there was some additional information that I was seeking. As yet, I have not seen a response to that. I look forward to doing so and then being able to make decisions from there.

MARINE SCALEFISH FISHERY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:41): Supplementary: in relation to the draft report, has the minister now gone out to consult with industry stakeholders about the contents of that review, prior to making any final determinations?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:41): As I mentioned, when I got the draft report there was additional information that I wanted, which I sought. As yet, as I mentioned, I have not seen that back. Once I do so, then I will be able to consider it.

MARINE SCALEFISH FISHERY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): Supplementary: what additional information has the minister asked for?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:41): Additional information that would be relevant to any decisions about the cost recovery going forward.

MARINE SCALEFISH FISHERY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): Supplementary: as the minister now in charge, have you considered continuing fee relief until a more affordable and equitable payment arrangement is arranged, with a higher level of industry support?

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: It was your policy. You are now abandoning it, are you? That's what your government did. It's what your government did, and now you are saying, 'Oh, we didn't like it then. We don't like it now.' It was your government's policy.

The PRESIDENT: I don't think the question was to you, the Hon. Mr Hunter.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, the question was to you, not to the Hon. Mr Hunter. Can you please answer it?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:42): Indeed, initially it appeared the question was to you,

Mr President. You were being addressed. However, I take it that the intention was to address it to me. I would also ask those opposite what they want to say to those licence holders—which, I am advised, is more than half of the remaining licence holders in the fisheries—who are getting a decrease in their fees compared to what they would have had under the existing system. Do they also object to more than half getting lower fees than they would have otherwise done?

MARINE SCALEFISH FISHERY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries regarding marine scalefish fishery reform. Will the minister be publicly releasing the independent review into the seafood sector's cost-recovery policy model?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:43): Once I receive the additional information and am able to consider it as a whole, I will make that decision.

MARINE SCALEFISH FISHERY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:43): Supplementary: will the minister be consulting prior to releasing that final report?

The PRESIDENT: You did mention the final report.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:44): The same answer applies: once I have received the additional information, I will be able to make decisions about the next steps.

MARINE SCALEFISH FISHERY

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:44): I have a supplementary: under what circumstances would the minister not release the information in the report?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, it is about the final report.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:44): It's a hypothetical question.

LAW SOCIETY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA PRESIDENT'S MEDAL

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:44): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the minister inform the council about the recipient of the Law Society of South Australia's President's Medal for 2023?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:44): I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in the Law Society's President's Medal, which is well known. It gives me great pleasure to inform the chamber about the Law Society's President's Medal, which may be awarded to an individual or group who has, in the President of the Law Society's opinion, made an outstanding contribution to the profession or has provided outstanding assistance to the Law Society in the various projects and achievements of that president during his or her term.

Each year, the president may award the award once, and the award may be shared. This award is only awarded when the president identifies a suitably meritorious nominee. For these reasons, the President's Medal is not always awarded each year.

Recent previous recipients have included: in 2022, Paul Black, a barrister at Carrington Chambers, for his work in industrial relations law; Craig Caldicott in 2020 for his longstanding contribution in representation and advocacy in criminal law; Chris Boundy in 2019 for his work towards the review of the Australian Solicitors' Conduct Rules; Ross Womersley, now Chief Executive of SACOSS, in 2017 for his contribution to the work of the Law Society in various projects; and Diane Mifsud, executive assistant to the honourable Chief Justice, in 2016 for her outstanding contribution to the legal profession over some decades.

In relation to the question the honourable member asked on this year's recipient, as I have mentioned in this chamber a number of times, I am very pleased as Attorney-General with the work of the South Australian Legal Services Commission, which has been providing legal assistance to South Australians now for almost half a century. They are annually delivering in excess of 140,000 legal assistance services through the provision of legal information, advice and representation.

I am also very proud, as Attorney-General, that in addition to the two winners of the Justice Award for 2023, the President's Medal this year was won by another member of the Legal Services Commission, Ms Emma Shaw. Emma Shaw is the team leader of the Legal Services Commission's Major Indictable Unit and has been a member of the Law Society since 2011. During her time as a member, she has made a significant and meaningful contribution to the Law Society's work through involvement on the executive, the council and a large number of committees.

Emma has been a member of the council since 2018, the Ethics and Practice Committee since 2019 and the Criminal Law Committee since 2017, and joined the Governance Structure Working Group this year. She has been the Law Society's nominee on the Board of Examiners since 2017. Emma was previously a member of the executive in 2019, 2020 and 2022, the Court SA Criminal Practitioner Users Group between 2021 and 2022, the GDLP committee in 2020, and what was then the Administrative Law Committee in 2017 and 2018.

Emma is well known for her thoughtful and well-considered contributions to the committees of which she is a member. Her commitment to these roles serves as an inspiring example to others to follow in the pursuit of making a positive impact on the Law Society and the legal profession in this state generally.

Members of the Law Society often give up their time and energy outside normal working hours—on evenings, weekends and in the early hours of the mornings—to their project, and Emma exemplifies this selflessness. I congratulate and commend the winner of the President's Medal, Emma Shaw.

ESTABLISHMENT OF ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:48): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Education, on the topic of the university merger deal.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: This morning, the government announced that they have struck a deal with One Nation and the Hon. Connie Bonaros to support the university merger. One Nation's education 'policy' states:

One Nation will restore critical thinking in the classroom and reinstate the cornerstone of education with reading, writing, arithmetic, and discipline. There should be no room for Western, white, gender, guilt shaming in any classroom and instead children should be taught the benefits of a merit-based, free-thinking society.

In 2020, Pauline Hanson of the One Nation party did a deal with the then Morrison government on the Higher Education Support Act 2003, which included a freedom of speech clause for academics. It was reported in the *Sydney Morning Herald* at the time that the One Nation amendment would make it harder for universities to discipline racist or sexist academics.

A submission from seven institutions, including La Trobe University, Western Sydney University and James Cook University, opposed the changes and stated that it would seem that a university academic would be within her or his rights to publicly declare they hold a racist, sexual or gendered prejudice against one or more of the students they are teaching. My question to the Attorney-General therefore is:

1. Can the government clarify whether the One Nation education policy was considered as part of its negotiations with One Nation with regard to the university merger?
2. Will the government rule out inclusion of a One Nation freedom of speech clause similar to that that the party proposed at a federal level in any state university act?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:50): I thank the honourable member for his question. He certainly has been a well-known advocate on his views for what he sees as best for the education sector in South Australia. I think most of us have a similar aim in looking at what is best for education and higher education in South Australia.

Obviously, I haven't been involved in discussions in relation to this area. I did see media reports this morning to the effect that people who have been reported as supporting the proposal to create one university out of what are now the universities of Adelaide and South Australia have considered the proposals on their merits and what is best for South Australia, particularly those like the honourable member, who have had the benefit of a great deal of information and evidence through what I understand has been a pretty thorough committee process looking at this.

However, I am happy to refer the question on to, I think, the minister for higher education in the other place and see if there is anything that she wishes to add to that.

ABORIGINAL REMAINS, RIVERLEA PARK

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs about Aboriginal affairs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: While appearing on ABC's Q+A show on Monday 9 October 2023, actor Natasha Wanganeen raised her concerns about the SA Labor government over the burial grounds at Riverlea housing development. Ms Wanganeen also claimed that she had tried and failed to speak with the state Aboriginal affairs minister and Attorney-General, Kyam Maher, about the development. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Can the Attorney-General confirm whether he has received a meeting request from Natasha Wanganeen?
2. Has the minister responded to her request so far?
3. Is the minister planning to meet with Natasha to hear her concerns?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:52): I thank the honourable member for her questions. I had my office have a look for any such request and we haven't been able to find any.

THRIVING COMMUNITIES PROGRAM

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about the announcement of the latest round of grant recipients from the Thriving Communities Program?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:53): I thank the honourable member for his question. The Thriving Communities Program is an important part of the Thriving Regions Fund, offering small grants of between \$20,000 to \$50,000 for projects which build social wellbeing, resilience and greater community participation.

The program has been designed to allow community groups—for example, show societies, agricultural bureaus, chambers of commerce or registered charities—to apply for grant funding for new or improved infrastructure, plant and equipment, improved access to services and programs, and events with wellbeing outcomes.

One of the advantages of the program is that it doesn't set out a long list of prescriptive criteria which applicants must meet to be eligible but aims to be flexible in allowing grassroots community groups to identify and design local projects and programs which most appropriately address community needs and aspirations. The program also endeavours to have a spread across regional South Australia, and the successful grant recipients for round 4 reflect this ambition, with

projects spread from the Upper Spencer Gulf through to the Barossa, McLaren Vale and the Riverland.

In addition to this geographical diversity, the projects and programs included in this grant round also offer very different contributions to their local communities. From the purchase of equipment to support a healthy meal preparation program administered by the Bungala Aboriginal Corporation to the construction or upgrade of shelter facilities at a childcare centre in the Barossa Valley and a community garden in Willunga, these initiatives respond to the specific needs and aspirations of regional communities.

Recently, I had the opportunity and indeed the privilege to visit the two Riverland community groups which were awarded grants in this latest round of funding: the Loxton Netball Club and the Renmark branch of the Girl Guides. The Loxton Netball Club was excited about receiving \$38,000 to support the costs of a fully enclosed, sheltered and inclusive playground, which I am told will be capable of containing children within the play area safely, protecting them from the harsh Riverland sun and providing inclusive play spaces, such as a sound arch where children can sit and make music.

The Renmark Girl Guides will receive \$50,000 for significant restoration works of their hall, which currently hosts 15 guides between the ages of five and 14. I am advised that these works will actually help the organisation to become financially self-sufficient and, as a consequence, be in a better position to continue their work of mentoring and upskilling Riverland girls into the future. I thank all community groups who have made applications to the Thriving Communities Program, and I look forward to the completion of grant-winning projects in the coming months.

MARINE SCALEFISH FISHERY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:56): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development about cost recovery.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Earlier today, the minister gave us an outline of the cost-recovery review process and where that's at, and didn't indicate in fact whether she would be releasing that publicly or not. My question to the minister is: when did she make the request for additional information so as to assist her in making her final determination, and has she put a time frame on the duration of time that it will take to get that information back so that she can finalise her report?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:57): I am happy to check the records to see when that request was made. If I recall correctly, I didn't put a particular date on that. It's usual to expect that a review committee such as was established would provide that information as soon as they were able.

MARINE SCALEFISH FISHERY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:57): Supplementary: the minister spoke about the report. Under what circumstances will the minister not release the report on the independent cost-recovery review into the seafood sector?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:58): I think this was put forward as an attempted supplementary earlier. Whilst I don't want to assume the reasons why the President didn't allow the question, my understanding was that hypothetical questions are out of order. This similarly is a hypothetical question, I would have thought: 'Under what circumstances?' Until a decision is made, it would be inappropriate to say, 'Well, perhaps if this happens or that happens then I may or may not release the report.' Once I have the information and I am able to make a considered view, then I will be able to decide on the next steps.

MARINE SCALEFISH FISHERY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): Further supplementary: then why can't the minister make a commitment to this chamber that she will publicly release that report?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:59): I have already answered—three times, I think.

MARINE SCALEFISH FISHERY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:59): Further supplementary, Mr President?

The PRESIDENT: A further supplementary and final supplementary question, the Hon. Ms Bonaros.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Has the minister given any commitments that she will release the report to stakeholders before it is made publicly available?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:59): Does that arise from the original answer? I wouldn't have thought so.

ADNYAMATHANHA HERITAGE SITE

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:59): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs on the subject of damage to Adnyamathanha heritage.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: In late August, as honourable members would be aware, the traditional heritage on the lands of the Adnyamathanha people were destroyed by earthworks commissioned through the Department for Environment and Water. According to some information in the public domain, traditional owner Regina McKenzie wants a comprehensive survey done of these areas. My question to the minister is: will the government be listening to the traditional owners and working with them to provide the review of how their sacred lands were damaged through this government process?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for her question. I have outlined in this chamber before, and I won't outline the nature and who the discussions were with, and I have had discussions with traditional owners, including Kuyani traditional owners, about this particular incident and the effect it has had on them.

I know that the Minister for Environment, the Hon. Susan Close, member for Port Adelaide and Deputy Premier, has talked about a review that is currently underway in the environment department about how the events that played out came to be. I look forward to that review, and I certainly look forward to continuing my discussions with the traditional owners about how to best protect their heritage.

FRONTLINE RETAIL WORKERS

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector. Can the minister tell the council about steps taken to deal with violence against frontline retail workers?

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 his question, and his commitment to protecting workers in South Australia. As members of this council would be aware, incidents of abuse and violence toward retail workers are sadly all too common. We saw this increase dramatically during the COVID period where retail workers who were on the frontline during significant shortages of goods, particularly household items, bore the brunt of the frustration and the unnecessary abuse and sometimes violence directed towards them from members of the public.

Surveys of retail employees have indicated that as many as 85 per cent have experienced verbal abuse from customers, and nearly 8 per cent have been the victims of physical violence. From August 2022 to August 2023, SAPOL's figures indicate that just over 200 criminal charges were laid in relation to violence and aggression in the retail sector.

At the last election, the now government committed to making assaulting a frontline retail worker an aggravated offence, to send an unequivocal message that retail workers, who are very often young people in their first jobs, do not deserve to be threatened, abused or suffer violence simply for doing their jobs. The election commitment was delivered with new regulations last year that increase the maximum penalty for a basic assault against retail workers from two to five years, and the maximum penalty for assault causing harm from three to seven years; however, we know that while introducing higher penalties often does act as a deterrent, a lot of things need to be put in place, and there needs to be a sustained campaign of education about safe work practices to protect retail workers.

SafeWork SA has worked very closely with the Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees Association in relation to education on this issue. Between January 2022 and January 2023, SafeWork SA has run a targeted compliance campaign in retail workplaces throughout metropolitan and regional South Australia. I am advised that campaign included visits to 89 different workplaces and the issuing of 28 improvement notices. I am informed service stations had the highest number of notices issued; however, other notices were issued at workplaces including supermarkets, pharmacies and fast-food outlets.

The main issues identified by SafeWork SA have been twofold. Firstly, too often businesses are not putting in place safe systems of work designed to control and manage the risk to their staff. Simple systems to address violence and aggression can include things like security screens, duress alarms, signage and CCTV cameras as physical implementations. Secondly, many retail workers have insufficient training on how to deal with violent or aggressive customers, including how to deal with situations at the highest end, such as armed robberies.

The campaign conducted by SafeWork has been about education for businesses, not punishment. Conducting worksite visits and issuing improvement notices puts business on notice about health and safety issues and gives them the opportunity to deal with those issues before more significant enforcement action needs to be considered.

That work has had real results on the ground, including the installation of bank teller like security screens at McDonald's in Hindley Street, the first instance of such screens being used in a fast food venue in South Australia and, I think, if I am remembering correctly, perhaps the first of its kind in a McDonald's in Australia. I look forward to continuing to work with SafeWork SA and workers' representatives such as Josh Peak and the SDA to improve the health and safety of retail workers throughout South Australia.

FRONTLINE RETAIL WORKERS

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:05): Supplementary: has the Attorney had an opportunity to monitor, following the increase in penalties in legislation, the actual penalties handed out by the courts for the offences committed?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:05): I thank the honourable member very much for his question. It is a very good question indeed. It is one that I did ask about when we announced the results of the compliance so far. We don't have information available about the effect it has had to date. As I have said, in the 12 months to 2023, I am informed a bit over 200—I think it's 215—criminal charges have been laid by SAPOL in relation to violence and aggression in the retail sector. The number of those that apply to the aggravated offence we just don't have figures on. I did ask that. I thank the honourable member for his question. It is one that I considered also.

STIRLING VILLAGE FIRE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:06): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Regional Development on the topic of the Stirling Village fire.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Last Sunday, as we know, Stirling Village shop owners had been forced to relocate or close after a huge blaze swept through that shopping centre. An estimated \$25 million damage was caused to the Stirling Village, which has a Woolworths, a pharmacy, a Cibo, a sushi store, a Bakers Delight, a butcher and a ready-made meals store.

The Woolworths supermarket was fully destroyed. Businesses in the adjoining mall still haven't been able to access their shops to even see what has been damaged. These shops therefore aren't open, and local people not only are unable to access much-needed produce but aren't working. While Woolworths workers have been deployed to other stores, the closest stores are Blackwood, 12 kilometres away; Mitcham, 14 kilometres away; and Mount Barker, 18 kilometres away. We know that public transport options are very limited.

It is unclear how long the stores will be closed, but I note that local Adelaide Hills Council Mayor, Jan-Claire Wisdom, has contacted the Stirling Business Association to investigate what the needs might be and has offered options such as temporary caravan accommodation for some businesses. My questions to the minister are:

1. Has the minister contacted the Adelaide Hills Council or the Stirling Business Association to assess the needs of independent traders and workers or to offer assistance?
2. What needs have been identified, and what assistance has been offered?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:08): I thank the honourable member for her question. I am sure we are all saddened and shocked to see the fire that occurred at Stirling Village and to see the devastation that it has caused to those smaller shops as well as to Woolworths. I am happy to refer the question to the Minister for Small and Family Business in the other place to see whether she can provide some information in regard to the questions asked by the honourable member.

STIRLING VILLAGE FIRE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:08): Supplementary: does the minister see this as a regional development issue?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:09): As I mentioned, the more appropriate minister, I would suggest, is the Minister for Small and Family Business. I am happy to reach out to her and see if she can provide additional information.

STIRLING VILLAGE FIRE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:09): Supplementary: what can the small business minister do to assist with transport and infrastructure in this region? Do you not see this as a regional development issue more broadly?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, you did mention the other minister in the other place, but you choose to answer it how you see fit.

STIRLING VILLAGE FIRE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:09): Supplementary: is this not yet another reason that the minister should pay more attention to transport as an issue for regional communities?

The PRESIDENT: I can't really rule that in because there was no mention of transport in the minister's original answer.

AERIAL CULLING

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:10): I seek leave to give a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding aerial deer culling.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: In a freedom of information determination, it was revealed that a second near miss occurred three days after the well-known and publicised incident involving legal deer hunters. This time a worker was within the shot zone of the aerial culling helicopter. My questions to the minister are:

1. Has a separate investigation taken place and been completed in regard to the second incident, and what changes were made as a result of this investigation?
2. Are farmers, their workers and people in general in the South-East safe from this practise of aerial culling by your department?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:11): I thank the honourable member for her question. The incident that occurred, if I recall correctly, in March has been investigated and in this place I have referred to the changes in our procedures that related to some change in ownership that had not come to light. The change in procedures involves checking three different sources of data to ensure that the information is up to date.

Aerial deer culling is a well-recognised and successful method for trying to eradicate feral deer, which cause so much difficulty and destruction both to the environment and also to farmers and landholders. The committees that are associated with DEW are continuing to work very hard in terms of trying to eliminate and eradicate feral deer, an issue which I think the majority of landholders in the South-East, which is where this incident occurred, are very supportive of. They appreciate how damaging it is in terms of financial cost, as well as how damaging it is to the environment. If the honourable member has any additional information she would like specifics on, I am happy to take that on notice and provide additional information.

AERIAL CULLING

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:12): Supplementary: is the minister aware that there was a second incident within days of the first incident and what has she done to address this?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:12): If the honourable member would like to be more specific, I am happy to seek additional information as required.

AERIAL CULLING

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:13): Supplementary: I am more than happy to provide a copy of the incident report. So are you indicating that you are not aware there has been a second incident, or are there other multiple incidents that have occurred that you would like to disclose to this chamber?

The PRESIDENT: We never heard anything about multiple incidents—

The Hon. H.M. Girolamo interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The first part of the supplementary I think was in order. The second part perhaps wasn't because there was no mention of multiple incidents in your first question, but the first part I would invite you to provide an answer.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:13): Whenever there are any serious incidents that are brought to the attention of the department, those are investigated. I then receive a briefing if it's something that is expected to be something that has some basis in fact. If the honourable member would like to provide more details about which specific incident she is referring to, I am happy, as I mentioned in my original answer, to seek additional information.

AERIAL CULLING

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:14): Supplementary: is the minister aware of the incident that occurred on 28 March this year?

The PRESIDENT: That question has been asked repeatedly. Do you want to provide an answer or we move on?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:14): I think I have already answered it.

STERILE INSECT TECHNOLOGY FACILITY

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:14): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the council about the recent expansion of the Port Augusta SIT fly facility?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:14): I thank the honourable member for his question. Indeed, he has approached me on a number of occasions in regard to people who have contacted him in regard to fruit fly, and I appreciate his advocacy on their behalf.

I am delighted to provide an update to this place about the very exciting news that the Port Augusta Sterile Insect Technology Facility is now expanding its SIT fly production of Qflies from 20 million to 40 million a week, which will go directly into the Riverland region to assist with the ongoing fruit fly outbreaks in that region.

The official opening in Port Augusta occurred last month. Unfortunately, I was unable to attend because of illness, but I want to thank the member for Stuart in the other place for stepping in and officially opening the \$3 million expanded centre on my behalf. I understand the member for Giles, as well as the Hon. Justin Hanson MLC in this place and the Hon. Nicola Centofanti were also in attendance for the opening. I am told there was a real 'buzz' of excitement at the opening from all who attended and were thrilled to see the expanded facility up and operating. Since the facility opened in Port Augusta seven years ago, South Australia has played a key role in research into sterile insect technology.

The state government is using every tool at its disposal to eradicate the current outbreaks in the Riverland and, of course, part of this response has been to release up to 20 million SIT flies into the affected areas each week in the appropriate season. Now, with the Port Augusta expansion in full swing, we have the ability to release up to 40 million SIT Qflies into the Riverland every week, and this will be crucial to our success in achieving eradication. I look forward to the region being covered with sterile flies over the weeks into the future, which will provide significant assistance to the on-the-ground crews who are working on the response. We know that the work going into the response is having an impact.

This particular facility won't just assist South Australia but is also significant for the Australian horticultural industry as a whole. Having more SIT flies available offers a long-term, more sustainable management solution to controlling Qfly nationally. I must also acknowledge the generous investment of the commonwealth government through its \$30 million national Building Resilience to Manage Fruit Fly package, and \$20 million of that has been committed to managing the risk of fruit fly in South Australia.

Along with commonwealth and state government funding for this expansion, I thank Citrus SA for their financial contribution towards the building of the expanded facility. I understand Citrus SA Chair, Mark Doecke, and executive officer Frances Asher both attended the opening and I thank them for their continued partnership in the response to fruit fly outbreaks in South Australia. Once again, I thank everyone involved in the build which has achieved a high-quality economical build in a short time frame. I look forward to continuing to provide updates to this place on the state government's response to fruit fly in South Australia.

STERILE INSECT TECHNOLOGY FACILITY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:18): Supplementary: has the minister received any advice from her federal colleagues as to when the funds for the fruit fly irradiation facility, which will assist in fruit fly control, will be delivered to South Australia?

The PRESIDENT: I am not quite sure how that fits. You can answer it if you wish.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:18): I continue to have ongoing discussions with my federal counterpart about addressing this issue.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am sorry, minister, can you repeat that? I didn't hear what you said.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I said, I continue to have ongoing discussions with my federal counterpart about such issues.

ESTABLISHMENT OF ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:18): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General and the Premier a question about the university merger.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Similar to other members in this chamber, I was somewhat surprised and disappointed with the Premier's announcement this morning that he had done a deal with the Hon. Connie Bonaros and the Hon. Sarah Game to get his university legislation over the line. I have not settled on a position. I know I said to the Premier that I would need to engage with stakeholders once the report was finalised, but he seemed to be impatient to get his win. My questions to the Attorney-General and the Premier are:

1. Is One Nation now seeking support for Labor to repeal the legislated South Australian Voice to Parliament as a condition for their vote?

2. How can the Attorney-General be comfortable that Labor has jumped into bed with One Nation, which has savaged and wants to dismantle Labor's signature Voice legislation?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:20): I thank the honourable member for his question. I'm happy to repeat what I said earlier. I know from media reports I have seen today that members of this chamber have said to the effect that they have considered the proposal on its merits and what's best for South Australia. But, as I said to the Hon. Robert Simms, I will say again: I am happy to pass on to my colleagues in the other place to see if they wish to add to that reply.

I don't think I could have been any more clear yesterday in this government's steadfast commitment to the election of the South Australian First Nations Voice that will occur on 16 March next year. Let me be completely unequivocal: these elections will be going ahead. We will be meeting the aspirations, desires and hopes of the South Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community.

ESTABLISHMENT OF ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:20): Supplementary: would the Attorney-General like me to respond and clarify my reason for supporting the merger—

The PRESIDENT: No, that is not a supplementary question.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: —given that I am sitting right here, ready—

The PRESIDENT: No. Sit down.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: —willing and able to do so.

The PRESIDENT: Sit down.

AUTOMOTIVE TRADES WORKFORCE

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:21): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions of the Attorney-General, who represents the Minister for Education, Training and Skills in the other place, specifically on motor trades recruitment.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: I have been contacted by the owner of a small crash repair business in South Australia—and I'm aware of at least one other—who is very much struggling to find panelbeaters to employ in their business, and as a result of that the business is suffering quite substantially. The business owner has apparently exhausted every avenue of trying to attract employees from South Australia and interstate and has explored obtaining workers through the immigration system, even. However, the cost of this avenue has proven to be too high, with no guarantee of success, and of course there are other complexities around that as well.

In addition to this, the CEO of the Motor Trade Association has stated:

We're currently short 33,000 skilled professionals across the automotive trades—the vast majority of those are in the mechanical and collision repair sectors.

My questions to the minister—and I appreciate fully that this is a matter that he will refer, but perhaps if he can make some general comments and refer it to his colleague—are:

1. What would be the state government's response to this constituent and the countless number of business owners who find themselves in this exact situation across this sector and others?
2. Are the National Centre for Vocational Education Research figures from last year and this year showing an increase or decrease of people in training in these fields?
3. What specific measures are being put in place by the state government to encourage more training and apprenticeships, particularly in the automotive collision repair sector?
4. What measures has the government undertaken to attract more workers to this sector in particular, whether from South Australia, interstate or overseas?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:22): I thank the honourable member for his question and the honourable member's regular inquiring of making sure industry in South Australia can prosper to its fullest.

Certainly, many areas of the automotive trades are suffering because of a general skills shortage and a tight labour market right across Australia at the moment. This isn't something new for the automotive trades. I know from my previous incarnation as a minister, when the Hon. Jay Weatherill was Premier and when I held the portfolios of Minister for Manufacturing and also Minister for Automotive Transformation as we were seeing the closure of the Holden production plant at Elizabeth, we put a whole lot of programs in place to allow people who were involved in the OEMs, the original automotive manufacturers such as Holden but also the tier 1 and tier 2 manufacturers that supplied to Holden, to retrain.

Even then, back in around 2015, 2016, not just the Motor Trade Association but individual proprietors of companies were talking about a shortage. Some of the things they talked about were the fact that there were particularly family-owned automotive repair places, panelbeating included, that had been owned by the family for one or two generations, and it was difficult looking for that next transition when people exited the industry. That also applies, obviously, to looking for new people to enter the industry.

It is something that I know has been an issue for some time but has been exacerbated, as we see an exceptionally tight labour market right across Australia in a whole range of areas. I know it is something that my colleague the Minister for Skills, the Hon. Blair Boyer, the member for Wright, has had numerous discussions with the Motor Trade Association in particular about.

I know this because I have talked to the Hon. Blair Boyer about this, but also because the Motor Trade Association has been one of the many industry groups that has come and presented at cabinet. Something we regularly do is have industry groups at the start of cabinet meetings presenting some of the issues faced by those industries.

About the middle of last year, if I remember correctly, the Motor Trade Association presented at the start of a cabinet meeting, and that skills shortage certainly was an issue that was raised. All cabinet ministers from that meeting had the benefit of being appraised of some of the problems that are being faced. As I have said, I know the minister, the Hon. Blair Boyer, has had numerous discussions.

I am happy to refer the question to the Hon. Blair Boyer to add more of what the government is doing, but I know one particular thing—it was either earlier this week or last week—was announced and that is in relation to the Tonsley Technical College, where it was announced that automotive would be a specific stream at that college. As I understand it, the MTA came on board as an official partner with the Tonsley Technical College, with the automotive stream as something very concrete that the government is looking at doing to address the concerns that the honourable member has raised.

I am happy to refer the question to the Hon. Blair Boyer, the Minister for Skills, to bring back a more complete answer, because I know it is an area that he has been closely in contact with the MTA and the industry about, looking to see what more as a government we can do to encourage the skills and labour shortages that are being faced.

Matters of Interest

GALIPO FOODS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:26): It is my great privilege to rise today to convey my heartfelt congratulations to Galipo Foods, a proud and award-winning South Australian family-owned business. This year marks the 40th anniversary of Galipo Foods, and it was a great honour to be invited to the gala celebration on Wednesday 11 October 2023 at the beautiful Sunnybrae Estate function centre.

Many distinguished guests, including the Hon. Hieu Van Le, former governor, along with many wonderful Italian and multicultural community leaders and prominent business leaders from the food service and hospitality industry across South Australia and Australia were there, of course with the whole Galipo team, united as one big family to mark the momentous occasion celebrating four decades of the outstanding success of Galipo Foods.

It was great to see so many of my Liberal colleagues there as well, including former Premier, the Hon. Steven Marshall, the Hon. John Gardner and also the Hon. Vincent Tarzia, all of whom are great supporters and have a long-term association and friendship with the Galipo family.

When we come across a successful company, we often underestimate the sheer hard work by business owners, their determination to overcome many challenges through taking risks and making personal sacrifices in order to transform themselves and their company, so that they can stand out from the rest and become the best they can be.

Galipo is both a successful Italian migrant's story and an award-winning business story. A special book called *From no-hoper to no.1* details the humble beginning of Galipo, where 40 years ago Sebastian Galipo, with a burning desire to prove he was better than a no-hoper, decided to make a go of a simple idea, started with a modest \$5,000 loan and became a one-stop shop food distribution company.

The Galipo Foods company started out of the garage of Sebastian Galipo's home and commenced its operation with just four domestic refrigerators and freezers all the way back in 1983. For those who have the pleasure of knowing Sebastian Galipo, he is a passionate leader with big dreams and big ambitions. He knew from the very beginning that the business he created must always be innovative and 100 per cent customer orientated—as Sebastian says in his own words, 'a win-win for ourselves and our customers.'

Back in 1983, Galipo Foods was one of the 14 South Australian owned broad range food wholesale distributors. Today, there are only four remaining from the original group, and Galipo Foods is the only one remaining that is still South Australian owned.

In order to stay competitive and grow the business to accommodate more customers, more suppliers and more staff, Galipo Foods has had five relocations, including moving to a larger premises in Stepney in 1988, which coincided with Sebastian's brother, Bill, leaving behind his career as a teacher to become a partner in the company. The dynamic Galipo brothers, along with their professional team at Galipo Foods, would later establish a distribution centre at Dry Creek in 2003. Two other acquisitions expanded to serve customers in regional South Australia.

Though Galipo Foods has rapidly expanded over its 40 years and services some of the biggest names in the food industry, including Domino's Pizza, Subway, KFC and Barnacle Bill, at the same time they also maintain a focus on smaller and local businesses. Their customers include cafes, restaurants, hotels, caterers, aged care, school canteens, sports clubs, fish and chip shops, pizza bars and many more.

Their commitment to high-quality service has seen Galipo Foods become one of the most highly decorated food service distributors in South Australia. The company has won the South Australia's Best Distributor Award presented by Foodservice Suppliers Association Australia for 10 years in a row from 2014 to 2023. Furthermore, across the country Galipo has been voted the number one food service distributor in Australia five times by Foodservice Suppliers Association Australia at their national Awards for Excellence.

Today, it has a strong brand and employs 233 staff to supply more than 4,000 businesses across South Australia, using 60 trucks. Congratulations Galipo Foods and thank you for the significant contributions you make to support our economy, our local jobs and our community.

GOLDEN NORTH ICE CREAM

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (15:31): Consumers enjoy plenty of choice when they are browsing the ice cream section at the shops, but for many people, especially here in our state, one brand stands out for some of the best possible reasons. It is South Australian, it is a perennial consumer favourite, and this year Golden North ice cream reaches the remarkable milestone of turning 100 years old. It has a fantastic homegrown South Australian story that I would like to share in brief today.

Around the beginning of the 1880s, Mr William Bowker of Laura was attracted to mining ventures in Broken Hill, but once there he observed that the local community was in want of supply of dairy products. He seized the opportunity and started supplying Broken Hill and surrounding communities with scalded cream from the Bowker family farm at Laura.

The distance from Laura to Broken Hill is some 366 kilometres, presenting distribution challenges in the era before refrigeration. The cream made the journey to the Gladstone railhead by horse and dray. In warmer months the containers were stored in vats of standing water prior to sendoff, and typically covered with wet bags for the overnight rail journey to Broken Hill.

William Bowker died in 1900 at the age of 55. In 1903, the business was handed over to his eldest living child, Percival. It was under Percival's leadership that the family ice cream enterprise later began. In 1923, the first ice tank and two coldrooms were installed at Laura. The one-tonne capacity tanks supplied ice for storage and for packing the cream to rail. In that same year, the Laura Ice Company was formed, primarily to serve the expanding needs of both the local Mid North and Broken Hill communities. This marked the real beginning of Golden North as it now exists.

In 1925, extensions were built on the factory at Laura, the Laura Ice and Produce Company was established, and a glass-lined cream cooking vat was imported from the United States. Sales of cream increased steadily and ice cream began gaining popularity as a delicious treat within Australia. To meet demand, the Laura Ice and Produce Company again increased the size of its plant and installed its first churn freezer.

By 1930, electricity became available from local power stations, making refrigeration easier to implement at the site. To improve the keeping quality of their milk, in 1938 the Laura Ice and Produce Company began to offer the first pasteurised milk in the region. Milk sales expanded during the wartime years, with Woomera and other military establishments being set up near the region. Golden North Dairies Ltd was formed in 1948. Over time, their distribution area ranged from Gawler in the south to the Northern Territory's Tenant Creek in the north. This was said to be the world's longest milk run. It also extended from Ceduna in the west to Broken Hill in the east.

The Bowker family sold Golden North in 1983 to South Australian Southern Farmers Group, which we now know as Farmers Union. Southern Farmers launched Golden North ice cream into the Adelaide market and introduced their distinctive slice-and-serve sausage pack of our childhoods, which later gave way to the more popular plastic two-litre tubs.

In 1991, the larger National Foods was formed, including Southern Farmers and Golden North. Milk production moved to Port Pirie and the Laura site started producing ice cream exclusively, expanding distribution to national markets. In late 2001, a group of local businesspeople bought the company back into South Australian hands. It is now owned by five South Australian families. I had the pleasure of meeting some of the owners at a recent event, and I look forward to taking them up on their invitation to tour the production facilities. Members can let me know if they want to form a tasting delegation.

To this day, the factory remains at Laura, producing the iconic range of ice creams, frozen yoghurts and sorbets for local, national and international markets. Annual production now stands at around 12 million litres and they have a workforce of around 65 people. If William Bowker dared to imagine such success and longevity for the modest enterprise he started, I can only believe he would be thoroughly delighted, not just at the success of the brand but at the quality and the popularity of Golden North's much-loved products.

Since 2018, Golden North has won five consecutive national Canstar Blue Awards for Australia's favourite ice cream tub. Among many other achievements, this one shines. For a century, the enterprise that is now Golden North has been a true icon of South Australia, and it was, quite literally, declared a National Trust South Australian heritage icon in 2006.

Golden North embodies so much of what we love about our little part of the world: enterprise, ingenuity and innovation, as well as fine quality and a genuine sense of love and loyalty for our state. I commend Golden North for supplying our state, our nation and markets across our region with great products year on year, and I congratulate them on their remarkable century of success.

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT REGULATION OF PROSTITUTION REPORT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:37): The European Parliament is an important forum for political debate and decision-making at the EU level. The members of the European Parliament are directly elected by voters in all member states to represent people's interests with regard to EU lawmaking. The EU covers 27 countries and has a collective population of 448.4 million people.

On 30 August this year, the European Parliament handed down its report on the regulation of prostitution in the EU, its cross-border implications and, importantly, its impact on gender equality and human rights. It found that there are links between prostitution and organised crime, such as human trafficking and drug trafficking, and that in countries with decriminalised pimping and sex-buying and the associated legal infrastructure, trafficking of vulnerable women and minors for sexual exploitation is facilitated and encouraged.

It also found that prostitution is a form of violence and both a cause and a consequence of gender inequality and that the gender-specific nature of prostitution and its exploitation exacerbates the power imbalance between men and women. Given that the majority of people in prostitution are women, it speaks about its impacts on the widening of the inequality gap between the two genders and its negative effect on the further realisation of women's rights.

The report calls on member states to introduce comprehensive psychological, medical, socio-economic and administrative support for victims and survivors of prostitution and ensure access to essential services, such as housing, health care and education. It also makes multiple significant comments around targeting demand for prostitution. In particular, the report notes, and I quote:

...prostitution and trafficking for sexual exploitation exist because there is a demand for it; stresses that, besides addressing the vulnerability of potential victims and prosecuting traffickers and facilitators, among others, demand reduction is a key instrument for the prevention and reduction of human trafficking, as it targets financial incentives;

The report goes on to say that it:

...believes, therefore, that this—

that is demand reduction—

should be developed further in the revision of the EU Anti-Trafficking Directive;

It also notes that:

The 'knowing use' approach of victims of trafficking has proven to be ineffective in order to reduce sexual exploitation due to the impossibility of proving a buyer's knowledge; points out, in this context, that people voluntarily in prostitution are so few in number that they alone cannot meet demand; calls, therefore, for awareness to be raised about the fact that people who want to buy 'sexual services' are at high risk of de facto buying exploitation due to the high number of people forced or lured into prostitution.

Importantly, this report noted that:

...the decriminalisation of pimping and of the purchase of sex increases demand, empowers the demand side and normalises sex buying; underlines that the stigmatisation of people...in prostitution nevertheless persists.

The report refers to studies showing that the normalisation of buying women's bodies goes hand in hand with the greater use of violence against women and a greater sense of entitlement towards women in prostitution and women in general. It notes that only if demand is reduced can the prostitution market, and therefore the number of those exploited in it, shrink.

On 14 September, after debate on the report, the report was adopted by the European Parliament. This is a monumental occasion and moment for the European Union, with its members representing 27 countries, as they formally recognise the inherently harmful nature of prostitution. In its explanatory statement, the report concluded that:

It is therefore high time that the Member States take measures in the areas of prevention, decriminalization of people in prostitution, while supporting exit and reintegration programs, destigmatization and the reduction of stereotypes and do not shy away from punishing clients. Because in the end it is their demand that is the basis for the exploitation taking place in prostitution. Demand makes trading in women attractive. Demand takes advantage of vulnerabilities and the lack of alternatives. And demand legitimizes a system of inequality and exploitation in which women and children are the primary victims.

It is about time Australia heeded the same advice.

INDUSTRIAL MANSLAUGHTER

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:41): I think it is pretty consistent with Australian values that when I say something like people should not put cost-cutting or profit ahead of workers' or people's lives, that sits pretty comfortably with the Australian set of values. Around about 2007, a young and somewhat idealistic person starting his work at the Australian Workers' Union as a legal officer back then sat down and read a report. That report said a pretty interesting thing. It said that South Australia should introduce this offence of industrial manslaughter.

This young person sat there—I sat there—and thought, 'Yes, that sits pretty fairly with me. That sits with the Australian set of values.' Well, sadly, it has taken a little bit of time. It is now 2023. Every South Australian worker, every Australian worker really, should be able to access the fundamental right to come home from work and be alive—not yet. Workers are still not guaranteed access to that most basic of rights—they are still not—to the tune of a conservative estimate of more than 100 human lives over the last decade in our state alone.

We are almost there, though. The Labor Party at the last election promised that it would bring in industrial manslaughter laws. Very recently, we moved them through this house very successfully with the help of some of our crossbench colleagues. I particularly acknowledge in that fact the Greens.

I want to say today to the families of those workers who have not come home, to those families who are exhausted from beating their fists against a brick wall on this issue for many decades, I am sorry. I am sorry you have not been heard or acknowledged in the way that you deserve. To the leaders of industrial advocates—my good friends in the union movement, myself not that long ago among them—who have been exhausted by the lobbying, the endless protesting, the trying to convince people to put an end to it, I am sorry it has taken too long.

The fact is, until now there were modest fines—very modest fines—that could typically be claimed against insurance for a death of someone at work. If someone died you could claim that on insurance. Insurance for a human life. Well, I am sorry, recognising the severity of preventable workplace deaths arising from negligence or recklessness should not have taken this long, but it has.

I wholeheartedly convey my gratitude and my commendations to the Attorney-General and his staff. They are all people, and he is a person, of unfaltering conviction in this and many other areas of industrial relations. The fact that this moment is now arriving under his watch, and his hardworking staff's watch, is a commendation to them.

I commend members of this place and the other—both past and present—who have been firm advocates of industrial manslaughter laws. The fact is, there are too many to name in five minutes, but I do want to honour some of those who spoke here over the years while I have been here: the Hon. Connie Bonaros, the Hon. Mark Parnell, the Hon. Rob Simms, the Hon. Tammy Franks, in particular come to mind.

I convey my solidarity again to my comrades in the union movement who have never faltered in their advocacy and are a primary reason why this legislation has come about. Most importantly, I want to acknowledge every family who has lost a loved one in a workplace death. Anyone who has ever been around something like that would know what that means. I also acknowledge every South Australian worker who has ever died at work. Each of you had the same right to safety as any other person and it is a shame to all of us that this right was denied and that it took so long for us to get the laws that we are going to put in place now.

All aspects of criminal law are based on deterrents, and that will be the objective of these laws. It is not about punishing people; it is about prevention. In that regard, I have to say that some of the comments from the Liberal Party and, indeed, One Nation about potential reputational damage have been disappointing in this regard when we are talking about workers' lives. That is what this bill will be about: preventing deaths at work.

FEDERAL VOICE TO PARLIAMENT REFERENDUM

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:46): I rise to give my take on the Voice. Saturday was a really hard day. The Greens share the disappointment of those who wanted to see us, as the minister earlier today said, realise the hopes and aspirations of First Nations people. I note that in South Australia eight state electorates voted for a Federal Voice. Those electorates were Adelaide with 57.5 per cent; Badcoe with 53.2 per cent; Bragg with 52.3 per cent; Dunstan with 55.3 per cent; Heysen with 52.5 per cent; Unley with 58 per cent; Waite with 60.4 per cent; and West Torrens with 51.5 per cent. Eight state seats did vote for a Federal Voice.

I worked on the Republican referendum in 1999 and I remember the trauma of losing a referendum. While I was what would have been called a direct electionist republican, I understood that, while the republicans were divided against each other, it was a step forward. It was not to be. I take hope, however, in George Megalogenis's article 'Demographics and the Voice'. I refer some members of this chamber to that article, but I hope the Liberals do not read it.

The Hon. R.A. Simms: No chance of that.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The reality is, as George Megalogenis pointed out well before the vote, the thesis was that Dutton loses either way whether or not the yes or the no vote got up last Saturday. Quite honestly, because of the 1999 referendum results, we then saw lifetime Liberal voters who wanted to be rid of the monarchy—known as doctor's wives in political terminology—eventually turn away from the Liberal Party. They stayed loyal for a while. They stayed loyal under Howard; they were relaxed and comfortable. They stayed loyal even under Tony Abbott, not quite as relaxed and comfortable.

But when Morrison picked fights with tertiary educated voters and played culture wars on issues like climate change and the treatment of women, not only did he lose those doctors' wives, many of whom now are doctors themselves, he lost the election. I think in those eight seats in South Australia that voted yes in the federal referendum last week we see the pathway to government lost for the Liberal Party on the third Saturday in March 2026.

I note that George Megalogenis points to the heat map that the 1999 referendum provided. I think we have a new heat map now in South Australia for the pathway for the Liberal Party to lose the election if they continue their culture wars, if they insist on a race to the bottom, on auditioning for Senator Alex Antic, rather than staying true to Liberal values and being a true alternative government for this state.

The salutary lesson of the Liberals losing to the teals in Melbourne, Goldstein, Higgins, Kooyong, Menzies, Deakin, Aston, the horseshoe of affluence has now been lost to the Liberals. In Sydney, Labor has captured Bennelong. The teals snapped up North Sydney and Wentworth, and the Liberal Party now has no seats with a view of the harbour from the north for the first time in their history.

It may well happen here in South Australia. Particularly those seats of Waite, Unley, Heysen, Dunstan and Bragg will play a strong role in that on the third Saturday in March 2026. So I do not lose hope, because I have been traumatised by the loss of a referendum before, but that last one gave us a heat map to turning politics on its head, and I think that this particular vote last Saturday is a salutary lesson for the Liberals that I do not think they will pay attention to.

WORLD TEACHERS' DAY

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:51): On Friday 27 October, Australia will celebrate World Teachers' Day. We all know what a difference teachers make in the lives of young ones. I am sure we all have memories of a special teacher who inspired and encouraged us and taught us to see the best in ourselves and in others.

In the lead-up to this year's World Teachers' Day, I would like to acknowledge a person who committed her long life to sharing her love for the power of education, a woman who went on to become, in 1956, the first senior mistress at the newly opened Darwin High and later, in 1960, became the headmistress at the newly opened Elizabeth Girls Tech.

This special teacher was also my much-loved great aunty, Myra Lillywhite. Myra was a teacher for over 40 years. Her career started at age 19 in 1943 at Mount Muirhead, near Millicent, in a one-room, one-teacher school with seven students, and ended at Salisbury Teachers College, where she was Dean of Students. In between that time, she taught in the Mallee, at Mount Gambier High School, Thebarton girls' junior and senior technical school, Darwin High School and Elizabeth Girls Tech.

She rose from the ranks of junior schoolteacher to senior mistress and deputy head and headmistress, and finished her career at the compulsory retirement age of 60 as a leader in the tertiary education of teachers. She studied primary teaching at Adelaide Teachers College and later gained a Bachelor of Arts and several diplomas and a Master of Educational Administration.

Needless to say, Myra saw all sorts during her long career. She spent nine years at Elizabeth Girls Tech, during which time it grew from 126 students to more than 1,200 students. As the school grew, Myra had to adapt. They had temporary buildings and had no power, lighting, fencing or even a phone for some time, and apparently a lot of mud, while the new school was being built. As legend has it, after school she would go to the Elizabeth South shopping centre with a purse full of pennies to phone the education department and ask when the next building contractors would be arriving to help fix her school.

Myra was a much-loved teacher by her school communities. In 2019, students from Darwin High, whom Myra had taught 60 years prior, met her in Adelaide just to thank her for the commitment she made to their lives. It takes a special teacher to have that sort of impact on their students.

Myra quickly became part of the community she was living in. Her church community was her extended family. At the age of 90, she was still picking up what she would call 'the oldies' and taking them to church.

Myra had many other skills, too. She was the queen of shortbread. You would always be guaranteed after the arrival of a new baby that Aunty Myra would pop into hospital with a fresh batch of much-needed shortbread. I am sure that a very large batch of shortbread was meant to last several days, but it was usually consumed within hours.

Whether she liked it or not, after Myra's trip to South Africa in the late eighties she became the queen of elephants. In true Myra fashion she would receive each new elephant item for every birthday and every Christmas from her great nieces and nephews with such excitement, from the smallest to the largest of elephants. I think she received at least 100 or so.

Just like an elephant, Auntie Myra had a long and graceful life. She was a respected leader of our family herd. Myra passed away last year at the age of 99. I know that in our house we have two treasured items and one of them is Auntie Myra's cupboard. It is a cupboard where we keep our daily requirements—our plates, our cups and a small herd of elephants, three representing each of our Bourke girls. Whenever we are looking for something, the answer is usually that it is in Auntie Myra's cupboard, stored safely and in great style, just like Auntie Myra.

FEDERAL VOICE TO PARLIAMENT REFERENDUM

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:56): Australians have been unfairly divided during this referendum—friends against friends, families against families and Indigenous Australians against other Indigenous Australians. The Australian people are not stupid or dinosaurs or other unpleasant names. They are good, hardworking people who have been let down by the Prime Minister. It did not need to be like this.

Australians have spoken and more than 60 per cent of Australians voted against the Voice, myself included. The result could have been different. With a bipartisan agreement to split the referendum into two, recognition would have been supported; I am sure of that. The changes to the constitution for a Voice enshrined in the constitution were clearly not acceptable to a vast number of Australians, with every state voting no and every federal seat in South Australia voting no.

The only location that voted yes was the ACT, which is quite ironic given that this was often referred to as 'the Canberra Voice'. The Australian people said no to a Voice enshrined in the constitution that was poorly articulated and at huge risk of being another layer of bureaucracy with potentially serious legal ramifications. It clearly caused unnecessary division—division I have never seen before in my lifetime.

But there is much work to be done. With the end of Albanese's divisive Canberra Voice that not even our Prime Minister could explain, our parliaments, our public servants and the many programs dedicated to Indigenous Australians must get back to work and seek to close the gap and return to the path of reconciliation. Along with my colleagues in the state and federal parliament, I am committed to real action to improve the lives of disadvantaged Indigenous Australians. They must be our focus with not just talk but real action.

I stand by Senator Kerryne Liddle's call for accountability. Having previously lived and worked in Darwin for several years, as an accountant I saw firsthand the waste of government funds time and time again through duplication of services and serious gaps in service delivery. I also saw some remarkable work being done by different groups of elders and other Aboriginal-led organisations.

We must see more accountability, more focus on outcomes and more support to enable Aboriginal people to not only survive but to thrive. This will not be done by one Voice in Canberra. It needs to be done by a full review, both state and federal, to ensure issues are identified and resolved. It is so disappointing to see Labor and the Greens blocking Senator Price and Senator Liddle's call for a royal commission into Indigenous sexual abuse and an audit to support practical outcomes and to review the state of Indigenous affairs right across Australia.

I would like to acknowledge Senator Nampijinpa Price, Warren Mundine AO and South Australia's own Senator Kerryne Liddle for their extraordinary efforts during this referendum. With countless campaign activities across the country, they ensured the commonsense outcome that we saw on Saturday night.

Earlier this year, when the state government rushed through legislation for a state-based Voice to Parliament—which I voted against, along with all my Liberal colleagues—it occurred without proper consultation with the South Australian people. Well, the South Australian people have now been consulted and it is clear that they do not support a State Voice to Parliament. The government must take this into consideration and not ignore the voices of South Australians.

Finally, I would like to say thank you to the many volunteers who gave up their time on Saturday and at pre-poll in the two weeks before the referendum. It is because of their efforts that we had such an overwhelming result. Many of the volunteers for the no campaign had no connection to political parties; rather, they were concerned, hardworking South Australians looking to voice their

opposition to such a permanent and concerning proposal. I would like to thank the great volunteers who I worked with at Brighton pre-poll, especially Bridgid and Theresa who helped every day during the campaign, morning and night.

Motions

WORLD CAR-FREE DAY

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:00): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that 22 September is World Car-Free Day.
2. Notes that according to the Department for Environment and Water, transport accounts for 28 per cent of South Australia's greenhouse gas emissions, the highest for any sector in the state.
3. Notes with concern that public transport use has declined by 13 per cent since July 2019.
4. Acknowledges that reducing car use has many benefits including:
 - (a) reduced greenhouse gas emissions;
 - (b) improved air quality;
 - (c) increased beneficial health and wellbeing outcomes; and
 - (d) reduced traffic congestion.
5. Calls on the Malinauskas government to implement the recommendations from the report of the Select Committee on Public and Active Transport by:
 - (a) increasing the frequency of bus services, simplifying concessions, and improving connectivity;
 - (b) trialling of passenger rail services from Mount Barker to Adelaide and incentivising passenger rail between Adelaide and Melbourne;
 - (c) trialling separated bike infrastructure and traffic calming measures, including speed limit restrictions;
 - (d) commencing planning for a statewide, integrated separated cycling network;
 - (e) development of a statewide strategic transport network plan;
 - (f) promotion of alternatives to car travel to reduce carbon emissions; and
 - (g) legislating to enable the use of privately owned e-scooters and other e-personal mobility devices in public spaces.

This motion recognises that 22 September was World Car-Free Day. It is an annual event held every year on 22 September and it involves cities around the globe coming together to celebrate World Car-Free Day and encouraging motorists to leave their car at home for the day.

I do not intend to speak for very long on this motion, as I know we have a few things to get through, but I do want to talk about some of the benefits of going car-free. We know, of course, that this reduces air pollution and that the promotion of walking and cycling is good for public and community health. Car-free days provide cities with the opportunity to appreciate how pollution impacts on our everyday lives.

Vehicle emissions are one of the main sources of outdoor air pollution, particularly in our cities, and ambient air pollution alone caused 4.2 million deaths in 2016 according to the World Health Organization. Transport is also the fastest growing source of fossil fuel emissions, the largest contributor to climate change. In fact, in South Australia, transport accounts for 28 per cent of our greenhouse gas emissions, the highest for any sector in our state.

Whilst we talk a lot in South Australia about energy policy and the importance of energy policy in combating climate change, we often forget the importance of transport policy and the role that plays in carbon emissions. It is really important that we see government policy begin to remedy that. The exhaust from vehicles emits harmful greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxides, and it is these emissions that pose a significant threat to our environment and to our health.

While the no-car lifestyle is not for everybody, there are lots of good reasons to drive less, including lowering the carbon footprint, reducing road congestion and, of course, reducing the chance of car accidents, not to mention the fact that walking and cycling is really good for general health and wellbeing. By driving less, drivers will also save on expenses such as soaring petrol prices, car insurance and car repairs, and by choosing more active models of transportation such as cycling, walking or using scooters, one increases their activity levels too.

According to the Department for Infrastructure and Transport, almost 81,000 fewer trips were taken on South Australian public transport in July compared with the same period in 2019 pre-COVID. This figure represents a 13 per cent decline in usage. That is concerning for us in the Greens, and that is one of the reasons that we have been calling for free public transport to be made a priority by the Malinauskas government, so that we can provide an incentive for people to use alternatives to car travel.

Members of this place will remember—and I bang on about it quite regularly—that there was a report of the Select Committee on Public and Active Transport handed down in this chamber in February. Six months on, and I am still waiting for an audience with the minister and still waiting for the government to formally respond to the recommendations.

Those recommendations are listed in the motion, so I do not propose to detail them again here, but it is really important that the government take some action to reduce the reliance on cars. It is worth noting that the first car-free day event that was held in Paris, France, in September 2015 was found to reduce exhaust emissions by 40 per cent. So reducing car travel does have a significant impact.

I would like to commend the Adelaide City Council for recognising World Car-Free Day for the first time ever this year. In particular, I note the work of Councillor David Elliott, who is chair of Bike Adelaide and who I understand raised this idea at the council level. It is important, and we do need leadership at all levels of government to get this climate crisis under control.

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

Parliamentary Committees

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (16:05): I move:

That the final report of the committee be noted.

I am pleased to present to the house the final report of the Joint Committee on the Establishment of Adelaide University. South Australia has three major public universities: the University of Adelaide, founded in 1874; Flinders University, founded in 1966; and the University of South Australia, formed in 1991 from the merger of the South Australian Institute of Technology and the South Australian College of Advanced Education. These three institutions operate separately and have historically performed competitively in the context of global rankings.

On 2 July 2023, the state government signed a heads of agreement with the University of Adelaide and the University of South Australia regarding the proposed amalgamation of those two universities. The agreement included a proposal for the state government to invest \$300 million in two perpetual funds and other funding to support the proposed amalgamation.

In summary, the government has committed \$200 million to a perpetual research fund and \$100 million to a perpetual for purpose fund. The government will maintain control of this money and invest it via SAFA. The new university will receive the proceeds of this investment to fund research and to provide bursaries, etc.

The government has also committed to \$10 million per year for the first three years to support the attraction of international students to Adelaide University and \$114.5 million to purchasing land currently part of the University of South Australia's campuses at Magill and Mawson Lakes.

The committee was established on 6 July 2023 to inquire into and report on the amalgamation proposal within the terms of reference. In doing so, we have given close attention to the legislative, funding and governance arrangements that would provide for a university that

facilitates access to university education, has a modern governance framework, generates high-quality research, engages with industry and business, and is positioned to be highly ranked against universities globally.

Ten members from both this chamber and the other place have diligently considered the written and oral evidence. It has been a significant undertaking. The vigorous debate, insightful questions and deep commitment to understanding the issues involved in the proposed amalgamation have resulted in a report that I believe fairly represents the evidence presented and gathered.

I sincerely thank all who took the time to make a submission as well as those who provided oral evidence to the committee. The information and insights gained through this have been invaluable in shaping our thinking and the recommendations in this report.

The committee received 86 written submissions and heard evidence from 47 witnesses. We received 381 form letters in support of the National Tertiary Education Union submission. We heard a lot about universities and their roles—their roles in education and research and the direct and indirect benefits across the economy. We heard a wide range of perspectives on the proposed amalgamation, both for and against its establishment.

The proposal to create the new Adelaide University is not a proposition to be taken lightly. It comes with some big challenges but equally big potential and opportunities. It will represent a substantial change to the public university landscape in South Australia and is not without some risk.

South Australia has always enjoyed a competitive university sector delivering lasting economic and social benefits to the state. The committee received evidence that competition between universities globally remains fierce and is likely to increase over coming decades. The proposal to establish Adelaide University must be viewed against the increasingly competitive environment for universities generally and the risk to the state's interests in taking no action to strengthen the sector.

Some of the submissions and witnesses in support of the proposed merger contended that it would likely deliver long-term economic benefits to South Australia, increase the international ranking of a new institution when compared to extant institutions in the sector, attract more international students, enhance research output and quality, and provide possible benefits of scale, including the reduction of barriers to research intensity and collaboration.

Submissions and witnesses against the proposed merger raised concerns that it would lead to redundancies or job losses through efficiency measures, creating staff uncertainty; deliver an inferior student and staff experience, arising partly from the scale of the new proposed institution; deliver an education model out of step with the ongoing review of the national higher education sector as part of the Australian Universities Accord; reduce the quality of research through the failure to retain leading researchers; and divert key staff from their core teaching and research roles while they are engaged in completing the merger scheme arrangement.

However, on balance the committee considers that the economic and social interests of the state would likely be advanced by the amalgamation of the University of Adelaide and the University of South Australia into the new Adelaide University. The committee does raise some concerns and has made six further recommendations.

One of these is around the necessity for the universities to put appropriate measures in place to monitor, evaluate and sufficiently invest in the ongoing actioning of the risk management analysis and consider additional risk management measures. Another is around additional oversight, legislative and administrative measures, including for the management of the government funds committed to the merger, the representation of staff and students on the university council and annual reporting requirements.

The committee's deliberations have occurred in the light of the Australian Universities Accord process. The recently released interim report has highlighted the importance of themes such as access and attainment; equity in participation; sustainable funding and financing; and more predictable funding for research, innovation and research training. The committee believes that the legislation establishing Adelaide University should reflect the access, equity and governance

priorities identified in the Australian Universities Accord interim report. We have made a recommendation to that effect.

Student associations play an important role in university life, providing student advocacy and financial, cultural, academic and health-related support. The Adelaide University Union has strongly argued to the committee that the establishment of a student association for the new university should be explicitly included in the legislation, and the committee agrees that there is merit in doing so.

The future use of land at Magill and Mawson Lakes currently occupied by the University of South Australia is of significant interest to the local community. The committee received submissions highlighting concerns, from traffic congestion to the loss of green space, amenity and community-accessible facilities, including the childcare centre. The committee is in favour of timely local council and public engagement on the future of this land.

We also see value in the early identification of the possible additional investment required for the proposed Adelaide University to meet its commitments to tertiary education in regional South Australia. Finally, in the interests of equity and to be sure that no public university is disadvantaged as a result of this merger, consideration should be given to ensuring potential investment for Flinders University.

There are significant opportunities in establishing a new university in South Australia through the merger of the University of Adelaide and the University of South Australia. While the committee understands that this process is not without its risks, we are satisfied that the assessment of risk and the steps proposed to mitigate such risks, both by the universities and in considering the recommendations of the report, are thorough. The committee believes overall that the merger is in the best interests of the state.

I thank my fellow members of the committee for their diligent and probing questions, their commitment to identifying the key matters of concern, and the collegial nature of our discussions. I believe this was a valuable process that will help inform the proposed amalgamation of the University of Adelaide and the University of South Australia in their work towards establishing Adelaide University.

I would also like to acknowledge the staff involved with the committee and thank them for their work and dedication to ensuring that we remained on schedule and reported to the house in a timely manner. I commend this report to the house.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:14): I rise to speak in relation to the report. In so doing, I want to recognise the work of all members of the committee: the Hon. Reggie Martin, the Hon. Jing Lee, the Hon. Connie Bonaros and my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks, who represented the Greens on the committee for the first half of the process while I was on leave. I really appreciate the work that the Hon. Tammy Franks did on the committee in terms of raising issues on behalf of the Greens.

I think it is worth noting that this committee would not have occurred if not for the work of the Greens and the work of the Hon. Frank Pangallo and the Liberal opposition. When it became clear that the two universities wanted to merge, the Greens came out—with the support of the Hon. Frank Pangallo and the Liberal opposition—and said that we wanted there to be a parliamentary inquiry.

At that time, the government said no. They said, 'Any delay is denial of this proposal. We can't possibly have the parliament cast a ruler over this, because that's going to delay the whole process and it has to be done at breakneck speed.' Luckily, they relented and we did manage to get a parliamentary inquiry established. I want to recognise the work of the Hon. Frank Pangallo and the work of the opposition in making that happen.

It was disappointing, though, that what we got was a committee process that was less than ideal because it was operating under a very tight time frame. The proposal that the Greens had put forward, which was supported by the Hon. Frank Pangallo and the opposition, had a much longer reporting time frame and I think would have provided more of an opportunity to ventilate the key issues. That said, we welcome the fact that there was some level of parliamentary scrutiny.

I think it would have been optimum for there to be a commission of inquiry into this proposal—an independent commissioner who could have given a recommendation on whether or not this was

indeed in the public interest. Instead, what we saw was a politicised process where you had the two vice-chancellors lining up with the government to advocate for this reform. I think that has been regrettable, because it has undermined some of the public confidence in this proposal.

You will note the majority recommendations, and the Hon. Reggie Martin has spoken to those. The Greens dissent from those recommendations. We have submitted our own minority report and I will talk to a few of those elements. In particular, it is worth noting that we reserve our position on any bill that comes before the parliament. Although I note that, as a result of the One Nation/one university/one SA-Best deal that was announced in the media earlier, our position may not be that relevant to the government, because it seems that some of my colleagues have signed along the dotted line before the bill had even been introduced into this place.

Just to talk to some of the elements of the inquiry and the issues that the Greens have thought are pertinent, one of the key elements for us that has been of concern is the business case. I have a motion before this chamber that we are going to deal with subsequently, so I will not speak on that at length other than to say that the Greens have always been of the view that the full business case should be publicly released and that the universities should disclose any of the external consultants that have worked on this project.

We know that there has been, rightly so, controversy in the public realm about the role of consultants. The public has a right to know who has worked on this proposal, and the Greens are calling for that. We are also calling for the government to review its processes around how it works with external parties in the future. If we are going to be talking about putting public money on the table, then surely commercial-in-confidence should not be used as a shield to prevent the public from getting access to key information. That is something that I think needs to be looked at, and it is an important principle for our democracy.

Another key issue for the Greens, and it is one that was raised through a number of the submissions that came before the committee, was that of governance. What we do not want to see in any new university is a continuation of the status quo. There is a real opportunity here to see more staff and more students playing a role in university decision-making.

We would really like to see a majority of elected members on the university council being staff and students and we would really like to see more diversity on the council. Rather than just having fossil fuel barons, former Liberal Party politicians on university councils, it would be great to see more diversity: people of culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, First Nations people, people who have experience in the university sector and bring real expertise, rather than just corporate appointments. That is an issue for the Greens.

We would also like to see the minutes and agendas of university councils being made publicly available and their meetings happening in public. These are public institutions; they are not secret societies that should be able to close the door and shield themselves from public view. These are institutions that get significant investment in terms of public money and the community has a right to know what goes on within these institutions.

Another issue that we are concerned about is the remuneration of vice-chancellors. The two vice-chancellors in South Australia at the University of Adelaide and the University of South Australia receive over a million dollars a year each. It is concerning when one considers the pay that is given to the Prime Minister or the Premier, for instance. Indeed, I refer to the comments of the Hon. Chris Schacht, former Labor minister and a big proponent of the merger, who advised the committee:

I think a million dollars for a vice-chancellor of any university, when the Prime Minister of Australia gets half a million, is a bit ridiculous.

We agree, and that is why we have been arguing for a cap. I did note some of the evidence around rankings and I was concerned that there was contradictory evidence provided to the committee around rankings. Some academics were concerned that the rankings for the institution may dip considerably in the short term and the impact of this on the potential to recruit new students—in particular, international students—is unknown.

The Greens are also concerned about the jobs and employment conditions. The long-term impact of any merger on jobs in the university sector is still unknown, but we note the submission of

SA Unions where they called on any new university to prohibit short-term casual contracts and to also look at some of these gig economy style arrangements that put workers in the university sector often at a real disadvantage in terms of their rights. We would like to look at that as part of the new university. I also want to make sure that there is actually a student union as part of any new university and that it gets a legislated minimum return from the student services and amenities fee.

One of the big issues for us, too, has been this question about Flinders University. I welcome the fact that Flinders University students are going to have access to a scholarship fund—that is a good outcome—however, it is not really enough, particularly when all of these other issues have not been addressed.

Might I say, I am concerned that Flinders will not have the potential to apply for research funds. We do not want to see a situation where there is a *Hunger Games* scenario that is developing between this new institution and Flinders, where they are competing for a narrow pool of money among themselves and where one of our universities is placed at a disadvantage.

Whilst it is true to say that there were some benefits identified with a merger, there are some significant risks as well, and there are some opportunities that come with that. It is really important and I would urge members of this chamber to consider all amendments that come forward—and the Greens intend to move a range of amendments—to see if we can address some of the concerns that were expressed at the committee level, but also to ensure that if we do establish a new university that it models best practice governance, that it better protects the rights of students and of workers; otherwise, why on earth would we go down this path?

As I say, I was surprised to hear news in the media this morning about a deal being brokered with two crossbench members given the fact that the bill has not actually been formally introduced into this chamber and given the fact that no members have had an opportunity to file amendments, nor have any members had an opportunity to consider the amendments. It was disappointing to see members of this house of review give the government a blank cheque. That said, the Greens will keep on pushing to improve this bill and we reserve our right on the legislation.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:24): I thank the Hon. Reggie Martin for tabling the report yesterday, and I thank the Hon. Robert Simms for his well-informed and articulate message today about the report and what transpired. Like him, I have been quite disappointed by the swiftness of today's events, with barely the ink drying on that report after it was tabled yesterday to give us an opportunity to absorb what was in there. I could not read it thoroughly until last night when I went through it.

I admit that I saw elements in there of great merit in this proposal, but it is all supposition—'this could happen' and 'the likelihood that this may happen'. It is all subjective stuff that needs to be substantiated and supported with concrete evidence that it will work, and that is the reason that myself and the Hon. Robert Simms wanted a select committee into this. We are talking about a really big deal. It is important.

When you look at the make-up of both universities, the size of them, and after talking to people at both of those universities, it is actually massive. This is a massive exercise. It is not something that has to be rushed, as has been rushed over the last three months. You have to remember that the Premier himself made an election commitment that there would be an independent commission of inquiry into this merger, and that would have involved all three chancellors: Adelaide, UniSA and Flinders University.

Certainly, I would have looked forward to seeing something like that happen, but that all changed and then suddenly the Premier embarked on this course that this merger had to happen, had to happen quickly, when still so many questions needed to be answered. Those questions still need to be answered thoroughly. To make that announcement this morning I found disappointing. As I said, I only read the report overnight, and I made some notes about areas that I was concerned about and areas that the Hon. Robert Simms has pointed out just a short time ago.

There are areas of concern that have been raised by the National Tertiary Education Union. They supplied a submission that had been signed by more than 200 staff who were involved with the NTEU. They had items that need to be addressed and assurances that need to be given about proper

governance, accountability, security of tenure and also the welfare and culture of students on both campuses. There are a lot of things that need to be answered also regarding funding for research and other aspects of financial matters that I do not think the committee had enough time to actually absorb in that period of time.

Nonetheless, we are now told that the legislation is going to be introduced tomorrow. We have not even seen that. It has barely given the opposition and the crossbench—the crossbench being me, the Hon. Mr Simms and the Hon. Tammy Franks—the opportunity to come up with amendments that we think could improve the legislation.

I do not think we ever said that we were going to oppose this. I never said that. I was always adamant that—and I told this to the Premier only a week or so ago—if I felt the proposal stacked up and was in the best interests of South Australia, of South Australian students, of the tertiary sector, I would support it, but this whole thing was just rushed through today. As a result, it is going to make it difficult for amendments to be properly considered.

As I pointed out, there are members of the community, members of the faculties of both Adelaide and UniSA—and at Flinders—who want some questions answered. We certainly do not want to see this project have a catastrophic impact on Flinders University. We do not want to see the enormous work, the research that goes on there, the academic nature of the work and also the campus itself be affected by this when we have this massive institution that is being set up that can in fact even cannibalise what Flinders Uni is doing.

These are the things that we wanted to get assurances on, and we did not want to be rushed into it. The Premier is in such a rush to get this in before the end of the year and just pin another win to his lapel when it really needs serious consideration. That is what I was disappointed about today. I really did not have time to, firstly, fully absorb what was in that report, and then to go out to stakeholders.

I had given stakeholders an assurance that once that report was tabled I would then engage and consult with them and get their viewpoint before formalising a position, and then look at any amendments that needed to be considered by this place in order for us to ensure that, if the proposal did go ahead, it would go ahead and be something that would be financially viable, it would be of great benefit economically to the state, and it would be of great benefit to tertiary education in South Australia.

That is how important this is. It is actually for future generations of students, and you do need to get it right and not rush something through because it is politically expedient for you or because you have done a deal with a couple of members in this place. I do not know what those deals were because I have totally been shut out of the whole thing.

It concerns me that this proposal is going to lack the proper scrutiny that it requires. It should be done—apart from a committee that was selected, perhaps one that was selected or cherry-picked that might bring about a favourable response to the government. That was also my concern. Anyway, all I can say is that I look forward to the legislation coming in, and I will still engage with all the various stakeholders and get their viewpoint on this before the legislation passes.

Again, thank you for the opportunity, and thank you to the Hon. Robert Simms, the Hon. Reggie Martin for his work on that committee, and other members of that committee who worked on it, because I imagine the Premier put them under the pump quite a bit as well to try to get this report out so he can give himself a Christmas present leading into 2024.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.S. Lee.

Motions

ESTABLISHMENT OF ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:33): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes that:

- (a) according to a survey commissioned by the Australia Institute, six in seven (or 86 per cent) of South Australians agree that the details of the business case for the proposed university merger should be made public;
 - (b) support for releasing the business case is strongest in the regions, supported by 88 per cent of respondents; and
 - (c) there is a high level of support for releasing the business case among the voters of all political parties represented in the parliament.
2. Calls on the University of South Australia and the University of Adelaide to publicly release the full business case to inform the community's consideration of this proposal.

This motion notes that, according to a survey commissioned by the Australia Institute, six in seven (or 86 per cent) of South Australians agree that the details of the business case for the proposed university merger should be made public. It notes that support for releasing the business case is strongest in the regions, supported by 88 per cent of respondents, and it notes that there is a high level of support for releasing the business case among the voters of all political parties that are represented in the parliament. It calls on the University of South Australia and the University of Adelaide to publicly release the full business case to inform the community's consideration of this proposal.

I saw this research come out from the Australia Institute last week, and it is really interesting. The motion draws attention to some of the key aspects of the polling. What it finds is that there is an almost universal view across all sectors of the South Australian community that the business case underpinning this university merger should be made public. In particular, I note the high level of agreement across supporters of all political parties: 84 per cent of Labor voters, 86 per cent of Coalition voters, 87 per cent of One Nation voters, 87 per cent of voters of other political parties and 90 per cent of Greens voters. They all want to see the business case.

The support for releasing the business case is actually strongest among people living in regional areas. The Hon. Ms Game from the One Nation political party in this chamber talks a lot about listening to regional voices. The Hon. Clare Scriven talks a lot about listening to the voices of people in the regions. The Hon. Ben Hood and many others do as well. I hope that they heed the call of people in the regions and their desire to actually see this critical information.

When we are talking about investing public money into a proposal, then I think the community has a right to the information. As I said earlier, universities are public institutions. They are not secret societies. They are not these secret organisations that operate behind closed doors and beyond public scrutiny. The community has a right to know what is going on, and this is a simple proposition.

I want to flag with members that I will be bringing this motion to a vote during the next sitting of parliament, and it will be a test for members of parliament in terms of whether or not they are committed to transparency and whether or not they are committed to providing the people of South Australia with the information that they require.

I know that the Hon. Connie Bonaros and the Hon. Sarah Game of One Nation have done a deal with the government, but I hope that they will still consider this motion on its merits and recognise the need for transparency with respect to this proposal. While I am at it, I reiterate my calls for the universities to release the names of any consultants who may have worked on this project, because the community has a right to that information as well. Let's get all of the facts out on the table to inform the debate around this important proposal.

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

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:37): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that October marks Breast Cancer Awareness Month, which provides an opportunity for everyone to focus on breast cancer and its impact on those affected by the disease in our community and helps to raise awareness of the disease, educate about its symptoms and prevention and support fundraising activities;

2. Notes that the pink ribbon has become the universal symbol of breast cancer which aims to bring women together in solidarity by showing support for loved ones battling breast cancer and building an inclusive supportive network for families and friends;
3. Recognises that the flagship Pink Ribbon Breakfast Campaign for breast cancer celebrates its 21st anniversary this year, and that it is important to show appreciation to all amazing communities across Australia who, in the past 21 years, have taken part in the Pink Ribbon Breakfast events and come together to raise vital funds for breast cancer research;
4. Recognises that the National Breast Cancer Foundation (NBCF) is Australia's leading not-for-profit organisation funding world-class breast cancer research into causes, treatment and cure; and
5. Acknowledges that NBCF has invested over \$200 million into more than 600 world-class research projects across Australia since its inception in 1994.

This motion recognises that October marks Breast Cancer Awareness Month. It provides an opportunity for everyone to focus on breast cancer and its impact on those affected by the disease in our community. It helps to raise awareness of the disease, educate about its symptoms and prevention, and support any fundraising activities.

This motion shines a light on the devastating impact breast cancer has on thousands of Australians each day. Our thoughts and prayers go to those who are currently going through challenging times dealing with this horrible disease.

I want to share some of the alarming statistics about breast cancer. Breast cancer is the most commonly diagnosed cancer amongst women in Australia. Sadly, it has been found that 57 Australians are diagnosed each and every single day with this disease. This means over 20,000 Australians are diagnosed with breast cancer each year, with one in seven women diagnosed with breast cancer in their lifetime. It is important to highlight that this disease impacts men as well. About one in 500 men are diagnosed with the disease in their lifetime.

In 2023, over 3,200 Australians will pass away from breast cancer. That is nine Australians a day dying from the disease. Sadly, one woman under the age of 40 is expected to die each week from breast cancer. In 2022, breast cancer remained the second most common cause of death from cancer in females. In the last 10 years, breast cancer diagnosis has increased by 21 per cent. There are nearly a quarter of a million people living with breast cancer who were diagnosed in the last 36 years in Australia.

As these statistics show, breast cancer, which develops when cells within a breast grow abnormally and multiply to form a tumour, is a destructive force in today's society, not only for those who are unfortunately tormented with it but also for the families and friends who have to watch their loved ones suffer. Too many have lost their grandmothers, mothers, sisters and friends—people they loved dearly—through breast cancer.

Since the National Breast Cancer Foundation started funding research in 1994, the death rates from breast cancer in Australia have reduced by over 40 per cent, thanks in large to research in prevention, early detection and new and improved breast cancer treatments, but there is still much more progress to be made. Early detection of breast cancer gives the best possible chance of survival. The earlier an abnormality is discovered, the greater the number of effective treatment options available. This ensures the best possible outcome.

There are many ways breast cancer can be detected. This includes through clinical examination, mammograms, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), ultrasound and biopsy. It is also important to undertake regular self-checks.

From my own experience, I am aware that many women, particularly women from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, feel self-conscious, emotionally distressed or even shameful about sharing any personal health concerns or about diseases like breast cancer with their family and friends. Often these women will try to hide it to keep the bad news away from everyone they know for as long as they can.

By not talking about breast cancer, they isolate themselves from their loved ones, they keep themselves away from their community, they refuse to get out of the house, they refuse treatments, and they reject any forms of support because they have lost hope and lost the will to fight on. This is

one of the reasons why I want to move this important motion today and encourage everyone to reach out to those affected.

Since the 1990s, ribbons have been used to represent many cancer patients. The pink ribbon has evolved from a humble peach ribbon handmade by Charlotte Haley in the United States of America to a powerful symbol of breast cancer awareness and support. The pink ribbon has become the universal symbol for breast cancer. Its aim is to bring women together in solidarity by showing support for loved ones battling breast cancer and building an inclusive supportive network for families and friends.

It is great to recognise that the flagship Pink Ribbon Breakfast campaign for breast cancer celebrates its 21st anniversary this year. It is so important to show our appreciation to all the amazing communities and individuals across Australia who in the past 21 years have taken part in Pink Ribbon Breakfast events to come together to raise vital funds for breast cancer research.

Pink Ribbon Breakfast is the National Breast Cancer Foundation's longest running signature campaign. The campaign runs throughout the month of October and invites everyday Australians to host an event to raise money for breast cancer research. The host runs all types of events, such as breakfasts, lunches and dinners. They are held across all the states by individuals, businesses and even schools and community groups.

As we recognise that October is Breast Cancer Awareness Month, I had the great honour to sponsor and host my pink ribbon spring reception in Parliament House on 6 October 2023 by bringing together a group of wonderful women—business and community leaders—to raise awareness of breast cancer and raise funds to support the NBCF.

I place my sincere thanks to all my friends who joined me at my pink ribbon reception. It was wonderful to see such a diverse group of guests who turned up in their beautiful pink outfits and made generous donations to support a good cause. Every dollar makes a difference.

I would also like to highlight some very courageous women who are breast cancer survivors, and I will take this opportunity to highlight two champions in our community. Alison Warner is an inspirational force with a passion for making a difference, even in the face of cancer. She began stepping out with the Adelaide Hills Relay For Life in 2008 with the team 'The Desperate Housewives'. The relay event recognises those who are fighting cancer and remembers those who have lost their battle to the disease. To date, the team has raised an incredible \$200,000 to support South Australians impacted by cancer.

Following a routine breast screen in 2014 with a diagnosis of breast cancer, just a month after her surgery to remove the tumour Alison stepped out with her local Relay For Life event, putting one foot in front of the other, not only for herself but for all the people in her life and for all South Australians who have been impacted by cancer, including her mum and sister, who were also diagnosed with breast cancer before the age of 50. I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge Alison and thank her for her strength, her courage and her compassion in doing what she does.

The other champion I would like to mention today is Mary Tarzia. Mary is the mother of our Liberal colleague the Hon. Vincent Tarzia, and she was awarded an Order of Australia medal in recognition of her charity work. Mary began the Faith Hope Charity foundation in 2014 to help raise funds for breast cancer research after being a breast cancer survivor herself. Her goal was to build a house that women with breast cancer and their families could live in whilst receiving their treatment in Adelaide.

The annual black tie ball organised by Mary and the RAH Research Fund raises money to promote awareness of breast cancer and improve patient care for cancer sufferers and for breast cancer research. The ball has raised more than \$104,000 for the RAH breast endocrine unit. Congratulations to Mary on her Order of Australia, and I also acknowledge her fantastic work raising funds for research.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the National Breast Cancer Foundation, being Australia's leading not-for-profit organisation funding world-class breast cancer research towards the vision of zero deaths from breast cancer. I would like to thank the National Breast Cancer Foundation board members, the CEO and all their staff for their incredible work and convey my best wishes to all the

community members and individuals who are supporting the National Breast Cancer Foundation and the Pink Ribbon Breakfast campaign.

In conclusion, I would like to acknowledge that the National Breast Cancer Foundation has invested over \$200 million into more than 600 world-class research projects across Australia since its inception in 1994. With those remarks, I would like to commend the motion.

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

RESTART A HEART DAY

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:49): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that 16 October is internationally recognised as Restart a Heart Day;
2. Acknowledges that rapid access to automated external defibrillator (AED) devices and the application of cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) can lift survival rates of sudden cardiac arrests from 10 per cent to 70 per cent;
3. Calls on the government to promote first aid programs to train more people in CPR and the use of AEDs;
4. Recommends the government include a mandatory instruction course in CPR and the use of an AED as part of the training process to acquire a driver's licence; and
5. Commends the South Australian parliament in unanimously passing the first laws in the nation making AEDs widely accessible in the community, to apply from 1 January 2025.

October 16 marks world Restart a Heart Day, which falls within a month-long initiative known as Shocktober to raise awareness of the ultimate medical emergency, cardiac arrest, through cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and the use of automated external defibrillators.

A cardiac arrest occurs when the heart stops beating and can often lead to death. It can happen to anyone of any age. A person in cardiac arrest will collapse and stop breathing normally. This is due to blood not flowing through their veins, resulting in their brain not receiving oxygen. When this is the case, they should receive cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) immediately. Early defibrillation within three to five minutes of collapse can increase survival rates by up to 50 to 70 per cent. The message for how to treat cardiac arrest is a simple one: call 000, push on the chest to start CPR and shock if an AED is available.

World Restart a Heart Day was launched in 2018 by the International Liaison Committee on Resuscitation (ILCOR) with a slogan that all citizens of the world can save a life. It has the full support of the European Parliament. Seven out of ten cardiac arrests happen in front of bystanders; however, less than 20 per cent of lay bystanders end up providing first aid. Furthermore, lay bystander resuscitation rates differ significantly across the world, ranging from 5 per cent to 80 per cent. Research shows that CPR, especially if performed immediately, can double or triple a cardiac arrest victim's chance of survival.

The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, through the Global First Aid Reference Centre, made a partnership with ILCOR to promote qualitative first aid education based on scientific evidence and practice for cardiac arrest. I am proud to say that the South Australian parliament is following this course of saving lives through AED and CPR in unanimously passing my legislation to make AEDs widely accessible in our community. It will come into effect in January 2025 and be rolled out over the course of the following 12 months. The legislation is the first in Australia and one of the few in the world. I am informed that other states are looking at following our lead.

Death from cardiac arrest is preventable. Thirty thousand people suffer cardiac arrest in Australia each year. Less than 10 per cent struck down manage to survive. Survival rates decrease by 7 to 10 per cent with every minute that defibrillation is delayed. Every second counts. I am pleased to see that many organisations and businesses in our community are now actively seeking information about AEDs and installing them.

On my travels either overseas or interstate, I make it a point to take photographs where AEDs are placed. European countries are rolling them out, and I noticed quite a few during my recent visit to Taiwan. I now have a portable and affordable CellaAED in my car. I have seen recent interstate reports where people's lives have been saved because an AED was nearby.

SA Health in conjunction with the SA Ambulance Service and 000 is using the GoodSAM app, which gives locations for AEDs and which can alert first responders trained in the use of AEDs and CPR to an emergency in their vicinity. CPR is crucial and needs to be used in the application of a defibrillator. We need more people in our community to be trained in CPR. It is not a difficult or even time-consuming exercise.

My motion also calls on the Malinauskas government—and I hope the transport and health ministers seize upon this—to make training in CPR mandatory in the process of people learning to get their driver's licence. If they do not show any interest, I might even look at introducing amendments to the relevant act.

This is already happening in Europe through the acclaimed 'Learn to Drive. Learn CPR' project in collaboration with the European Resuscitation Council and the European Driving Schools Association. Forty-four per cent of European countries, including Germany, Norway, Switzerland, Lithuania, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Croatia, Slovakia and Slovenia, require their citizens to undergo CPR training courses to qualify for a driver's licence. This policy is driving future generations of life-saving drivers on their roads.

I shall be engaging with our own driver training associations and the AAA, NRMA, MTA and RAA to consider supporting this initiative in South Australia. I commend the motion to the chamber.

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

FIRE DANGER SEASON

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

That this council—

1. Acknowledges that the Bureau of Meteorology has formally declared an El Niño weather event and that risk of a significant fire danger season is higher following an El Niño year;
2. Notes that some South Australian Country Fire Service stations are currently ill-equipped to ensure volunteers' safety and dignity; and
3. Calls on the Malinauskas government to urgently audit current Country Fire Service facilities and fund any identified need.

(Continued from 27 September 2023.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:56): I rise as the lead speaker for the opposition to thank the Hon. Tammy Franks for bringing this motion forward to the chamber, and indicate our wholehearted support for the motion. El Niño, a climate phenomenon characterised by the periodic warming of ocean temperatures in the central and eastern tropical Pacific, has a significant impact on Australia's fire danger season. The link between El Niño and heightened fire risk in Australia is well established and has been the cause of numerous devastating bushfires in our country's history.

During El Niño events, Australia typically experiences a shift in weather patterns. Warmer and drier conditions prevail, leading to increased evaporation and reduced soil moisture content. These changes in South Australia in particular create a tinderbox effect, making the landscape more susceptible to ignition and rapid fire spread. With vegetation becoming drier and more flammable, even a small spark can lead to a large and uncontrolled wildfire.

The upcoming 2023-24 summer has all the categories of an elevated fire danger season. It poses significant challenges to firefighting efforts, will strain our water resources and may threaten regional communities and ecosystems. In previous summers, El Niño related fires have resulted in loss of life, significant loss of property and decimation of wildlife and landscapes.

Emergency responders are closely monitoring El Niño patterns to anticipate and prepare for heightened fire risk in Australia as summer fast approaches. Adequate preparedness, fire prevention

strategies and community education are essential in mitigating the impacts of El Niño induced fire danger. Key to this and key to the honourable member's motion is ensuring our regional Country Fire Service units have resilient measures to address these immediate challenges.

Given the increased risk of a dangerous fire season, it is vital that our South Australian CFS stations are properly equipped to respond to incidents in a safe manner. We owe much to our CFS volunteers, who give up their time and risk their lives to help others. The least we can do is ensure that they have appropriate facilities in order to do that work.

As a country resident, and as a member of a family who has been part of their local CFS, I am proud that the former Liberal government committed funds to upgrading stations around South Australia and also invested in new appliances to support CFS volunteers in keeping the community safe. Examples of this include burnover protection systems, fresh air circulation systems in vehicle cabins, improved crew protection systems, improved water pumping systems, class A foam systems on all firefighting appliances, and electric rewind hose reels.

The stations upgraded under the former government were widespread across 11 sites. I am very proud of that investment. I am proud of the 80 per cent facilities and budget resources increase which came to fruition during our four-year tenure. In addition, there was a separate \$97.5 million in response to the independent bushfire review. This included 25 new CFS fire trucks, thermal imaging cameras for various CFS groups, and the use of two Black Hawk helicopters to boost protection for the community and firefighters.

If further needs have been identified—and they have—and the government has been informed that there are additional requirements to keep volunteers in the community safe ahead of the upcoming fire danger season, we the opposition absolutely support that call. An audit, as suggested by the honourable member, is a sensible way to discover and clarify those additional requirements. CFS stations must have a working toilet and handwashing facilities; I would have thought those are fairly basic requirements. There must be appropriate places for volunteers to change and equip up for their duties.

I note the government have put forward an amendment which I can inform the chamber the opposition will not be supporting. At the end of the day, it is all very well for the government to say that they are committed to upgrading facilities, but unless we see action and unless we see actual resources and funding, then those words are just that: words, with no tangible actions or outcomes. Once again, we the opposition support this motion and we strongly support the Country Fire Service and the incredible volunteers who will keep our community safe this summer.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (17:01): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out paragraphs 2 and 3 and insert new paragraph as follows:

2. Notes the commitment from the state government and CFS to build and upgrade stations to meet the needs of volunteers.

The South Australian Country Fire Service has declared the season will start two weeks earlier for six fire ban districts, with the Flinders, North East Pastoral, North West Pastoral and West Coast districts going into fire bans on 16 October (Monday just passed), followed by the Mid North and Yorke Peninsula on 1 November. Fire bans will commence for Eastern Eyre on 1 November and on 15 November for the Lower Eyre Peninsula.

These changes have been assessed against what would normally be expected in these six fire ban districts. Consequently, the bushfire management committees in these regions have recommended that the fire danger season in six districts be brought forward earlier than usual.

The start of the fire danger season sends a message to all South Australians to be prepared for the upcoming season, including knowing what they can and cannot do during the fire danger season and particularly on total fire ban days.

As we know, bushfires can happen at any time of the year and it is everyone's responsibility to prepare for bushfires, irrespective of the fire ban district they live in, work at or are likely to visit

this summer. I encourage all residents, workers and visitors to any of South Australia's 15 fire ban districts to help reduce their risk by developing a bushfire survival plan.

In this year's budget, the Malinauskas Labor government invested a record \$27.6 million in the CFS's aerial firefighting capacity. Five new aircraft will be added to the South Australian Country Fire Service's aerial firefighting fleet this season, increasing the number of aircraft from 26 to 31 and significantly enhancing the state's aerial capability to combat the risk of bushfire. Two South Australian companies, Aerotech and Helifarm, are amongst those to be awarded contracts to lease the services.

This investment will result in quicker responses to fires, more support for frontline firefighters, and better protection for communities across South Australia. It is the biggest investment, I am advised, to upgrade the state's aerial firefighting fleet, with aircraft vital in gathering bushfire information quickly and firebombing in difficult terrain or for dangerous fast-moving fires to assist crews on the ground.

The state government recognises the need to provide appropriate facilities and equipment to those who volunteer to protect the lives and property of others. The amendment that I am moving leaves out paragraphs 2 and 3 and inserts a new paragraph that would read:

2. Notes the commitment from the state government and CFS to build and upgrade stations to meet the needs of volunteers.

The vast majority of the 425 CFS stations across the state have private spaces that can be accessed by members, while others are adjacent to community facilities which can also be used. An amount of \$12 million is forecast to be invested into new station builds and upgrades over the next four years in South Australia. Design and construction of new stations is undertaken in consultation with brigades to recognise and reflect their needs.

Many of the stations that are now operated by the CFS were first built by councils before transferring to state government ownership in the 1990s and I am advised a number of them were in poor condition at the time. Since then, upgrades have been prioritised, taking into account the need for toilets and change rooms. As I mentioned, the government has a commitment to continue to build and upgrade stations that will meet the needs of volunteers.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:05): I thank the members who have made a contribution today: the Hon. Nicola Centofanti and the Hon. Clare Scriven, Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, on behalf of her colleague in the other place.

I note that the Labor Party have sought to congratulate themselves on their amendment, and I urge the council not to give them that congratulation unless they actually do what this motion calls for, and that is an audit and appropriate funding. One would have thought that the minimum that could have been brought forward today would have been a commitment to do that audit.

What we do know from the Greens putting this motion on the agenda is that we have now had some response that some 90 CFS stations do not have toilet facilities but use adjacent community facilities. We do not know how adjacent they are, and we do not know what the operations of those arrangements are. I am informed in some cases there are toilet blocks nearby, but it seems to be incredibly ad hoc.

Even more concerning, however, is that although the minister just alluded to the fact that this was a historic issue stemming from receiving facilities not necessarily in 21st century conditions in the 1990s, the 1990s is a long time ago when we are in 2023.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I remember the Spice Girls as well, the Hon. Ian Hunter, but we have come a long way since then.

The Hon. B.R. Hood interjecting:

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Nirvana as well, the Hon. Ben Hood. There are so many nineties musical icons, however, I think we would all agree that the facilities of the 1990s are in no way the facilities that we have come to expect in 2023. What I particularly note that has come out of this in

response to one of my questions on notice is that of the 420 stations, 345 do not have change rooms. That, to me, seems a minor investment for the value that we would get from the diversity in our volunteer firefighters, giving them the respect and dignity that they deserve as they put their lives on the line—345 out of the approximate 420 stations do not have change facilities.

This certainly goes a long way to a very small investment that could be made to have a very big impact on recruitment and retention and respect and, of course, diversity in our volunteer firefighting service. The \$12 million over the next four years quoted by the minister is actually the normal budget allocation for the CFS towards building maintenance.

I am advised by my sources that this equates to \$3 million per annum. With an anticipated cost of each CFS station to be close to \$1 million, this allows for the construction of approximately three stations per annum, which means that a rebuild program for CFS stations in this state would take approximately 140 years to complete. Clearly, this is far from optimal; indeed, it is possibly farcical.

It would be a responsible and mature approach—and I agree with the CFS Volunteers Association on this—to ensure that any investment of funds into CFS building and maintenance is done wisely and with appropriate prioritisations, and indeed that initial modest investment to do the audit is the first step. I would have hoped that the government would have come to the party with that very first step.

I thank members of this council for their support. I believe the motion will get up unscathed by the attempt of the government to congratulate themselves but not actually do the thing the motion calls for. I hope we do not see this summer as one that in recent years we have come to know as quite devastating for our state.

I congratulate those volunteer firefighters on their efforts to date and I commit that this council, and certainly from my perspective as a member of this council, will do all we can to support you in that extraordinarily difficult, demanding and necessary work. This will be a cruel summer ahead. We have already seen the declaration of the fire season brought forward a couple of weeks. We know that we rely on volunteers to keep our people, property and nature in this state safe in these seasons.

I hope that by the Mid-Year Budget Review we see the Malinauskas government come to the party with a small, modest investment, and the Minister for Emergency Services at least will have effected, through his executive powers, an audit so that we know exactly what we are dealing with. I do hope that we see very shortly those 345 stations that do not currently have change facilities have change facilities installed. With that, I commend the motion and urge council members to oppose the amendment.

Amendment negated; motion carried.

Parliamentary Committees

**ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: DISPOSAL OF PFAS
CONTAMINATED WASTE IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

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

That the first report of the committee, entitled Briefing Report on the Disposal of Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) Contaminated Waste in South Australia, be noted.

(Continued from 27 September 2023.)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (17:12): On 4 May 2021, the House of Assembly took a step forward in acknowledging the challenges and need for solutions to disposing of PFAS-contaminated waste. Understanding that these resilient, so-called forever chemicals have persisted in our environment, crossing borders of soil, water and even biological systems, is imperative. Although significant in the technological and industrial realms, their legacy also casts a shadow on environmental stewardship for a very long time.

The challenge is twofold: not only do we need a disposal method but also a location within South Australia. We have felt the strains of transporting waste interstate due to the absence of licensed local facilities for PFAS disposal.

I understand this situation prompted Southern Waste ResourceCo to come forth with a potential solution, applying to the EPA to accept PFAS waste at their McLaren Vale landfill, but that was met with some concerns primarily centred on the unacceptable level of risk it presented. The EPA, following its rigorous assessment, has denied this request. On 22 May this year, the Cleanaway Inkerman landfill received approval from the EPA to handle PFAS-contaminated waste.

It is important to understand the backdrop against how these decisions have been made. Our approach to PFAS management has consistently aligned with the PFAS National Environmental Management Plan, or NEMP 2.0. An updated version, NEMP 3.0, is coming due to collaborative efforts of state and territory Australian and New Zealand governments, all under the oversight of the Heads of EPA Australia and New Zealand (HEPA).

PFAS in South Australia remains under the regulatory structure of the Environment Protection Act, environmental protection policies and the guidelines set forth by the EPA SA. In the briefing on 23 May 2023, the Environment, Resources and Development Committee had briefings from Dr Jon Gorvett, Ms Kathryn Bellette and Dr Shaun Thomas from the EPA, and we thank them for their evidence. A large part of their briefing was to provide updated guidelines for PFAS disposal.

The revised guidelines, yet to be finalised, establish controls to safeguard the environment and health and to determine the viability of a site for PFAS disposal. In order for the existing landfills to be PFAS compliant they would need to undergo a process change in their licences, and an exhaustive human health and ecological risk assessment will become mandatory, ensuring that all of these consequences are evaluated.

We look forward to progress on this journey. Clearly, there have been a number of different communities that have been impacted by PFAS persisting in their environment and we understand that this is a challenge that we will all face going forward.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:15): I rise to speak on this report. PFAS, of course, are a group of over 4,000 synthetic chemicals being used in industry and consumer products for decades because of their ability to resist heat, stains, grease and water. Unfortunately, in many ways, these useful properties also make PFAS highly problematic 'forever chemicals' that persist in people, animals and the environment, and may impact on their health.

The PFAS of greatest concern are those that are highly mobile in water, which means that they travel long distances from their source point. Many countries have discontinued or are progressively phasing out their use. Indeed, the Australian government has worked since 2002 to reduce the use of certain PFAS.

The historical use of PFAS in firefighting foams has resulted in increased levels being detected at sites like airports and defence bases where firefighting training has been conducted, including the RAAF base at Edinburgh in South Australia. Heightened environmental levels of PFAS have also been found near some industrial areas, effluent outfalls and landfill sites.

It should come as no surprise that when landfill operator Southern Waste ResourceCo lodged an application with the EPA in 2020 to begin accepting PFAS waste at their landfill on Tatchilla Road near McLaren Vale, many members of the local community and the City of Onkaparinga were deeply opposed to this development. Local industry was concerned about reputational damage to McLaren Vale's internationally renowned wine region, and residents were not only worried about their health but also about the impact that this could have on property prices in surrounding regions such as Willunga, Maslin Beach and further afield.

Fortunately, the local community successfully campaigned to protect their health and their environment. They petitioned the state government as well as the EPA, which ruled in 2021 that the disposal of PFAS at the landfill would not be allowed to go ahead due to an 'unacceptable level of risk'. It was a relief to many, but the proposal should never have been considered in the first place. It was this proposed PFAS waste dump and the resulting public outcry that prompted the House of Assembly in May 2021 to task the ERDC with investigating and reporting on the management of

PFAS in our state. At that time, there was no location whatsoever in South Australia where PFAS could be safely disposed of.

As noted in this report, over the course of the ERDC's inquiry, the EPA developed new siting guidelines for the disposal of PFAS waste in landfills and, rather than continue with the inquiry, the committee chose to be briefed by the EPA. It is good to see these new EPA guidelines map the suitability of PFAS disposal sites with reference to the risks to people and the environment, protected areas such as national parks and wildlife areas, water protection areas, heritage sites, food production areas, prescribed wells areas and Indigenous lands.

The guidelines firmly prevent PFAS waste from being disposed of in inappropriate landfill sites such as the one operated by Southern Waste ResourceCo at McLaren Vale. This is a good thing. Instead, the disposal of PFAS in our state will now occur at the Cleanaway Inkerman landfill site, which is a location consistent with the new guidelines and removes the need to transport PFAS interstate for disposal.

The committee heard from the EPA about the lengthy and extensive process of changing the licence to enable the Inkerman site to accept PFAS waste, which further highlighted the potential risks to human health and the environment posed by PFAS and the importance of storing it as securely as possible.

As a state, we should always be seeking to proactively protect our community from the harmful impacts of PFAS. We have some form on this. South Australia was the first state to ban fluorinated firefighting foams back in 2018. This was explicitly because of the associated environmental and human health risks associated with the use of and subsequent contamination by PFAS.

I was pleased that the committee had the opportunity to hear about the ongoing research into capturing and destroying PFAS, including the research being conducted by scientists at the University of South Australia and the University of Western Australia on a new, environmentally friendly method of breaking down PFAS substances in contaminated waters by using Australian native rushes and constructed floating wetland systems.

The risks of PFAS are clear and they are very real. It makes sense to ensure that dangerous and toxic waste is kept far away from residential areas and, of course, from our food production, because even with the best practice measures in place we cannot guarantee community safety. We must always ensure that the disposal of toxic substances is done in a manner and in a location that is least likely to cause harm. The EPA's development of these new guidelines is a really important step in ensuring that this happens, at least when it comes to the disposal of PFAS. With that, I commend this report.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (17:21): In wrapping up and concluding this debate, I would like to thank the Hon. Michelle Lensink and the Hon. Tammy Franks for not only speaking on this important report today but also their work on the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, which is chaired by the member for Badcoe, Jayne Stinson.

As has been mentioned today, the EPA has done important work in mapping out where it is appropriate to be storing PFAS and making sure that safety and environmental impacts are minimised, because we know that there is considerable concern about where PFAS is disposed. We know that governments around the country are taking this seriously and are looking at ways to reduce the impact of PFAS in our community.

Motion carried.

Motions

ROTARY CLUB OF ADELAIDE

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (17:22): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges that 24 August 2023 marks the 100th anniversary of the inaugural meeting to form the Rotary Club of Adelaide;

2. Recognises the Rotary Club of Adelaide's proud history of service to the South Australian, Australian and international communities; and
3. Congratulates the Rotary Club of Adelaide on its centenary.

This year marks 100 years since the formation of the Rotary Club of Adelaide. It is one of Australia's oldest Rotary Clubs, having been formed in August 1923 through sponsorship by the Rotary Club of Melbourne, which was itself only two years old at the time. Twenty-three charter members formed South Australia's inaugural Rotary Club and began the proud history of Rotary in our state. Their first luncheon was held just across the road from this place, in the South Australian Hotel—which stood on what is now the site of the Stamford Plaza—on 31 August 1923.

For anyone who is not thoroughly familiar, Rotary International is a global service organisation based within local communities that provides aid and assistance throughout the world. Rotary's mission focuses on advancing global wellbeing through the improvement of health and education and the alleviation of poverty. Rotary's list of supported causes goes to the fundamental substance of human rights. They place particular focus on fighting disease, providing clean water, supporting young people to access education, growing local economies and protecting the environment.

Rotarians describe themselves as 'people of action'. Their two longstanding mottos, which both appeared at the top of the notice for Rotary Adelaide's inaugural luncheon in 1923, are 'Service above self' and 'One profits most who serves best'. The ideals these mottos embody are elaborated beautifully by one of the things within the Rotary canon that resonates with me the most—the Rotary four-way test, which is meant to be followed by all Rotarians. The four-way test is: of the things we think, say or do, (1) is it the truth, (2) is it fair to all concerned, (3) will it build goodwill and better friendships and (4) will it be beneficial to all concerned?

These strike me as sound principles of guidance for any person in virtually any undertaking. They offer a favourable reflection of the values of Rotary International, as well as illustrating some of the reasons for the organisation's enduring success. From the establishment of the first Rotary Club in Chicago in 1905, Rotary has grown astronomically. Only 16 years after its foundation, there were clubs on six continents. Today, there are 1.2 million Rotarians in nearly 33,000 clubs around the world. There are Rotary Clubs right across Australia and among South Australia's clubs many owe their origins to the sponsorship and support of Rotary Adelaide.

The first club sponsored by Rotary Adelaide was Mount Gambier in 1928, followed by Unley in 1935, Port Adelaide in 1946 and many more in the decades that followed. In its 100 years, Rotary Adelaide has sponsored 13 new Rotary Clubs, an Interact Club and a Rotaract Club. Rotary Adelaide is steadfast in its service to community, both locally and globally. Internationally, they fund water treatment plants in Sri Lanka, as well as supporting various projects across education and public health in Serbia, Nepal, the Philippines, India, Timor-Leste, Papua New Guinea and Tonga.

Within Australia, they support a number of projects and institutions, including the national Science and Engineering Challenge, the Hutt St Centre, the Migrant Resource Centre, a scholarship program for First Nation students across healthcare disciplines and the Australian Landscape Trust at Calperum Station, to name but a few.

To kick off their centenary year, Rotary Adelaide held a Founders Day Luncheon at Adelaide Oval on Thursday 24 August 2023, exactly 100 years from the date the club held its foundational meeting. I can only imagine that the charter members of Rotary Adelaide, whatever their hopes and intentions were for the club into the future, would be delighted that it is still going strong today and that its members cherish and honour their club's proud history.

I commend Rotary Adelaide's executive board and members, both past and present, for their dedication to service. It is an undisputed moral good to serve one's community and I appreciate the genuine impact that true people of action make on our world. Congratulations on reaching your centenary. May the next 100 years bring continued success and strength. I commend the motion.

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

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE

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

That this council—

1. Notes that this year marks the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Adelaide Festival Centre, Australia's first major capital city arts venue, known as the heart of the arts in this Festival State;
2. Commends the Adelaide Festival Centre management and staff, board members, performing artists and all who have supported the centre with their philanthropic endeavours, their volunteer efforts, their labour and creativity, and their patronage over the last 50 years; and
3. Recognises the extraordinary ongoing economic, educational, cultural and arts tourism contribution made by the Adelaide Festival Centre and its associated entities and activities over the last 50 years, today and into the future.

(Continued from 30 August 2023.)

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:27): I thank the member for this motion to celebrate 50 years of the Adelaide Festival Centre and surrounds. Coincidentally, it is the 50th anniversary of the iconic Sydney Opera House, which took seven years to finish amid lots of controversy. That was not the case here with our centre, a project fulfilled by Premier Don Dunstan, a staunch supporter of the arts in this state.

The centre, of course, was built after the demolition of the Adelaide city baths. For its day, the futuristic, geometric design was quite a surprise for a staid city of churches like Adelaide, but it emboldened our reputation as the Festival State, where we have enjoyed the Festival of Arts since the early 1960s.

I was a young cadet journalist at *The News* while the centre was being completed and as the afternoon paper's TV writer, I was lucky enough to be invited as part of the audience for one of the theatre's lead-up events to iron out any teething problems before the official razzle-dazzle opening where most of the elite establishment, the who's who of Adelaide society, were invited. This was a must-have ticket. As for us plebs from the suburbs, to get a seat in the amazing theatre to see the live broadcast of Ernie Sigley's *Adelaide Tonight* was like winning a bingo ticket.

I do recall the immense enthusiasm of 2,000-odd ordinary South Australians dressing up to the nines to be part of the excitement. It lived up—and more—to our expectations. Multiple Logie award winning Ernie was a great compere, albeit a rather modest singer. The show was broadcast live on NWS9 and included all the regulars, including Ian Fairweather, Kevin Crease and the incomparable Anne Wills, who can sing. I am scratching my head, but I reckon our own acclaimed baritone, Thomas Edmonds, also performed. It was a rollicking good night and everything seemed to go smoothly in the hands of the producer/director, Ron Christie, although we do not know if anything did go on behind the scenes.

The Festival Theatre established itself quite quickly as the hub of cultural activity in Adelaide and attracted many artists, actors and big stage musicals. I have been fortunate to have seen many of those productions, including spectacular operas, performers and musicians I admired, seated in those comfortable seats. I have also shot stories there as a TV journalist and been backstage to see how it all worked.

The centre was not without its controversy. One incident that comes to mind was in 1977 when the Queen was invited to open the new Hajek Plaza, which has since been demolished. It attracted a huge crowd of onlookers as well as invited VIPs. One long-haired guest made himself quite unwelcome for disrupting the ceremony after staging a protest by running across the plaza waving a flag. After all, the 1970s was the era of protests.

As he ran across the plaza, police, caught by surprise, quickly pounced on him and took him to the lock-up. He was released the following day without charge. Although it caused great concern at the time because of the presence of royalty, it later created some amusement for the sheer cheek he had shown. I do not think he would mind me naming him here today as we look back on it as part of the centre's unique history. That long-haired rebel with a cause was none other than the member for Giles, Eddie Hughes.

I have another experience to share. During my time as a South Australian bureau chief for *TV Week* magazine, I had the pleasure of chaperoning Hollywood TV and film star Pernell Roberts on a visit to Adelaide to promote his new TV show, *Trapper John, M.D.*, which was a spin-off from the hugely popular *M*A*S*H* show. Mr Roberts was also one of the stars of the popular *Bonanza* TV western. A wine aficionado, we had arranged for a visit to the Barossa Valley to sample some of our finest reds and a sumptuous lunch. It turned out to be a very long and boisterous lunch.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I am getting to that. However, Pernell told me he was in a rush to get back to Adelaide because he did not want to miss the legendary mime artist, Marcel Marceau, performing that night at the Festival Theatre. I accompanied him to the show and we had front-row seats. When the show started, you could hear a pin drop as Marcel entertained us with his silent artistry of mime, that is, until loud snoring erupted right alongside me. Pernell had fallen asleep, much to the amusement of the star on stage.

Of course, being a mime artist, he could not exactly yell to Pernell to wake up and be quiet. That would have spoiled his entire act. However, with that touch of brilliance and improvisation, Marcel stared and pointed at me, then made an action with his elbow for me to stir Pernell from his slumber, which I gently did, and he came back to life. Those around us all thought it was part of the act.

This centre is a treasure for all South Australians, and we are thankful that successive governments have spent considerable amounts of money to refurbish it and rebuild areas that had been affected by insidious and damaging concrete cancer. We have a Festival Theatre, along with its adjoining theatre and amphitheatre, which will serve our community for generations. I commend the member's motion.

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (17:34): I rise in support of this worthy motion. Members should rightly take a cross-partisan pleasure in celebrating this golden anniversary milestone for the institution that is the emblem of Adelaide's globally recognised arts landscape. The contribution of the Hon. Jing Lee in putting this motion to the council did a thorough job of paying tribute to the present day Festival Centre, and I echo her sentiments in relation to recognising the contribution of the Adelaide Festival Centre CEO, Douglas Gautier AM; the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust and its Chair, the Hon. Hieu Van Le; and the centre's board members, its management and all of its staff.

I also recognise the thousands of people, both within our state and outside of it, who have contributed crucial support through performance, through philanthropy, through volunteering their time, effort and creative expertise as well as through loyal patronage of the Adelaide Festival Centre's performances, programs, exhibitions and events across five decades.

The Festival Centre today is the proud result of well more than 50 years of broad collaborative efforts on behalf of so many good South Australians and many friends of the state over the decades to conceive, create, improve and maintain the centre to the high standard it now offers, from the building itself to all that happens within it.

I would like to focus my remarks on the pivotal and essential contribution that Don Dunstan made as Premier to the creation of the Adelaide Festival Centre. It is one of the most widely recognised physical monuments to his legacy, with the Dunstan Playhouse bearing his name in tribute, while the entire complex bears his essence in remembrance of his role as South Australia's visionary and unfailing champion of the arts.

The Festival Centre was far from a sole Dunstan effort in its concept, and it is certainly true that the idea of a Riverbank single-venue festival hall as well as the early planning began under Premier Steele Hall. The fact of the idea having enjoyed early and enthusiastic public support is a testament to its merit.

Don Dunstan had a vision for a more extensive arts complex relative to initial plans for a single concert hall, and when he came to office in 1970 the plans for the Adelaide Festival Centre evolved into the interconnected set of venues that now stand. Once the design, led by architects John Morphett and Colin Hassell, was approved, work on the nation's first multipurpose arts centre began in 1970. All three stages took 10 years to complete.

The Festival Theatre was completed in 1973, notably within its budget of \$10 million. On 2 June 1973, which was a Saturday, Prime Minister Gough Whitlam officially open the Festival Theatre, and its first performance was held that night.

It is great to see a recent announcement that the Festival Centre will present a series of free public conversations as part of its 50th anniversary celebrations: the Don Dunstan Lectures, exploring the influence of the arts in broader culture. The first, presented by Her Excellency the Hon. Frances Adamson, Governor of South Australia, on 28 November, will explore the role of cultural diplomacy and the value of the arts to society.

The second lecture, presented by former Premier the Hon. Mike Rann, will focus on Don Dunstan's creative legacy in film, screen and the arts more broadly and will be held on 14 December. While the lecture series is free of cost, registration is required to reserve a seat, so I encourage members to see to that if they wish to attend.

Local writer and columnist Brian Matthews, honorary professor at Flinders and a Don Dunstan enthusiast, recalls an endearing Dunstan anecdote. In *Eureka Street* he wrote in 2013 of a play he once staged in the Pioneer Women's Memorial Garden:

Towards the end of the 1970s I became a member of the Adelaide Writers Week Committee. It had been the custom in previous years to have a commemorative session on an Australian writer...I got the job for Writers Week 1980.

I decided to stage a kind of play for voices—a couple of critics, a poet, a narrator and two actors...the narrator...[was] an important role requiring someone with a fine voice, good timing, impeccable presence. With an insouciance that still embarrasses me when I look back, I asked Don Dunstan himself. He...said yes.

So we did it and it was a hit.

I had arranged lunch for the cast in the Festival Centre restaurant when the show was over and I walked across with Dunstan. As we approached the splendid building, its domes and contours glowing in the bright autumnal sun, he stopped, waved an arm to encompass the whole scene and said, with an ironic grin, 'I did that.'

Don Dunstan was not in all things known for his humility, but in all that he felt proud of achieving I submit that he amply earned his bragging rights. The Adelaide Festival Centre is an enduring icon of the arts in our state, and we are fortunate to have the opportunity to celebrate its landmark 50th year. I would like to again acknowledge every person who has contributed to its continued success over the past five decades and beyond. I thank the Hon. Jing Lee for moving this motion, and I commend it.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:39): I would like to thank the Hon. Frank Pangallo and the Hon. Reggie Martin for their wonderful contributions. Many interesting stories and treasured memories have been shared by the members. I would like to thank them for their support in celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Adelaide Festival Centre. With those remarks, I commend the motion.

Motion carried.

Bills

RETURN TO WORK (POST TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:40): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise to make my second reading speech on the Return to Work (Post Traumatic Stress Disorder) Amendment Bill, which I reintroduced recently. PTSD is a mental health condition triggered by a traumatic event or cumulative exposure to traumatic incidents and is symptomatically manifested through flashbacks, insomnia, hypervigilance and sometimes suicide.

This legislation will make PTSD diagnosed by a psychiatrist a presumptive condition for first responders, emergency workers, volunteers and others involved in time-critical, dangerous, life-threatening and traumatic events and situations, streamlining the often torturous and complicated

maze in making out their claims for workers compensation. It reverses the onus of proof from the injured worker to the employer.

I first introduced this bill in 2020, but it lapsed for various reasons, including a lack of support from the then Liberal Marshall government and the onset of the COVID-19 epidemic. There is legislation already in place in Tasmania and Queensland and elsewhere, and the bill mirrors their laws. It is also about to be included in federal workplace laws.

While I am unclear on where the Liberals stand today, I am hoping they will get behind it, considering their ongoing focus on the plight of our paramedics caught up in the ramping crisis. I am also counting on the Malinauskas Labor government, through the Attorney-General as the minister responsible for industrial relations, to endorse the objectives of the bill in supporting the mental health and recovery of our emergency frontline workers and volunteers and to support its passage through this chamber and the House of Assembly.

It would now be utterly hypocritical of Labor in this state to not commit to this important and required initiative, after its election commitments supporting paramedics and its promises to reduce ramping at our hospitals. It is time for Labor to return the goodwill the ambulance officers have shown them.

Another significant move which Labor should consider is the recent introduction of legislative reforms by the Albanese government that will make it easier for first responders who develop PTSD to access workers compensation schemes. The Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations, the Hon. Tony Burke, said the Albanese government will always stand alongside the first responders who keep Australia and Australians safe, while building on their work with firefighters to ensure they have better access to the compensation they deserve.

If it is good enough for federal Labor, it has to be good enough for state Labor. Our communities are so reliant on the incredible and often dangerous and challenging work our first responders carry out. They are often unheralded heroes who go about their responsibilities with diligence and without fuss. In carrying out their jobs they can experience all types of horrific scenes and stresses. At the end of their working day they go home to their families.

It is difficult for any of us to expect them to just totally switch off and erase those memories that can be ingrained for years. These nightmares may not even manifest for years, until they are triggered by some facet or incident in their lives. When they do appear, affected workers may suffer those feelings in silence until it becomes too much to bear.

In 2019, the Senate's Education and Employment References Committee reported on its extensive inquiry into mental health and wellbeing of first responders. It took evidence from a wide cross-section of emergency services and mental health experts and advisory bodies. The University of Adelaide's Centre for Traumatic Stress Studies reported emergency service workers face occupational hazards which present a risk to their mental health, describing the high rates of mental health disorders in this cohort as a predictable phenomenon.

In essence, it is the cumulative exposure to horrific accidents and life-threatening events, as well as the personal threat to their individual officers, that leads to cumulative risk of developing a range of mental health disorders. The report noted there was little actuarial modelling of this risk of mental health disorders during the career of an emergency service worker in any of the emergency services. The report also gave disturbing examples of lived experiences.

One was paramedic Peter James recalling his time as a student nurse. He was tasked to pick up stillborn babies born over the weekend and would have to place each baby in a cardboard box and place them on an ambulance stretcher. On one occasion there were seven babies. He took them to the Royal Hobart Hospital mortuary and placed each box on a sandstone shelf in the mortuary fridge. He says that at the time it did not impact on him, but as the years and decades rolled on he thought about it quite often.

Then there was firefighter Andrew Picker, who said first responders do not work in sterile office environments. Mr Picker said, and I quote:

We put our hearts and souls into our work. We constantly risk our lives at work. We have lost friends in our work. Our families risk losing a son, a daughter, a father, a wife when we go to work. We have had colleagues

significantly burnt or injured, shot or wounded, beaten and bashed, fallen from heights and hit by vehicles. We have had colleagues take their lives because of their experiences at work. We have had colleagues suffer and sadly die from significant cancers because of workplace exposure. Our actions or inactions are something we must carry with us for the rest of our lives.

He goes on to say, 'It is an honour and privilege to help others, but just as we care for others we also need to be cared for.'

Another emotive story came from an unnamed police officer. On a road patrol one day he was called to a fatality. He said he had attended many others and had learned to just deal with it, but when he got there he saw two 14 year olds lying dead on the road. It hit him like a brick. He said he was overcome with emotion. Again, I quote:

I did what was needed to be done but I was emotionally numb and I can't get the vision of those two lost lives out of my mind. I always just saw the bodies I never saw them as people. My mistake that night was I saw them as teenagers. Now my heart thumps every time we attend an accident. I just feel I will never be the same again.

And this from paramedic Malcolm Babb, who had responded to thousands of cardiac arrests, from newborns to the elderly, and was actively involved in resuscitation attempts. He managed something like 2,500 motor vehicle accidents and had to declare that there were no signs of life in many hundreds of cases. He personally had to inform the parents of a deceased child that their child had died. Malcolm says, 'That is very difficult to do (however it is part of the job), but it is even harder to inform a child that their parent/s are deceased.'

Mr Babb mentioned that he had been assaulted multiple times, was shot at, involved in knife fights and feared for his life on many occasions. He also had his own family threatened on numerous occasions. He witnessed a murder and suicide. Mr Babb's story might sound like you are watching a TV show but it is real and raw and happens each and every day in emergency services.

The Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists concurs that most first responders are repeatedly exposed to trauma. Research on Australian firefighters provides a valuable snapshot of trauma exposure in emergency services. A study on South Australian metropolitan firefighters found that 76 per cent of the workforce reported exposure to 10 or more critical incidents throughout their career, and almost all of those involved reported witnessing death on the job.

The South Australian Centre for Traumatic Stress Studies reported that the hazards and risks of exposure to trauma cannot be understated. It said there is an extensive body of literature documenting these hazards and risks and that the combined literature would suggest that ambulance officers and paramedics are a group at highest risk. In general, the risk is highlighted by the positive linear relationship between the number of fatal accidents attended and the rates of post-traumatic stress disorder, depression and heavy drinking independent of the emergency service in which the individual serves.

Emergency medical dispatchers are also prone to mental stresses and challenges and PTSD. It is important to know that emergency services officers do not become unwell after just one single traumatic event, it is often the repeated exposure to trauma over time. The United Firefighters Union Australia reported that firefighters are very well trained and while you can train a firefighter, and this country certainly has great firefighters, you cannot condition them from the accumulated exposure to the trauma. They have looked at programs where recruits get some education and promotional courses but you cannot inoculate them from the accumulated exposure.

There is also a stark warning here for the Malinauskas government, as it tries to grapple with ambulance ramping and reducing response times. The South Australian Ambulance Employees Association told a Senate inquiry in 2019 there needs to be a rethink of the pressure crews are placed under. It creates a risk for paramedics themselves and the community they serve.

Safe Work Australia has also done extensive research into mental health in the workplace, finding mental health conditions for first responders include depression, anxiety and PTSD. It can also lead to comorbidity issues, alcohol and drug abuse. The Centre for Traumatic Stress Studies pointed to emerging evidence indicating that PTSD is a systemic disease and emphasised the need for those managing the mental health of first responders to understand this.

Senator Andrew McLachlan, a former President of the Legislative Council, is a fierce supporter of paramedics and the perils of their job. He spoke passionately about them in the Senate in 2020, aptly describing them as one of the most noble of professions while advocating for committed support from governments. He said:

In leading a life to keep our community safe—especially during the pandemic when they walked willingly out of their own secure homes to an uncertain day—made them truly exceptional people. Angels who walk among us.

Senator McLachlan said a paramedic's mental health was adversely affected not only by the trauma they constantly experienced but the pressures of their job. As an active Army Reservist who has done tours of war-torn Afghanistan and Iraq, he also saw firsthand the stress associated with the service of veterans that led to PTSD. I thank Senator McLachlan for his unwavering commitment to the cause of first responders and also his support for my advocacy in South Australia.

For this bill, I have consulted widely with many, including Professor Alexander 'Sandy' McFarlane AO of the Centre for Traumatic Stress Studies at the University of Adelaide; the Police Association of South Australia, which endorse this legislation; the Ambulance Employees Association; the South Australian branch of the Nursing and Midwifery Federation; the CFS Volunteers Association; the SA SES Volunteers Association; and the United Firefighters Union of South Australia. They are all supportive.

This bill will cover a range of professions, including paramedics, police, firefighters, nurses, doctors, train drivers and correctional services officers. During a recent speech to set up a select committee looking into the mental health and suicides among first responders, I read sections of the harrowing statement given to me by Aaron, a police officer who narrowly escaped with his life after being shot in the face. I will finish here by quoting Aaron's heartfelt message on the necessity of legislation like this:

Until our emergency services can count on legislation that supports and promotes their mental health, then no amount of work by the organisations themselves will alleviate the stigma and fear of coming forwards about mental health. No employee assistance program or peer counselling will dispel the fear of losing our identities. No well-intentioned case manager will mitigate the dread of losing our livelihoods.

We often talk in this place about our admiration and support for those brave men and women who confront danger on a daily basis. I urge members to also consider the hidden emotional and physical costs of what we expect them to do. Shame on any government that puts dollars ahead of the wellbeing of these fearless angels among us. I commend the bill, which I intend to bring to a vote in November.

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

Motions

ZOOS SA

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

That this council—

1. Recognises Zoos SA was originally established in 1878 as The Acclimatisation Society of South Australia, and is one of the state's oldest conservation organisations;
2. Notes that both Adelaide Zoo and Monarto Safari Park are long-established parts of the South Australian community and have been integral to the state's tourism industry;
3. Congratulates Adelaide Zoo for winning the Major Tourist Attractions category at the 2022 South Australian Tourism Awards;
4. Congratulates Monarto Safari Park for winning the Tourist Attractions category, Excellence in Accessible Tourism category and Voters' Choice Award at the 2022 South Australian Tourism Awards; and
5. Commends Zoos SA for representing South Australia at the Great Wine Capitals Global Network and winning the 2023 Global Best of Wine Tourism Award for the 'Grapes for Good' program, and for the support the program brings to tourism in the Langhorne Creek region.

(Continued from 22 March 2023.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:56): I rise to support the motion moved by my colleague the Hon. Jing Lee, and I thank her for bringing this motion to the chamber. Zoos everywhere play several important roles, contributing to education, conservation, research and entertainment. Our own group of facilities—the Adelaide Zoo and the Monarto Safari Park—are indeed important institutions in our South Australian community, having been established in 1878.

Our two zoological facilities provide a unique opportunity for people, especially children, to learn about a wide variety of animals from all around the world. They offer educational programs, exhibits and interactive displays that take visitors to Adelaide Zoo and Monarto and teach people about the importance of biodiversity, wildlife conservation and ecological principles. This firsthand experience can foster a greater appreciation and understanding of nature.

My own personal experience of seeing different animals at the Adelaide Zoo that I had only seen in books and on the screen prior to that was influential and inspirational in my decision to be a veterinarian. Many modern zoos actively participate in breeding programs for endangered species and work to protect the genetic diversity of these animals. Our zoos in South Australia are no different.

Zoos SA staff are working on improving populations for the greater bilby, the regent honeyeater, the western swamp tortoise and the black-flanked rock-wallaby, to name just a few Australian species. They are also involved in international breeding programs, in particular for Zambian wild dogs and chimpanzees, and they also run conservation projects in places such as Kenya and the Solomon Islands.

Zoos often collaborate with international conservation organisations to support species recovery and reintroduction programs, and animals in zoos may serve as insurance populations for species that are critically endangered in the wild. Zoos SA is internationally recognised for its work in establishing insurance populations.

Directly linked to those programs and partnerships is zoological scientific research. Zoos SA scientists and researchers study animal behaviour, physiology and health. This research contributes to our understanding of wildlife biology and can have a broader application in fields like medicine and ecology. I know firsthand how committed Zoos SA are to providing high standards of care for their animals, promoting their welfare and supporting rehabilitation efforts for injured or orphaned wildlife. They endeavour to provide a safe and comfortable environment for animals in their care.

On the note of animal care, I would like to mention an incident from my years as a regional veterinarian, a story of which I was reminded when speaking about this motion with the Hon. Ian Hunter. There was a travelling circus, which was passing through the Riverland some years ago, that had an ill macaque monkey. I recall the professionalism of the Zoos SA staff whom I consulted with over multiple back and forth phone calls to assist the macaque, who was unfortunately suffering from diarrhoea.

They were exemplary in ensuring that not only was the macaque diagnosed and treated appropriately but that I, as the practising veterinarian, was also safe in dealing with the macaque monkey. Zoonosis, which is obviously the spread of diseases from animals to humans, is a risk when dealing with monkeys, particularly their notoriety in the spread of herpes virus. So I was thankful to Zoos SA staff at that time, and I know that their professionalism and expertise continue today.

As specifically mentioned in my colleague's motion, Zoos SA is an important contributor to our state's tourism dollars. Visitors from surrounding areas come to the zoos, which obviously boosts local economies. This influx of visitors has a positive impact on businesses like hotels, restaurants, and souvenir shops, generating revenue for not only Adelaide but also for the Murraylands region around Monarto Safari Park.

I would lastly like to applaud the Adelaide Zoo for their win at the 2022 South Australian Tourism Awards. The Major Tourist Attraction category, as I understand it, is hotly contested, but this award is a testament to just how well run the Adelaide Zoo is. They continue to be innovative with their activations and community engagement. I understand that they have recently also been named

as a finalist in this year's awards, in both the Major Tourist Attraction and Excellence in Accessible Tourism award, and I wish them all the best on this year's submissions.

Just like myself, a visit to the Adelaide Zoo or Monarto Safari Park could inspire the next generation of conservationists, biologists and scientists. With that, I commend the motion to the chamber.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (18:02): I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council, the Hon. Dr Nicola Centofanti, for her wonderful contribution and for sharing her personal stories and professional experience in relation to Adelaide zoos. I also want to acknowledge her remarks regarding the economic importance of the Adelaide Zoo and the contributions made to tourism of South Australia as well. With those remarks, I commend the motion.

Motion carried.

At 18:05 the council adjourned until Thursday 19 October 2023 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***GAS INDUSTRY CONSULTATION**

In reply to **the Hon. R.A. SIMMS** (15 June 2023).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Minister for Energy and Mining has advised:

He did address a conference of the Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration Association (APPEA) in Adelaide in May this year and that he is aware of a report in *The Guardian* about his comments.

The minister advises that he told the APPEA conference that the government of South Australia is committed to decarbonising the economy as soon and as efficiently as possible.

The minister spoke of this state's leading role in the energy transition including:

- Achieving more than 70 per cent of electricity generation from renewable sources, a world-first for a grid of more than one gigawatt without hydroelectricity.
- Pioneering grid-scale batteries.
- Investing \$593 million in the Hydrogen Jobs Plan.

The minister spoke of hydrogen and its trajectory to deliver multiple benefits—creating value for excess renewably generated electricity; long duration firming to facilitate more investment in renewables; and decarbonising hard-to-abate heavy industries.

Hydrogen is the only known, commercially viable alternative to using coal to transform iron ore and the most prospective alternative to natural gas in cement manufacture. We face a choice between continuing to pollute the world, ceasing production of steel and cement, or employing hydrogen.

The minister advises that the Malinauskas government will not accept either of the first two options. We must stop pollution, but we cannot condemn future generations—including billions of people in developing countries—to enduring and worsening poverty because they cannot build homes and cities of cement and steel. That is why this government has chosen to develop a hydrogen industry.

That industry will depend on people who have the skills and experience of workers in the petroleum sector. That was the minister's message to the APPEA delegates: We cannot decarbonise the economy without them. Indeed, the theme of the APPEA conference was 'Lead, Shape, Innovate—Accelerating to Net Zero'.

As representative of the host jurisdiction, the minister told delegates that the Department for Energy and Mining was available to help them hold a successful conference. Unfortunately, those quite ordinary words from a host city were interpreted as an open invitation for the unbridled exploitation of the state. Nothing could have been further from the truth.

Unfortunately, not only was that misleading report published but the honourable member has repeated it in this place.

ELECTRICITY COSTS IN REMOTE ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES

In reply to **the Hon. C. BONAROS** (15 June 2023).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Minister for Energy and Mining has advised:

1. The final decision made by the Essential Services Commission of South Australia (ESCOSA) on the Cowell Electric Supply Pty Ltd licence amendment required Cowell Electric to report to ESCOSA quarterly on metering metrics.

ESCOSA has confirmed that Cowell Electric has delivered its fourth and final quarterly report.

The final decision did not provide that ESCOSA would publish this data quarterly, only that it would be published.

2. ESCOSA will publish data in accord with the final decision.

3. From July 2022 to March 2023, Cowell Electric reported a number of self-disconnections. It was reported that some intentional self-disconnections were where residents left their homes for extended periods of time. ESCOSA is continuing to assess and verify these matters.

4. ESCOSA is reviewing the available data and preparing its initial analysis for publication. Following publication, ESCOSA will commence a review in accord with its final decision.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAMS

In reply to **the Hon. C. BONAROS** (30 August 2023).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services has advised:

There are various services and programs available for prisoners in relation to substance misuse. These include:

The South Australian Prison Health Service (SAPHS) offers Opioid Agonist Therapy (OAT) for prisoners who request it for opioid addiction, whether sentenced or remand. There is no current waiting list for a person to start the OAT assessment process.

All Department for Correctional Services (DCS) intensive behaviour change programs include modules on substance misuse and how it relates to prisoner's offending behaviours. DCS also runs the Making Changes program, specifically for general offending related to drug and alcohol use and abuse. Those found suitable will be added to a waitlist and are considered for program involvement as close as possible to their release date. This maximises the effectiveness of the treatment upon release.

Services procured by Offenders Aid & Rehabilitation Services (OARS) and Aboriginal Drug & Alcohol Council (ADAC) are voluntary and available to both sentenced and remand prisoners in the form of the Smart Recovery program, Drug Awareness Program, individual counselling and tailored support for participating Aboriginal clients.

Prisoners in custody, whether sentenced or remand, can access a free telephone helpline for Alcohol and Other Drugs (AOD) counselling provided by Life Without Barriers and Uniting Communities.

There are a range of service delivery options provided by DCS, SAPHS and non-government organisations. The intensive behaviour change programs are the only programs that require the prisoner to be sentenced and have enough time to access the program.

Intensive behaviour change programs are not offered to prisoners until they are sentenced due to the need for in-depth discussion about offending, including current offences (charges). If a person is pleading not guilty they cannot engage in program content in a meaningful way. In addition, until a person is sentenced the length of time available for treatment is not known. Research into best practice in offender rehabilitation indicates that a person's risk of reoffending may increase if they do not complete a rehabilitation program in full. DCS programs run for differing lengths of time, depending on the program, so the length of time a prisoner is sentenced to is important in ascertaining their priority for attending a rehabilitation program relevant to their assessed needs.

This government has committed to increasing the number and range of programs available through the reducing reoffending 20 per cent by 2026 target, and Closing the Gap initiatives. This includes programs for people who are sentenced, on remand, and in the community. Various services and programs are available for prisoners in relation to substance misuse that can be accessed during their time in custody. The intensive behaviour change programs are the only programs that require the prisoner to be sentenced and have enough time to access the program.

OPERATION PARAGON

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (31 August 2023).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services has advised:

Since the expansion of the Declared Public Precinct commencing on 11 July 2023 there have been no persons sentenced to imprisonment for an offence against part 14B of the Summary Offences Act 1953 (SOA).

Since 11 July 2023, police have reported interactions with 210 persons where authorities under part 14B of the SOA were utilised and 24 persons have been arrested, with 25 charges laid.

Of the 24 persons arrested and charged, 15 persons were diverted from the court and the matters have been finalised by way of adult or youth caution. Nine matters are currently pending before the court.

TRAM DRIVERS DISPUTE

In reply to **the Hon. R.A. SIMMS** (31 August 2023).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Minister for Infrastructure and Transport has advised:

As previously stated on the public record, it is anticipated that the government will resume operations of tram services from Torrens Connect by July 2025.

WORK-FROM-HOME ARRANGEMENTS

In reply to **the Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO** (14 September 2023).

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

Public sector employees in South Australia have the right to request flexible working arrangements, which encompass many options including working from home (WFH). These requests will be considered in line with the business requirements of the relevant department or agency.

The Commissioner for Public Sector Employment (the commissioner) has worked with agencies to identify minimum standards for managing WFH arrangements. These are included in Commissioner's Determination 8: Working Flexibly, and they aim to ensure employees working from home are productive, accountable and safe.

Agencies subject to commissioner's directions must apply the minimum standards. Where an agency is not subject to commissioner's determinations, it is encouraged to adopt the minimum standards as policy.

While determination 8 sets out the minimum standards for WFH arrangements, each agency will develop the detailed provisions that apply to their employees.

The Attorney-General's Department (AGO) has a policy and procedure on flexible working arrangements. This includes WFH arrangements, as well as other flexible work options. Employees need approval from their manager to work from home.

The manager and employee must ensure that arrangements are clearly agreed and understood in relation to health and safety, hours of work, contact and availability, operational needs and the general nature of the work proposed to be performed, including key work activities and expected outcomes.